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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report by The QED Group, LLC (QED) was commissioned by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) as an independent, mid-term evaluation of its Liberia Teacher Training Program (LTTP) project being implemented by the Academy for Educational Development (AED). QED’s evaluation team was tasked with the following:

1. Assess the performance of LTTP trainers in improving the skill levels of Liberian teacher trainers and teachers.

2. Assess the performance of LTTP in supporting the Ministry of Education’s (MOE) Liberia Primary Education Recovery Program (L-PERP) to improve the quality of primary education.

3. Assess the performance of LTTP in building the MOE’s capacity to manage and oversee teacher training as part of the nascent national education system.

4. Provide recommendations for ensuring the sustainable continuation of the processes begun by LTTP under the leadership of the MOE.

BACKGROUND

After 14 years of civil war, which resulted in the destruction of the country’s entire infrastructure, Liberia was confronted with the urgent need to rebuild its education system. Rebuilding the education system called for the Government of Liberia (GOL) to address the two main handicaps resulting from wartime: the destruction of most of the schools and other education related buildings (such as the Rural Teacher Training Institutes, RTTIs) and the absence of teachers. Thus, the GOL’s post-war education reform strategy concentrated on school rehabilitation and bringing teachers back into classrooms. Because most trained teachers were living as refugees in neighboring countries, the teachers that were welcomed back into the system were — in a large majority — untrained jobless members of the community who were willing to assume vacant teaching positions in the hope that someday their efforts would translate into stable employment. Many of these teachers underwent emergency trainings provided by an array of international NGOs according to different curricula that did not address modern, student-oriented learning methodologies. However, programs to address the “emergency” shortage of trained teachers marginally improve the skills of a modest number of teachers but, ultimately, added confusion to a teacher certification process already in disarray and did little to meet Liberia’s long-term needs for adequately trained teachers. This was the situational assessment that prompted USAID to develop the Liberia Teacher Training Program (LTTP), a three-year effort (2006-2009) designed to train Liberian citizens to become teacher trainers and to better prepare pre-service and in-service teachers for teaching at the primary school level. LTTP is currently being administered by The Academy for Educational Development (AED) in collaboration with the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Mississippi Consortium for International Development (MCID).
METHODOLOGY

The assessment team used both qualitative and quantitative data to document the program’s accomplishments and lessons learned. The quantitative information came from existing data and reviews of reports and other documents describing the implementation and operations of LTTP. The qualitative information was collected from observations of classrooms and visits to the RTTIs, as well as from interviews with project stakeholders, trainers, teachers, and senior MOE officials.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions presented below are organized according to the following three LTTP performance indicators:

1. Improving teacher training standards and teacher skills.
2. Supporting the Liberia’s overall plan for improving the education systems, as defined in the Liberia Primary Education Recovery Program (L-PERP) and improving schools.
3. Building MOE institutional capacity and strengthening the education system in Liberia.

LTTP Performance in Improving Training Standards and Teacher Skills

Accomplishments

- **Established general principles of teacher competency known as “Professional Standards for Teachers in Liberia.”** These standards identified five domains of competencies: knowledge, teaching skills, classroom management, student assessment and evaluation, and professional ethics and behavior. These general standards were also useful in the development of the C-Certificate level primary teacher training curriculum that could be implemented by all RTTIs.

- **Designed and implemented a new teacher training curricula for pre- and in-service teachers** based on an active-learning, student-oriented approach to primary level instruction.

- **Implemented effective Trainer of Teachers (TOTs) training designs.** LTTP has created an impressive corpus of curricula, standards, assessment instruments, supplementary materials, and TOTs training designs that foster high congruence between pre-and in-service training provisions.

- **Implemented C-Certificate Pre-service Training at the RTTIs.** LTTP facilitated the development of effective administrative structures for the RTTIs.
Areas Where Improvement is Needed

- Unable to recruit the desired number of qualified trainees for the first RTTI cohorts. The use of literacy screening test eliminated many applicants for the pre-service training whose literacy skills were unacceptably low.

- Need to redress the gender imbalance among the RTTI faculty and student body. Less than half of the potentially qualified applicants for pre-service training at the RTTIs were females, despite LTTP’s efforts to recruit female high school leavers.

- RTTIs are underutilized. The potential annual trainee output of all three functioning RTTIs is 710. The current annual output of 471 trainees makes only a slight dent in the overall need for 16,000 trained teachers.

- Instruction in the restored RTTIs suffers from a lack of trainee textbooks, library resources, instructional aids, equipment and supplies. While Kakata recently received donated books, neither Zorzor nor Kakata had anything approaching a full range of books, journals, and electronic resources covering education topics and the subject matter of the primary curriculum. Two out the three RTTIs lacked operational computerized resources and connectivity.

- The Webbo RTTI remains unfinished. This has forced all students from Southeastern Liberia to attend the Kakata RTTI. The failure of the responsible donor agency and its contractors to complete the renovation of this facility has continued to complicate the planning for the pre-service training program.

- There is a lack of follow-up after training completion. While the trainee monitoring by LTTP regularly reinforces skill development during the program, the sudden cessation of such monitoring at the end of the training year may leave some teachers ill prepared to use their skills effectively.

- In-service training is believed to be unsustainable without continued outside support. Both international and Liberia LTTP staff agreed that the in-service cluster-based training program would not be sustainable without continued external support for the immediate future. The need for continued outside support arises primarily because the MOE does not currently have capacity and institutional will to sponsor and maintain the program on its own.

- The in-service program’s current coverage of only five of 13 counties represents a significant constraint in expediting the training of Liberia’s 15,000+ untrained teachers.
LTTP Performance in Supporting the L-PERP and Improving Schools

Accomplishments

- LTTP has fulfilled its commitment to assistance with Component 3 (Teacher Development) of the L-PERP. The first cohort of pre-service teachers will graduate from LTTP in June 2009. The second in-service teacher training class — the first to use the curricula developed by LTTP — will graduate in August 2009.

- LTTP has made efforts to assist the MOE with the implementation of Component 5 (Supervision and Assessment Services) of the L-PERP. While the MOE has moved forward with the development of the Grade 6 West Africa Examination Council (WAEC) exam, the opportunity, in collaboration with the MOE and other organizations, LTTP has developed a PTA manual that encourages communities and parents to take a proactive interest in assessment and the success of their children in examinations.

- In accordance with Component 6 (Strengthening Education Governance) of the L-PERP, LTTP is currently working with the university to develop systems that will allow the MOE to implement processes and standards for teaching and learning in primary schools.

- LTTP’s support for Component 8 of the L-PERP (Institutional and Implementation Arrangements for Program) has achieved mixed results. The RTTIs are on solid footing but ongoing support for RTTIs from the MOEs continues to be a critical issue. LTTP regularly intervenes with the MOE management to ensure continued support for the RTTIs.

Areas Where Improvement is Needed

- Teachers in pre-service and in-service programs have received instruction in lesson planning, with reference to MOE and WAEC curricula, but have no consistent documentation of expected educational outcomes. Additionally, there has not been enough time for LTTP teacher training activities to result in significant changes in pupil performance.

- Participation in LTTP activities designed to strengthen education governance by key education officials is sporadic. Principals, who are generally considered to be the key determinants for quality in the system, receive training in LTTP-supported areas. However, participation by County Education Officers (EOs) is irregular, although EOs are encouraged to assist in the training.
LTTP Performance in Building MOE Institutional Capacity and Strengthening the Education System in Liberia

Accomplishments

- LTTP has established ongoing collaboration with the MOE with the recognized goal of transforming Liberia’s education system.

Areas Where Improvement is Needed

- The successful achievement of LTTP’s goals was challenged by the absence of action or accountability on the part of the MOE. The MOE was unclear about its responsibilities with regard to teacher training. The lack of clear assignment of responsibilities, chain of command and empowerment of MOE personnel to make decisions based on an agreed upon work plan impeded progress in the implementation of training activities.

- It is difficult to count on a timely procurement and delivery of services and resources need to implement LTTP at the local level. Centralization of procurement of commodities, lack of a previously agreed upon procurement plan and transportation difficulties, makes forecast and implementation of operations unpredictable.

- The environment in which LTTP is implementing its activities is one where teachers are uncertain about their future. The in-service teachers participating in the LTTP training have not received assurance that they will be hired when they obtain their C-Certificate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While LTTP has generated a number of major achievements in Liberia’s education sector since its inception, QED’s evaluation team also identified additional facets of project performance that still need to be addressed.

LTTP Performance in Improving Teacher Training Standards and Teacher Skills

- Continue to provide outside technical assistance to consolidate the nascent curriculum development capacity among Liberian educators. This assessment found that there are three primary level curricula currently in use in Liberia: 1) the outdated 1996 curriculum often available only one per school, 2) a newly-developed curriculum being piloted in selected counties, and 3) the WAEC curriculum upon which students are examined beginning in Grade 6.

- Expand the number of RTTIs and consolidate and improve the operation of existing RTTIs. While the Kakata and Zorzor RTTIs were functional, the Webbo RTTI was not fit for use at the time of this evaluation.

- Introduce a C-, B-, and A-Certificate qualification and salary ladder within each level of the K-12 continuum rather than link each certificate with the next higher level of
the education system. As currently conceived, the MOE’s proposed reinstatement of the old C-, B-, and A-Certificate qualifications for teachers offers no way for primary education teachers and school administrators to advance within the primary level.

- Link the delayed UNESCO-led curriculum revision of the B-certificate program with another donor to maintain the pace of creating and maintaining a teacher professional development system.

- Continue the cluster in-service teacher training program for ongoing teacher skill development and quality improvement. The in-service program currently covers only five of 13 counties, representing a significant challenge to expediting the training of Liberia’s 16,000 untrained teachers.

- Enlarge the role of RTTI outreach coordinators to provide monitoring and support of teachers who have completed in-service cluster training program. There are currently no mechanisms in place to monitor the performance of a teacher trained during the one-year in-service cluster program.

- Modify the no-family rule at RTTIs to encourage females with small children to attend pre-service programs. Poor conditions at RTTIs and no daycare options may be discouraging women with families from wanting to participate in pre-service teacher training sessions.

- Provide additional scholarships to qualified female teacher trainee candidates for enrollment in RTTI pre-service training. Of the 478 candidates attending the pre-service training at the RTTIs and expecting to graduate in June 2009, only 44 are women.

- Supply the RTTI reference libraries with relevant and current educational books, journals and reference volumes, as well as sufficient computers with Internet connectivity to allow both computer literacy instruction and individual use.

- Provide RTTI trainers and classrooms with adequate instructional aids, materials to make such aids, and appropriate furniture to optimize the use of student-centered instructional methods.

- Continue technical assistance collaboration with the UofL’s College of Education to enhance faculty qualifications and strengthen course syllabi.

**LTTP Performance in Supporting the L-PERP and Improving Schools**

- Improve the quality of schools and related facilities with involvement from local communities. Many of the schools visited were in poor condition, with little or no running water and periods of time without electricity. Parents, unified within their
communities, should take more of an active interest in helping to improve the quality of the schools their children attend.

- Implement system-wide assessments at the primary education level with which to measure actual learning against accepted standards.

- Supply schools with textbooks that are developed in Liberia that reflect the student-centered, activity-based methods taught in RTTIs and in-service training sessions.

- Restore the responsibility of managing items of training, certifying, and remunerating teachers, communicating core learning objectives, providing infrastructure and supplies, building a robust monitoring and information system, and disseminating information to the MOE.

**LTTP Performance in Building MOE Institutional Capacity and Strengthening the Education System in Liberia**

- Strengthen the coordination of USAID partners and other donor agencies involved in education sector activities in Liberia to avoid repetition and overlapping within projects.

- Finalize an appropriate payroll system to address the issue of trained teachers currently working without compensation.

- Implement a professional development strategy with salary increases and other incentives linked to a performance review system.

- Establish linkages between the MOE, County and District Offices and RTTIs, through an intranet and computerization process that makes possible fluent communication and data transmission. This strategy will facilitate management and decision making processes. This action should be the mandate of a Task Force that would provide advisors and technical assistance under the form of a direct intervention in the MOE.

- Develop and implement a two-year plan to restore the proper management of Liberia’s education system, beginning with the MOE. The strategy should encompass the definition of roles and responsibilities, and the development of accountability and transparency, procurement management, and performance-based evaluation of personnel and activities.

- Develop and implement a five to ten-year plan to bring education in Liberia to high performance standards that will support sustainable development.

- Develop and implement a Public Education Campaign to increase public awareness of achievement in the education sector and of the importance of education for the future of the country.
• Ensure that the LTTP model and final materials in process and instruction is passed on to principals, teachers, PTAs, and trainers so that other NGOs could utilize the same approach in other counties. This would allow for uniformity in efforts to improve Liberia’s education system, with eventual sustainability provided under the auspices of the MOE.
I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Liberia Mission commissioned this independent evaluation of its Liberia Teacher Training Program (LTTP) by The QED Group, LLC. The purpose of this evaluation was to assess the performance of the program’s contractor, the Academy for Educational Development (AED), in implementing the planned program activities. Specifically, the evaluation team had four main tasks:

1. Assess the performance of LTTP trainers in improving skill levels of teacher trainers and teachers.
2. Assess the performance of LTTP in supporting the MOE’s Liberia Primary Education Recovery Program (L-PERP) and progress to improve primary education quality.
3. Assess the performance of LTTP in building MOE’s capacity to manage and oversee the training of teachers for the national education system.
4. Provide recommendations for scaling up the activities started by LTTP

BACKGROUND

After the extended period of war that Liberia endured, not only was the infrastructure systematically destroyed but the social fabric of the nation experienced severe strains. The country’s Rural Teacher Training Institutes (RTTIs) and schools were seriously damaged or destroyed. Many teachers were killed, forced into exile in neighboring countries or forced to abandon the profession.

After the war, the international community mobilized to bring security and safety to the countryside and begin re-building the country’s systems and infrastructure. In the education sector, there were early efforts by many NGOs and donor organizations to address the educational needs through “emergency” responses. Some outside organizations rehabilitated a few schools and introduced short-term courses to give the remaining teachers and aspiring teachers some very basic teaching skills. As conditions gradually normalized, families began sending their children back to school and school populations grew. But the educational establishment was not prepared to meet the demand for formal education. Trained teachers were not available to staff schools. Female teachers, once common in the system, had left the profession and were not replaced by other female teachers. Many schools and communities responded to the situation by engaging, with tacit MOE acceptance, so-called volunteer teachers to fill part of the staffing gap. These were, generally, individuals from the immediate area who had completed at least some formal schooling and were willing to teach even if not receiving, initially at least, any official Ministry compensation for their work. Volunteer teachers were, often, barely literate and untrained but, given the circumstances and their commitment to serve their communities, were perceived as being more desirable than having no teacher.

The collapse of the old minimum level qualification—the C-Certificate level—and the influx of poorly educated and untrained volunteer teachers created a nearly dysfunctional school system,
at least outside Monrovia. Surveys estimated that approximately 60% of Liberian primary teachers were untrained and, probably, deficient in subject knowledge and, even, basic literacy.

The effects of the war were no less debilitating for the central Ministry of Education. Although nominally staffed with experienced educators with some graduate training, the MOE demonstrated little capability to conduct many of the normal functions of a central ministry: write curricula, train teachers, select and hire qualified personnel, collect essential educational data, procure essential supplies and equipment to teacher training institutions and schools, and manage education finances.

The USAID-funded Liberia Teacher Training Program (LTTP) was initiated in 2006 to support the Liberia Ministry of Education in developing a strategy to improve the teacher education system. This was to be done through an enhanced pre- and in-service training program, using the restored RTTI’s and the University of Library and distance learning methods. Rather than just recreating the pre-war system, new and re-trained teachers were to receive the latest methodologies of student centered learning so that students would be well-prepared as future citizens.

LTTP is currently being administered by The Academy for Educational Development (AED) in collaboration with the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Mississippi Consortium for International Development (MCID). Over the past two years, LTTP has supported the RTTIs in a variety of activities designed to improve the teaching curriculum for field-based and residential teacher training with the ultimate goal of increasing the number of Liberian teachers with a minimum “C” level certification.

**METHODOLOGY**

The assessment team used both qualitative and quantitative data to document the program’s accomplishments and lessons learned. The quantitative information came from existing data and reviews of reports and other documents describing the implementation and operations of LTTP. The qualitative information was collected from observations of classrooms and visits to the RTTIs, as well as from interviews with project stakeholders, trainers, teachers, and senior MOE officials. The team collected data from all administrators and from samples of trainers and trainees of the three Rural Teacher Training Institutes (RTTIs) located in Kakata, Zorzor, and Webbo counties and two private (mission-run) teacher training institutions. Interviews were conducted with the LTTP staff of the three in-service cluster program offices in Kakata, Zorzor and Webbo and the District and County Education Officers (DEOs and CEOs) of the districts/counties in which those LTTP programs operated. In addition, the team visited seven primary or primary-junior high schools within the LTTP-supported catchment areas, systematically observed classes, and interviewed the principal and samples of teachers and students. Wherever possible in the school community, the team met with at least one or more members of the local PTA. At the central level, in-depth interviews/discussions were conducted with several senior Ministry of Education officials, as well as a MOE consultant. Finally, the sample included all available senior LTTP and IRC managers and five consultants to the ongoing teacher training and curriculum development streams that have occurred over the last two years. To help ensure that comparable information was collected, the team drafted standard questions for interview protocols used to guide all discussions with LTTP stakeholders (see Annex B).
II. FINDINGS

LTTP PERFORMANCE IN IMPROVING TEACHER TRAINING STANDARDS

For Liberia to move toward a competency-based approach to teaching and teacher training, educators at all levels would need to conduct their job functions according to appropriate standards, allowing the system to assess teachers and teacher trainees’ qualifications for the teaching profession. There were no such standards in 2006. Similarly, there was no framework, even, to develop a curriculum, and no standards existed for guiding the development or revision of teacher education programs. LTTP recognized that these national standards and the framework would need to be put in place before attempting any curricular reform.

Accomplishments

Defining competencies and criteria. In its first annual work plan, LTTP, in cooperation with the MOE Teacher Education Department, drafted a process to create a “competency-based framework of knowledge, skills and dispositions” for teachers and teacher trainers. In short, this consisted of convening a task team—also known as the Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes (KSA) Taskforce—of 29 representative stakeholders, including University of Liberia education faculty, MOE officials, RTTI trainers, representatives of urban and rural schools, district and county education offices and education NGOs. Even while the teacher standards development activity was proceeding, LTTP initiated concurrent processes to create a template/framework for guiding the pre and in-service C-Certificate curricular revision, a set of similar standards for teacher education programs, and to align curriculum with the teacher and program standards.

What first emerged from the deliberations was a statement of general principles of teacher competency known as “Professional Standards for Teachers in Liberia.” The teacher standards identified five domains of competencies, including knowledge, teaching skills, classroom management, student assessment and evaluation, and professional ethics and behavior. According to a University of Liberia College of Education administrator, the adoption of general, rather than highly specified, standards made the teacher standards document suitable for any level of educator and for guiding any curricular revision—a potentially significant asset, considering the number of curricula awaiting reform.

Developing the teacher training curriculum: the C-Certificate Level. Even before the finalization of the standards document, LTTP and the MOE began to review and revise the primary teacher training curriculum. Given the widespread presence of untrained trained teachers, the curriculum for the old entry-level C-Certificate course rather than the bachelors and masters degree curricula at the country’s universities became the project’s major focus. There was a pressing need to restore the C-Certificate curriculum to a state where (1) the MOE could know the quality of the product emerging from both pre-service and in-service training programs, (2) the teacher trainees could have confidence that their training would allow them to...

2 Professional Standards for Teachers in Liberia,
capably fulfill their responsibilities, and (3) the primary schools could begin to benefit from
qualified professionals.

Separate task teams were formed to focus on the pre- and in-service training curricula. The
conceptual core of the two curricula is an active-learning, child-centered approach to instruction.
Such an approach went against decades of teacher-directed pedagogy in Liberia and required
wholesale changes in the way lessons are conceived. The revised curriculum was also notable in
containing vitally important elements on important peace education, electoral education and civil
society, child development and child abuse, and gender issues.

To the task teams’ considerable credit, the curricula contain all the essential elements of a
rudimentary, but good, primary teacher program. Particularly noteworthy is the high degree of
mutual consistency, interchangeability, internal coherence, and relevance of the two curricula.
Indeed, specific units or features of one curriculum have, reportedly, been incorporated in the
other. A majority of person interviewed during this evaluation, including RTTI and in-service
client trainers, trainees, and informed education specialists, praised the curricula as a significant
milestone in laying the foundation for teacher quality.

**Curriculum Revision at the University of Liberia.** With some 650 students in the College of
Education, the University of Liberia represents the flagship of the country’s degree-level teacher
training, preparing educators for what, in the past, was referred to as the “A-Certificate”
qualification. Despite its importance, University of Liberia has faced the twin problems of a
decimated, under-qualified staff and a patchwork program with gaps in courses and entire
specialties. With only three full-time faculty members, many courses were taught by part-time or
adjunct instructors holding positions in more than one other college. Most of the existing faculty
possessed only bachelor’s degrees, and some came from entirely different fields. Led by the
Mississippi Consortium for International Development (MCID), LTTP undertook a similarly
collaborative review and revision of this university-level curriculum in teacher education.
LTTP began its analysis by comparing the University of Liberia teacher education program with
standards set by the U.S.-based National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
(NCATE). The review involving College of Education faculty and administrators identified
several areas of weakness in course offerings and an absence of course outlines, syllabi, and,
even, course descriptions.

One of LTTP’s most important achievements at the university level has been its support to young
education degree holders. MCID consultants collaborated with University of Liberia
administrators in identifying six qualified B.Sc. graduates to receive scholarships for master’s
degree studies in education. Four of the six individuals have already completed coursework and
the field research for their thesis projects, while two others are completing coursework. All six
signed a memorandum of understanding with the MOE that guarantees them all positions at
University of Liberia upon successful completion of their master’s degree. Another eight
candidates have already been identified to receive the scholarships if the LTTP continues beyond
its slated termination date.


LTTP PERFORMANCE IN IDENTIFYING, SELECTING AND TRAINING TEACHER TRAINERS (TOTs)

LTTP also initiated a concurrent process to recruit, identify, select and train qualified master trainers for the restored C-Certificate programs. Like the curriculum revision, this process would involve a methodical set of these steps to ensure that trainers were fully capable of implementing the revised curriculum, including its active-learning pedagogy. The task team for trainer preparation had, also, been under considerable pressure to deliver qualified trainers by the originally planned RTTIs’ start date of September 2007. But their opening was postponed for one year.

Accomplishments

Process for focusing on the critical teaching skills. One of the hallmarks of the standards process and the training of trainers design had been a technique referred to as “performance-importance analysis.” The idea consisted of rating the perceived performance level on different skill areas and, then, assessing each skill’s importance as an educational goal. This allowed LTTP to identify skill areas that were considered educationally important but performed poorly by Liberian educators. With such information, TOTs could save valuable time by focusing attention on areas with the greatest possible return. This was crucial since the C-Certificate program would only comprise one year of training.

Self-access materials. To strengthen in-service trainers’ skills during the first year of the new curricula, LTTP engaged subject specialists to develop “self-access” materials in reading and mathematics. The pre-service program developed a similar set of supplementary materials, referred to as “foundation materials,” that were made available in the RTTI resource centers. These materials are, reportedly, being widely used by both pre and in-service trainers. Evidence of their effectiveness awaits an evaluation to be conducted at the conclusion of the academic year.

Areas in Need of Improvement

Recruitment problems. The greatest problem faced by the MOE and LTTP was recruiting sufficient numbers of suitable trainer candidates. A delay in the opening of the RTTIs proved fortuitous in this regard. The MOE’s recruitment effort yielded relatively few candidates, and many of these were quickly eliminated on inadequate educational qualifications. Most distressing was the refusal of some potentially qualified women to re-locate to distant sites such as Zorzor. In fact, the near absence of women candidates is reflected in the predominantly male composition of current RTTI and cluster in-service trainers.

The recruitment difficulty is not limited to institutions in the hinterlands but is endemic throughout the educational establishment. Even private, Monrovia-based teacher training institutions are facing paralyzing shortages of candidates. For example, Stella Marris Polytechnic, a respected Catholic teacher training program, was not able to recruit any applicants for the next academic year despite its outstanding reputation, making 99% of the program’s...
trainees in-service teachers. Even the University of Liberia’s College of Education degree program has felt the effects of declining applicants.

Passage of the LTTP-designed eighth-grade reading and math screening tests plus a suitability assessment were used to winnow the original recruitment class down to the final acceptable candidates. Nonetheless, the weak literacy abilities of some approved trainer candidates required ongoing remediation, which LTTP addressed using “self-access” materials described above.

**LTTP PERFORMANCE IN IMPLEMENTING C-CERTIFICATE TRAINING: PRE-SERVICE TRAINING AT THE RTTIs**

Pre-service C-Certificate training in Liberia resumed in October 2008 with completion of the rehabilitation of Kakata and Zorzor RTTIs. After a year’s delay, the program benefited from having a mature curriculum draft and trained trainers and administrators in place for almost all positions. The LTTP-facilitated task team’s conception of four administrative categories for each institution (director, academic dean, business manager, and outreach coordinator) appeared to cover the range of management responsibilities. This was particularly true for the decision to add an outreach coordinator, assigning weight to field monitoring and supervision—perhaps for the first time.

**Accomplishments**

*Teacher training has been implemented.* In terms of output, 980 individuals, including 145 females, applied for entry into the pre-service C-Certificate program. Of the 980 applicants, 311 were invited to attend the Kakata RTTI and 355 to attend the Zorzor RTTI.3 Only 66 of these were females. No graduates had yet emerged at the time of the evaluation. Thus, the evaluation could not evaluate any outcomes of pre-service training, such as the classroom application of the graduates’ acquired skills and knowledge as well as their opinions of the training quality after completion of the training. Nonetheless, the evaluation obtained some important evidence on the performance of the pre-service program in progress, as described below.

*Effective trainers.* Interview data from trainees and trainers clearly indicated a high level of academic quality. Trainees uniformly praised the trainers and the training content in terms of relevance, coherence and rigor. The high degree of motivation observed among the RTTI trainers at both operating sites offers additional evidence of the effectiveness of the trainer selection process and the TOT. Trainers expressed commitment to the demands of their jobs. Most impressively, the team observed trainers regularly applying the skills and philosophy of active-learning pedagogy in their RTTI classrooms. In nearly every observed class, trainers were engaging their trainees in a student-centered and participatory style of teaching; trainees worked in groups of various sizes on different kinds of assigned tasks, appointing spokespersons to report results.

*Motivated trainees.* The criteria used to select trainees for the RTTIs resulted in a capable cohort of enrollees. The MOE had insisted on passage of the WAEC exams but eventually relented in
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allowing, for this year, individuals without proof of WAEC results but who could pass a literacy screening exam. The vast majority of interviewed trainees reported having passed the WAEC, but the absence of a functioning WAEC office in Liberia probably disadvantages many high school leavers whose documents were lost.

Trainees consistently expressed idealistic and hopeful personal outlooks for deciding to become teachers—a uniquely positive for a post-war country. Most were aware of the beleaguered state of formal public education but found hope in the value of a teaching certificate. They all seemed committed to filling the current teaching gap.

Other program assets. The large collection of individual handouts for each lesson, or session, distributed to trainees was regarded as a valuable instructional aid. These handouts contain exercises, supplementary readings, assessment tools, and many kinds of graphic illustrations of the lessons’ major points.

Finally, the deployment of U.S. Peace Corps “Response Corps” Volunteers has proven to be a very helpful addition to the operational quality and efficiency of the RTTIs. PC Response Corps Volunteers, individuals who have already served at least one full two-year tour as regular Volunteers in another country, are currently assigned as mentors to the four administrative officers of the RTTIs. The Volunteers serve as a combined assistant and advisor to the administrators. Some Volunteers have taken the initiative to develop needed RTTI systems, such as financial accounting for expenditures, revenue and library resources. One Volunteer with substantial ICT capability trained all faculty and administrators in basic computer literacy and web-based educational resources.

Areas in Need of Improvement

Under-utilization. The RTTI-based training faces several daunting limitations to its overall potential. First is the small number of RTTIs for the scale of the demand and the geography of the country. The current output of 471 trainees makes only a slight dent in the overall shortfall of 16,000 trained teachers. Because of the recruitment problems, the RTTIs are currently under-enrolled. Table 1 shows the current enrollment compared to the capacity of the institutions. According to LTTP staff, the potential trainee output of all three functioning RTTIs is 710.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTTI</th>
<th>Enrollment: 2008-09</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kakata</td>
<td>M 158 F 17 T 175</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webbo (at Kakata facility)</td>
<td>M 77 F 3 T 80</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorzor</td>
<td>M 195 F 28 T 223</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>M 434 F 44 T 478</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

4 According to administrators of Kakata and Webbo RTTI programs, there were actually 170 Kakata trainees and 78 Webbo trainees being trained at the Kakata RTTI facility.
Recruitment difficulties. LTTP and the MOE have been unable to recruit the desired number of qualified trainees for the first RTTI cohorts. As noted above, the use of a literacy-screening test (in lieu of proof of WAEC exam passage) eliminated many applicants whose literacy skills were unacceptably low for teaching. The effect of so much interrupted schooling is, in effect, the disqualification of thousands of otherwise desirable teacher candidates.

Possible RTTI inadequacy for normal replacement training. Despite the current under-utilization of the RTTI facilities, long-term reliance on three RTTIs to train replacements for teachers who retire, change professions or die in the future may suffice only for the most minimal of systems. The existence of just three teacher training institutions (of which only two operate) forces many prospective applicants to relocate far from their homes. Interview data from pre-service students suggest that individuals are reluctant to attend faraway institutions, most often because of the high, and often un-reimbursed, travel costs between the institutions and their homes.

Gender inequity. Less than half of the potentially qualified applicants were females, despite LTTP’s efforts to recruit female high school leavers. Most lamentable was the inability of the RTTIs to accommodate women with very small children and, more broadly, the lack of interest in teaching among female high school leavers. RTTI administrators felt obliged to refuse admission to female candidates with children, on grounds that dormitory configurations and an absence of day care centers would complicate housing for mothers. However, the presence of mothers with young children in the residential part of in-service training has prompted consideration of establishing RTTI day care centers during the pre-service academic year. Redressing the gender imbalance among the RTTI faculty and student body does present a challenge to the MOE. LTTP has attempted to remedy the cost barrier by providing a certain number of scholarships for females. Known as the Girls Assistance Package, LTTP gave 50 scholarships to the top-rated test-takers on the qualifying exam for entry into the RTTI. But, the causes of female avoidance of the teaching profession may lie deeper. Perhaps, the conditions in the schools themselves, especially reported teacher housing shortages, or other school conditions, such as unavailable water or poor sanitation conditions, discourage young females from joining the teaching profession. These reasons will need to be better understood if corrective action is to be effective.

In the meantime, the large discrepancy between the number of male and female trainees seems to guarantee a continued absence of female role models in primary schools. Although more girls are enrolling in primary schools since the announcement of free primary schooling, their retention in school may depend on them being exposed to educated, and employed, females—a function most ably performed by women teachers.

Absence of textbooks, aids, resources, supplies. Instruction in the restored RTTIs suffers from an almost complete lack of trainee textbooks, library resources, instructional aids, equipment and supplies of all sorts to make homemade instructional aids. Trainees complained of not having textbooks for their different subjects. Trainers, likewise, noted the difficulty of developing the kind of aids that can make learning more interesting to trainees. And, most notably, the libraries at both RTTIs lacked recent and relevant education books, reference volumes, journals, and access to electronic materials.
In regard to trainee textbooks, the revision of the curriculum would have made obsolete any previous textbooks that might still have existed. And, writing and printing new trainee textbooks, is an endeavor requiring several years time. Nonetheless, provision of texts based on the new curriculum is a logical area for future development in the C-Certificate program. Of more immediate concern is the absence of, at the very least, a range of up to date resources in the libraries. While Kakata recently received donated books, neither Zorzor nor Kakata had anything approaching a full range of books, journals, and electronic resources covering education topics and the subject matter of the primary curriculum. Neither institution possessed any operational computerized resources and connectivity, although Kakata had received donated computers (not yet connected to the Internet) of relatively recent vintage.

Equally important, RTTIs have no basic instructional aids for classroom use or distribution. Even less understandable is the absence of poster and regular size paper and other supplies to enable trainers and trainees to make their own aids. Neither RTTI possessed an adequate copy machine or computer with printer for this purpose. As a result, the Institutes’ classrooms were as bare and devoid of trainee and trainer-made learning aids as the schools themselves. Finally, no RTTI had even one vehicle, which is being felt most acutely in relation to practice teaching. The need to place trainees in classrooms without overwhelming the receiving schools normally requires having many receptive schools. Without transport, trainees would have to be placed in schools within easy walking distance: no more than two or three miles away. With a common period for practice teaching and several hundred trainees to place, this inevitably means placing all students in two or three nearby schools. The under-use of the attached demonstration schools (at the two operating RTTIs) as venues to test teaching techniques and assessment instruments is currently being investigated by a LTTP consulting team.

RTTIs are, with LTTP assistance, adapting to the transportation situation by assigning trainees to practice-teach each other. But, this adaptation is hardly the equivalent of the opportunity to teach in classrooms full of children. Given the GOL’s reliance on RTTIs to help modernize the education system, provision of a modicum of instructional aids, reading materials, material supplies, and realistic practice teaching experience would seem self-evident.

**Infrastructural impediments.** Irregular electricity, while not directly affecting instruction, does indirectly hamper learning by denying lighting to trainees during late evening and early morning hours. To both save fuel and not over-tax generators (caused in part by nonfunctioning generators), RTTIs cut electricity supply during certain hours, inevitably limiting the amount of available study time. Kakata RTTI, despite its close proximity to Monrovia, has experienced food supply delays for its trainee and trainer cafeteria. Kitchen staff and faculty alike have on several occasions experienced tense situations in which the facility literally had no food stores and the expected deliveries by MOE trucks were delayed. These last-minute arrivals of food supplies, reportedly, continue to the time of this report’s submission. At the very least, such situations cause distractions to trainees and trainers, and their families, and, at worst, could potentially disrupt the entire functioning of the RTTI. LTTP only has an advisory capacity on the matter, but has regularly implored the responsible officials in the MOE for corrective action to these problems.
**Unfinished Webbo RTTI.** The failure of the responsible donor agency and its contractors to complete the renovation of the Webbo RTTI facility has limited the pre-service training program. The uncompleted RTTI at Webbo has forced all students from Southeastern Liberia to attend Kakata RTTI. The 78 trainees designated as Webbo trainees represent the greatly depleted population of enrollees who have actually ventured far from their home communities to pursue teacher training. While not overly burdening the Kakata facility, the presence of Webbo trainees at KRTTI does limit the number of trainees who could be recruited from the KRTTI catchment area. Given the extraordinary shortage of qualified teachers, the country’s ability to meet the demand will largely depend on all available institutional capacity for pre-service training.

The evaluation team’s inspection of the Webbo RTTI facility revealed slipshod workmanship and jobs that appeared to be dropped far short of completion. Leaky roofs in several instances had resulted in sagging ceiling materials and the presence of termites. Plumbing fixtures were unattached to supplies, and septic tanks were damaged. Major sections of the campus had no water pipes laid. The Webbo Business Manager, based there to try to expedite repairs, reported constant frustration in getting the attention of the donor, UNHCR, and obtaining any kind of action by its main contractor, LWSI. LTTP has projected the re-opening of the Webbo facility for the 2009-2010 academic year “at the latest.” From all appearances, the Webbo RTTI is far from being ready to open by next academic year. Should the RTTI not open, the Kakata RTTI will, again, accommodate the Webbo students, thus, lowering the potential output of the pre-service program and significantly inconveniencing teacher trainees from Southern Liberia.

**LTTP PERFORMANCE IN IMPLEMENTING C-CERTIFICATE TRAINING: IN-SERVICE CLUSTER-BASED TRAINING**

Inauguration of the LTTP-supported cluster in-service program (sometimes referred to as “fee-based” training) was implemented earlier than the pre-service program due to use of an adapted pre-existing curriculum from International Relief Committee (IRC). This resulted in the completed training of one cohort of 324 teachers, according to LTTP, by the IRC-operated segment of the program in Loma County and the continued engagement of those graduates in their previous schools. The team’s visit to a few of the schools with in-service-trained teachers permitted an evaluation of the most immediate program outcomes. The outcomes of this at the school level are discussed in the Chapter VI. Cohort 2 of the in-service program began with 917 applications that were winnowed down to 621 in-service teachers who met the designated standards. Of the 621, 592 approved applicants registered for the first residential component in August 2008, of whom 92 were females.

**Accomplishments**

**Pre and in-service compatibility.** The pre-service residential training and the field-based in-service training are different structurally but similar in overall content and expected outcomes. Where the pre-service program rests on an academic model with limited real-life teaching experience, the in-service program draws on acquired practical experience as a premise for
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6 An IRC field program director said 362 teachers were trained by IRC in its first cohort.
instilling modern progressive pedagogy. In the latter case, trainees would receive a scaled-down residential experience at the very beginning and very end of their one-year training. In between, they participate in ongoing training and technical assistance provided in their schools or at convenient locations within a cluster of nearby schools: hence the name **cluster-based** in-service training. While these two modes sound quite different, LTTP made extraordinary efforts to keep them similar. A LTTP workshop jointly involving pre and in-service trainers revealed the close connection and virtual interchangeability of the two training streams.

The in-service program’s use of RTTIs during vacation periods for the pre-service program allows a full year’s use of expensive facilities. Trainers for both RTTIs and in-service training received their training together and were only later assigned to their respective roles. However, in view of gaps identified during the first cohort training, the project did realize the need for additional materials for the in-service trainers, which included: (1) a Manual for the In-Service Certificate, (2) Guide for RTTI Implementation of Large Scale Trainings, and (3) Guidelines and Tools for In-Service Trainer Support and Observation, as well as monitoring and mentoring tools.\(^8\)

**Effective design.** At the current time, LTTP operates cluster training from five LTTP field offices serving six of the 15 counties in Liberia: Maryland, Grand Kru, Grand Gedeh, Nimba, Bong and Lofa. In the AED-operated program in Southeastern Liberia, schools were selected on the basis of the number of untrained teachers or the presence of female teachers on the staff. Despite the possibility that schools with larger numbers of untrained teachers might lack a critical mass for effective reform, the project decided to limit training initially to schools that had at least five untrained teachers or at least one female teacher. This accomplished two goals: (1) concentrates the training on schools with the most need, and (2) encourages the recruitment and hiring of female teachers.

Interviews with LTTP staff, MOE trainers and participating teachers suggest that the cluster in-service program delivers effective C-Certificate-level training to untrained, “volunteer” teachers. According to trainers in the Southeast of Liberia, the cluster training events are held regularly and each participating teacher is visited once monthly, while the IRC coordinator said that teachers were visited twice during the school year. In-service trainers were uniformly convinced that the program was making an important contribution to training teachers.

**In-service training provided to principals.** The fact that LTTP is also training the principals of schools with in-service trainees helps ensure a robust application of learned pedagogical skills to classrooms. This training began with preparation of the Principals’ Training Manual by June 2008. While the MOE was still reviewing the manual as part of its approval process, LTTP consultants used the manual for the first phase of principals’ training that began in July 2008 in two sites, Lofa and Nimba, with 37 principals. From here, training resumed at the county LTTP offices, where principals were brought for training sessions.

One feature of special note is the effort by the Zwedru-based LTTP program to prepare talented female teachers to become principals. They have selected a group of women teachers who are being given administrative training for this purpose. Another positive aspect of the principals’
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\(^8\) LTTP Quarterly Report, July – September, 2008.
training is the integration of training on PTA development with the principals’ training. This has been facilitated by the completion of a draft manual for PTAs. The ability of principals to strengthen and help PTAs become advocates for school improvement and for needed material support from the district education office is likely to become critical in generating local demand for school quality.

**Areas in Need of Improvements**

**Under-skilled in-service program applicants.** LTTP and the MOE ended up with relatively few qualified applicants among the many who applied for the in-service program. The applicants had to pass a test of basic literacy and numeracy and also a test of teaching suitability. Of the approximately 1,000 in-service teachers tested, only one-third were acceptable. This obviously raises the question of what should be done of the two-thirds of untrained teachers who are deemed to possess inadequate skills and/or suitability for being trained in an in-service program. Even among teachers who qualified for training, basic literacy and arithmetic skills and subject-matter knowledge, often, require remediation. LTTP’s self-access materials in literacy and mathematics are being made available to teachers with weaknesses. The extent to which these materials are being requested and used by participating teachers is unclear. Early in the project, LTTP proposed to develop distance education approaches to strengthen teachers’ skills and establish teacher networks for sharing approaches and lessons. The demands of facilitating the development of curricula and reopening the RTTIs appears to have foreclosed some of these earlier plans for developing distance education and ICT modalities to buttress teacher skills.

**Delayed employment of trained teachers.** Seven months after program completion, the MOE still has not officially hired teachers trained in Cohort 1 of the in-service program. This is a concern to LTTP staff and teacher educators, who worry that the lack of official employment sends a discouraging signal about the teaching profession and may cause some newly trained teachers to switch professions.

The delay in employing qualified teachers runs counter to established MOE policy prior to the conflict. At that time, newly minted teachers from the RTTIs, reportedly, received an appointment and their first month’s salary immediately upon certification. This ensured that the government’s investment in training teachers would not be wasted by the loss of graduates to other professions. Whatever the cause for delays, disappointment risks to demoralize teachers who agreed to undertake training in good faith and, possibly, driving them from the profession.

**Lack of follow-up after training completion.** One major constraint of the current in-service program is the discontinuation of teacher monitoring and support after completion of the one-year program. While the trainee monitoring by LTTP regularly reinforces skill development during the program, the sudden cessation of such monitoring at the end of the training year may leave some teachers ill prepared to use their skills effectively.

The proposed linkage between the outreach coordinator at the RTTIs and teachers who have received in-service training would seem to offer at least a partial solution to the problem. The outreach coordinator, a position added at the suggestion of LTTP, is expected to handle school-community relations and support pre-service teachers as they begin their teaching careers. But,
there is a strong rationale for assigning outreach coordinators to support recently completed in-service-trained teachers as part of their position descriptions. This may also compensate for Liberia’s lack of any equivalent to the district-level school inspector—the education supervisor that observes, supports and supervises teachers in most African countries. The District Education Officer does perform that function to a modest extent but also has many administrative functions that consume much of his or her time. To date, except for some initial outreach efforts by Kakata RTTI’s outreach coordinator, linkages between the RTTI outreach coordination department and the current cluster-based in-service training program have yet to be made.

**Lack of MOE reimbursement for long-distance travel expenses.** Many current in-service trainees complained of transport hardships in traveling to the residential sessions of the training. This is a particularly acute grievance among teachers in Eastern and Southeastern Liberia. Because of the absence of a functioning RTTI at Webbo, teachers in these locations must travel far to Northwestern Liberia (Kakata RTTI) for the initial and final residential sessions. Teachers stated that these journeys cost anywhere from L$ 5,000 to L$ 7,000 one-way. The MOE has only reimbursed L$ 5,000 of the L$ 12,000 or more paid out for transport. This was a matter of substantial importance and frustration to the affected teachers and contributed to a perception of unfairness.

**Unsustainable without continued outside support.** Both international and Liberia LTTP staff agreed that the in-service cluster-based training program would not be sustainable without continued external support for the immediate future. This, of course, is not difficult to understand in light of the organizational damage inflicted by the conflict on the MOE’s district-level operations. There are a number of elements in a well-functioning field program, ranging from workable motorcycles to trainers having clear position descriptions and regular salaries that would need to be firmly in place for program activities to continue under local control. The LTTP staff members were clear that the program would need to see these elements being provided on a regular basis before concluding that the MOE had the capacity and institutional will to sponsor and maintain the program on its own.

One of these issues was the commitment—or lack thereof—of the MOE to the designated MOE training staff. Within LTTP, the AED-operated in-service program staff had fewer field officers than IRC program offices with which to do the regular cluster training and school monitoring. Former EOs had been trained to be master trainers but had not yet become in-service field officers, largely due to their reluctance to become MOE employees and face the MOE’s ongoing payroll barriers. In contrast, IRC possessed a cadre of project-funded field officers to conduct monitoring for the in-service training component.

The effect of this difference in field trainer numbers can be seen in the respective output of the two providers’ programs. IRC’s share of the projected 592 teacher-output for Cohort 2 is 369 teachers, which can be mostly attributed to IRC’s larger number of field trainers. The absence of these master trainers in the AED-operated program limits the number of schools and teachers that can be served in Southeastern Liberia, while the IRC’s financial support of field staff (to monitor several of its activities) in the North perpetuates the MOE’s dependence on outside funding for recurrent human resource expenditures.
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9 Notes of interview with IRC Zorzor-based field coordinator.
Absence of nationwide coverage. The in-service program’s current coverage of only five of 13 counties represents a significant constraint in expediting the training of Liberia’s 15,000+ untrained teachers. The restriction of the current program to five counties was predicated on the need to develop an effective in-service model before scaling up more widely. USAID, the sole donor for C-Certificate-level teacher training in Liberia, has expressed its intention to expand in-service training to additional counties in a follow-on activity but has also stated that funding does not exist for support of a nationwide in-service program. The gap between the need for a far larger in-service program and donor resources for this purpose has resulted in an impasse with significant consequences.

During this study, the MOE’s leadership strongly supported the value of in-service training but balked at offering substantive government financing. MOE objections to increasing government financial support for in-service training arise both from a legitimate concern for scarce resources and a philosophical disagreement with establishing a permanent in-service training provision.

LTTP PERFORMANCE IN DEVELOPING A TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM

Of all the areas in which LTTP has been involved, its efforts in teacher professional recognition were probably the least consequential. To a great extent, this was no result of a lack of effort on its part. Teacher salary ladders and advanced qualifications are hardly germane when no basic qualification level exists. And, facilitating the actual payment of existing salaries and payrolling teachers actually on the job, obviously, took precedence over any attempt to create additional graduated pay scales and incremental teacher qualification levels. Some of the critical areas identified by the evaluation team are described below.

Flattened qualification and compensation system. Despite war-induced reductions in the number and quality of teachers, Liberia’s education personnel still reflects varied qualifications, as represented in the pre-1989 C, B, and A-Certificate-levels. However, there are two issues that affect the current range of qualifications. First, the generally older B and A-Certificate-holders earned their credentials prior to conflict and mostly work at the junior high and senior high school level. Second, Liberia currently lacks any available means to advance beyond the C-Certificate level—especially between the recently reinstated C-Certificate and the baccalaureate degree in education. As a result, as individuals with higher qualification levels leave the system, their places are not being filled by younger teachers advancing upward.

Equally important, the education establishment lacks any real professional development system to distinguish between levels of qualification, including the C, B, and A-Certificates. All teachers and education officers, including DEOs and CEOs, make the same basic salary of $75 per month, with the only differences being the EOs’ gasoline and housing allowances. Where a B or A-Certificate might have earned one a salary enhancement in the past, such differences in qualifications bestow no salary increase under current government policy. Second, there appears to be no clear path for teachers to progress to the position of school principal and for principals to a district of county officer position. The flat compensation system and absence of advancement opportunity offers little if any incentive for teachers to improve teaching or administrative skills. Without incentives, teachers are likely to rely on existing skills and
knowledge rather than undertake training that would improve their skills and the learning of their students.

**Obstacles to salary differentiation.** As desirable as a teacher salary ladder would be, making this a reality would involve concurrence among a number of important stakeholders, not the least of which are teachers. Representing their interests are several teacher and teacher training professional associations, such as the National Teacher Association of Liberia (NTAL), Nation Education Trust, the Association of Liberian Universities, and the National Commission on Higher Education. To its credit, LTTP held several workshops with representatives of these organizations. According to interview data, the outcomes of these workshops demonstrated little interest in tackling any issues of teacher compensation and professional development.

Instituting a scheme of salary increases pegged to qualification enhancements would involve more than staff of the Ministry of Education. Salaries of civil servants across the Government of Liberia are tied together: that is, raising the grade level and salary of one set of civil service personnel requires raising the grade levels and salaries of comparable civil servants in all other ministries. This, of course, poses significant budgetary consequences for the GOL. Nonetheless, the need for an incentive-based compensation system is becoming increasingly clear in the education sector, and consideration of such a system in the near future may be appropriate.

**The MOE’s solution.** In accordance with its L-PERP guidance, the MOE proposed to re-establish the old C, B, and A-certificate qualifications for teachers. LTTP assumed the role of restoring C-Certificate training and strengthening the degree-level institution, the College of Education at the University of Liberia, that in the past granted A-Certificate qualifications. The MOE has requested UNESCO to develop a process for re-establishing B-Certificate-level training within the RTTI system.

Presumably, clear standards for the different certificate programs would re-establish distinctions in qualifications that could differentiate salary levels and be used for personnel decisions. In-service qualifications would have to accompany promotions that currently might be made entirely on the judgment of education officers. However, in practice, returning to the old certificate system may be problematic for other reasons.

The C, B, and A-Certificate system, as currently conceived, offers no way for primary teachers and school administrators to advance and stay in the primary division. Advancement from a C to a B-Certificate-level automatically qualifies a teacher for junior high school teaching, and advancement from B to A-Certificate-level qualifies for teaching at the secondary level. Teachers who advance in qualifications are, by definition, forced to move to the next higher division of the K-12 education continuum. This model both diminishes the perceived value and importance of primary-level education and links personal advancement with leaving the primary division.

It is, perhaps, partly for this reason that many Liberian primary schools are combined with junior-high grade levels. In the past, this allowed a teacher who obtained B-Certificate qualification to remain physically in the same school, perhaps as the principal but at least as a junior-high teacher. Despite this contrivance, these more qualified teachers were effectively lost to the primary level of the school. And selection of a school principal would still depend on a
personal judgment by the relevant DEO rather than on some incremental skill enhancement of
the teacher. In a large sense, the system sends a discouraging signal to those who derive
professional and personal satisfaction from teaching or administering primary school students. If
the country is to create incentives for improved primary instruction, some kind of advancement
will need to be possible within each education division.

One possible mechanism is to create a C, B, and A-Certificate qualification for each division of
the K-12 continuum. This would enable primary (as well as junior high or senior high) teachers
to advance professionally without leaving the level in which they currently teach. Such a system
would also provide a basis for selecting principals on their qualifications. In interviews for this
study, the leader of at least one major teacher education institution thought that this potential
scheme had merit.

**Delivering training for professional development.** Creation of differentiated qualifications
accompanied by a salary ladder requires a readily available system for teachers to advance
themselves. Not too much thought has been given to how teachers would obtain this training
during their teaching careers.

The ability to obtain the skills required for higher qualification is essential, if teachers are to have
confidence in a professional development system. This would seem to suggest a future role for a
de-centralized in-service system along the lines of LTTP’s cluster model, to supplement short-
term residential courses held during vacation periods. The MOE currently perceives in-service
training as a stopgap mechanism for rapidly training the huge population of untrained teachers,
with no utility once the backlog of untrained teachers is eliminated. Nonetheless, it is difficult to
see how the Ministry would make organized and recognizable training available to teachers who
seek to upgrade their skills and qualify for a B-Certificate in a one to three year period.

For the A-Certificate level, the College of Education and other private higher education
institutions would continue to be the source of in-service training. There is evidence that many
high school leavers are uninterested in majoring in Education or to join the ranks of teachers,
given the low salaries and the problematic payments. Also, according to LTTP’s most recent
Annual Work Plan, however, the UoL College of Education still does not have a faculty
professional development system for its own instructors, making the institution a poor model for
upgrading the skills of other in-service educators.¹⁰

**Slow progress on other certificate levels.** In addition to the issue of how to deliver training for a
proposed reinstatement of the old certificate system, the current effort to re-establish a B-
Certificate program has been disappointingly slow to some Liberian education observers. The
assigned donor for this activity, UNESCO, has engaged consultants to develop a curriculum
development process. After a few visits by the consultants to Liberia, UNESCO has made little
progress in involving Liberian educators in the actual development of curriculum units and
appears to have garnered little support among stakeholders for its process. This raises the
question of whether this effort should be turned over to a different provider, unless UNESCO can
expedite its effort on this goal.

---

LTTP PERFORMANCE IN SUPPORTING MOE’s L-PERP AND IMPROVING SCHOOLS

The Liberia Primary Education Recovery Program (L-PERP) is a 3-year Action Plan consisting of seven components with the overall objective of putting primary education in Liberia back on track after years of civil war. The components of the program include: (1) infrastructure expansion and improvement; (2) instructional materials and curriculum development; (3) teacher development; (4) accelerated learning programs for older students; (5) advisory, supervision and assessment services; (6) education sector governance; and (7) organizational capacity. As part of the Fast Track Initiative, launched as a global partnership between donor and developing countries to ensure accelerated progress towards the Millennium Development Goal of universal primary education by 2015, the L-PERP strives to work with key stakeholders to reach targets set forth under each of the components of the program. LTTP committed to assistance in components of the L-PERP related to teacher development; advisory, supervision and assessment services; strengthening education governance; organizational capacity building; and institutional and implementation arrangements for the program.

**Teacher Development** is the major L-PERP component to which LTTP has contributed. As described above, in-service and pre-service training standards and curricula for teachers have been defined and the first cohort of in-service trainees graduated in September 2008. The first cohort of pre-service trainees will graduate in June 2009.

**Organizational Capacity Building.** The L-PERP calls for strengthening of the MOE’s middle management structures and process. Management deficits create serious and persistent problems with teacher recruitment, availability of information, financial management, and procurement. Because the MOE has been resistant to providing the resources needed for the successful implementation and scaling-up of teacher training activities and on-going professional development, and the guarantee of teaching positions for trained teachers, LTTP staff advocate on behalf of the trainees. But their ability to influence the accountability of the MOE is limited. LTTP has striven to involve key MOE personnel in all of its project activities. Yet, there is abundant evidence from this evaluation that the MOE does not see all the LTTP-facilitated activities as tasks for their eventual takeover or absorption. The most obvious of these is the cluster-based in-service teacher training system.

**Supervision and Assessment Services.** EOs carry out MOE instructions related to hiring, communication, assessment exercises, and other management functions. EOs do not appear to have a mandate to address quality issues relating to teaching and learning. To train communities on the roles they may have in supervising and monitoring the quality of their schools and to take an active role in monitoring academic results and other quality issues, LTTP developed a PTA manual in collaboration with the MOE and partner organizations.

With regard to assessments, except for the Grade 6 WAEC exam, there are no systems to supervise, assess, or track primary school teaching and pupil achievement. WAEC assessment takes place in Grades 6, 9, and 12. GOL underwrites Grade 6 WAEC assessment but exam results are not kept by District Education Offices. At the request of the MOE, LTTP has used the WAEC as a qualifying examination for the in- and pre-service training.
Strengthening Education Governance activities are designed to promote and enable MOE processes and standards for teaching and learning in primary schools. These activities are the responsibility to 15 County Education Offices (CEOs) and 86 District Education Offices (DEOs). Specific responsibilities of CEOs and DEOs are unclear. As part of its cooperative agreement with USAID, LTTP was charged with working with the CEOs, DEOs, primary school principals, and PTAs to develop and implement effective management functions. LTTP is currently working with the university to develop systems that will allow the EOs to manage their schools. LTTP also has invited EOs to take part in cluster workshops for in-service C-Certificate candidates and in the Certificate Program for School Principals in hopes that their participations will increase their awareness of Professional Standards for Teachers in Liberia.

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements for the Program. The University of Liberia, College of Education and the RTTIs are the primary mechanisms that have been used by LTTP for the delivery of pre- and in-service teacher training. The RTTI s appear to be on solid footing; the teacher training standards and teaching curriculum used at these institutions have been revamped and are being used with varying degrees of success.

LTTP’s support of the College of Education has achieved mixed results. Six master’s degree students (three women, three men) are being supported at University of Ghana, Cape Coast. However, the number of trained teachers and their qualifications are below levels needed to contribute to Liberia’s education system.

LTTP PERFORMANCE IN BUILDING THE CAPACITY OF THE MOE

It is expected that the Ministry of Education will assume primary responsibility for operating and managing teacher training activities for the Liberian education system at the end of the funding period for LTTP. To help build the MOEs capacity, in its project plan LTTP pledged to engage the MOE leadership in managing teacher training activities. Fulfilling this pledge has proven to be one of the biggest challenges faced by the LTTP. The evaluation team identified several limitations at the MOE that interfered with implementation of LTTP.

Absence of action and accountability at the MOE. The inability or refusal of the MOE to deliver services for the teacher training program has been a serious impediment to the successful achievement of LTTP’s goal. As a senior LTTP manager stated, “There was nothing going on (at the MOE). No accountability. Even the question of who would be a teacher was an issue.” This inaction left activity-planning hostage to the Ministry’s ability and willingness to support and co-implement the program’s objectives.

Statements by senior MOE officers strongly suggest that the Ministry had expected greater financial and programmatic from LTTP and USAID. The Minister of Education emphatically stated that the financial expectations placed on the Ministry may be too high and may require “revisiting the memorandum of understanding.”

Budget, procurement and logistic shortcomings within the MOE. LTTP activities required timely delivery of commodities to RTTIs (food, fuel, and other) during the time of in-service as
well as pre-service training activities. As RTTIs have no knowledge or control over their budget, LTTP staff was constantly soliciting MOE personnel for information on budget lines and requesting timely procurement and delivery of commodities to the regions where RTTIs operate. As the MOE has a centralized procurement system, the handicap posed by the deteriorated state of roads to timely delivery of commodities is huge. LTTP staff was constantly confronted with complaints from RTTI directors and personnel about lack of food, lack of fuel and other resources that interfered with proper functioning of the RTTIs and teacher training activities.

**Lack of status definition within the teacher community.** The environment in which LTTP is implementing its activities is one where teachers have no idea about what will be their future. The in-service teachers going to the LTTP training have been guaranteed that they will be hired when they obtain their C-Certificate. The MOE declared a freeze in new hiring until they are able to clean their current payroll from “ghost” teachers. LTTP is making big efforts to convince the MOE that the first cohort of in-service teachers should be given a firm promise that they will be hired, before they go to the private sector to look for a job now that they will have a degree in hand.

A similar situation exists for the pre-service students attending the RTTIs. They have no assurance that at the end of their year of training they will be automatically hired. This situation generates concern, stress and tension within students as well as faculty at the RTTIs, as many of the teachers are still not on the payroll or have to go to a great deal of trouble and expense to get their salaries. In all cases faculty and teachers must travel to Monrovia to get their paychecks.
III. CONCLUSIONS

LTTP Performance in Improving Training Standards and Teacher Skills

- LTTP effectively facilitated revision of critically important curricula and other elements for training primary school teachers and for selecting and training the individuals who will train those teachers.

- LTTP has designed a multi-dimensional system, including national teacher standards, teacher education program standards, separate curricula for pre- and in-service teacher training (at the entry C-Certificate level) that are mutually compatible, interchangeable, logically coherent, relevant, detailed, and contain supplementary instructional materials.

- LTTP developed and implemented comprehensive process to screen, select, and train trainers both for pre-service or in-service roles.

- LTTP used a highly participatory process, with project facilitators ensuring representative stakeholder participation and Liberian control over process and product. Consequently, there is broad Liberian support for the training process and products.

- LTTP’s support to UofL College of Education has begun process of strengthening degree programs in education.

- There is currently a significantly improved primary-level teacher training infrastructure in place that includes (1) a relatively smoothly functioning set of refurbished rural training institutions and (2) a decentralized system of in-service cluster training for existing untrained teachers.

- The RTTIs are now staffed by competent, motivated teacher trainers as the result of LTTP-assisted staff development procedures and instruments.

- The two LTTP-facilitated teacher training curricula are effective structures for developing the basic qualifications of both pre and in-service teachers.

- RTTIs and the LTTP-supervised in-service training program will, for the first time since before the war, produce substantial (471 and 616, respectively) numbers of qualified primary teachers.

- An important contribution is being made by Peace Corps “Response” Volunteers who are mentoring RTTI staff.
• Expected output of trained teachers emerging from LTTP is small in comparison to country’s teacher shortage—although the quality of the output and the reliability of the restored system are significant.

• The continued absence of a functioning RTTI at Webbo limits overall enrollment and greatly disadvantages trainees from Southern Liberia.

• There is significant imbalance in favor of males among both teacher trainers and trainees.

• There is a lack of instructional aids, basic supplies, adequately resourced RTTI libraries, trainee textbooks and infrastructure inputs—no transport for practice teaching, limited electricity and water limit study time and cause inconvenience to trainees.

• The size of the current RTTI cohort is well below the facilities’ capacities due to recruiting difficulties.

• There is a lack of trainer monitoring/support of in-service trainees after program completion.

• Low educator salaries, delayed payment, and no payroll inclusion of some teachers and all RTTI trainers convey low societal regard for teaching profession.

• Failure to hire and pay upcoming graduates of RTTIs and cluster training will put at risk significant investment in attracting and holding qualified MOE staff in education.

• The pre-war C-Certificate, B-Certificate, and A-Certificate qualifications create a salary ladder related to qualification but reinforce the perception that the next higher level in the K-12 education system is more valuable than the one immediately below.

• The newly emerging education professional associations have not yet exerted significant influence on teacher compensation, school and working conditions.

• Continued lack of adequately educated faculty in some specialty areas at the UofL, College of Education has left gaps in course offerings or resulted in ineffectively taught courses in key subjects.

**LTTP Performance in Supporting the L-PERP and Improving Schools**

• LTTP has fulfilled its commitment to assistance with Component 3 (Teacher Development) of the L-PERP. The first cohort of pre-service teachers will graduate from LTTP in June 2009. The second in-service teacher training class — the first to use the curricula developed by LTTP — will graduate in August 2009.
LTTP has made efforts to assist the MOE with the implementation of Component 5 (Supervision and Assessment Services) of the L-PERP. While the MOE has moved forward with the development of the Grade 6 West Africa Examination Council (WAEC) exam, the opportunity, in collaboration with the MOE and other organizations, LTTP has developed a PTA manual that encourages communities and parents to take a proactive interest in assessment and the success of their children in examinations.

In accordance with Component 6 (Strengthening Education Governance) of the L-PERP, LTTP is currently working with the university to develop systems that will allow the MOE to implement processes and standards for teaching and learning in primary schools.

LTTP’s support for Component 8 of the L-PERP (Institutional and Implementation Arrangements for Program) has achieved mixed results. The RTTIs are on solid footing but ongoing support for RTTIs from the MOEs continues to be a critical issue. LTTP regularly intervenes with the MOE management to ensure continued support for the RTTIs.

Teachers in pre-service and in-service programs have received instruction in lesson planning, with reference to MOE and WAEC curricula, but have no consistent documentation of expected educational outcomes. Additionally, there has not been enough time for LTTP teacher training activities to result in significant changes in pupil performance.

Participation in LTTP activities designed to strengthen education governance by key education officials is sporadic. Principals, who are generally considered to be the key determinants for quality in the system, receive training in LTTP-supported areas. However, participation by County Education Officers (EOs) is irregular, although EOs are encouraged to assist in the training.

**LTTP Performance in Building MOE Institutional Capacity and Strengthening the Education System in Liberia**

- LTTP has established ongoing collaboration with the MOE with the recognized goal of transforming Liberia’s education system.

- The successful achievement of LTTP’s goals was challenged by the absence of action or accountability on the part of the MOE. The MOE was unclear about its responsibilities with regard to teacher training. The lack of clear assignment of responsibilities, chain of command and empowerment of MOE personnel to make decisions based on an agreed upon work plan impeded progress in the implementation of training activities.

- It is difficult to count on a timely procurement and delivery of services and resources need to implement LTTP at the local level. Centralization of procurement of
commodities, lack of a previously agreed upon procurement plan and transportation
difficulties, makes forecast and implementation of operations unpredictable.

- The environment in which LTTP is implementing its activities is one where teachers are
  uncertain about their future. The in-service teachers participating in the LTTP training
  have not received assurance that they will be hired when they obtain their C-Certificate.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

LTTP Performance in Improving Teacher Training Standards and Teacher Skills

- Continue to provide outside technical assistance to consolidate the nascent curriculum
development capacity among Liberian educators. This assessment found that there
are three primary level curricula currently in use in Liberia: 1) the outdated 1996
curriculum often available only one per school, 2) a newly-developed curriculum
being piloted in selected counties, and 3) the WAEC curriculum upon which students
are examined beginning in Grade 6.

- Expand the number of RTTIs and consolidate and improve the operation of existing
RTTIs. While the Kakata and Zorzor RTTIIs were functional, the Webbo RTTI was
not fit for use at the time of this evaluation.

- Introduce a C-, B-, and A-Certificate qualification and salary ladder within each level
of the K-12 continuum rather than link each certificate with the next higher level of
the education system. As currently conceived, the MOE’s proposed reinstatement of
the old C-, B-, and A-Certificate qualifications for teachers offers no way for primary
education teachers and school administrators to advance within the primary level.

- Link the delayed UNESCO-led curriculum revision of the B-certificate program with
another donor to maintain the pace of creating and maintaining a teacher professional
development system.

- Continue the cluster in-service teacher training program for ongoing teacher skill
development and quality improvement. The in-service program currently covers only
five of 13 counties, representing a significant challenge to expediting the training of
Liberia’s 16,000 untrained teachers.

- Enlarge the role of RTTI outreach coordinators to provide monitoring and support of
teachers who have completed in-service cluster training program. There are currently
no mechanisms in place to monitor the performance of a teacher trained during the
one-year in-service cluster program.

- Modify the no-family rule at RTTIIs to encourage females with small children to
attend pre-service programs. Poor conditions at RTTIIs and no daycare options may
be discouraging women with families from wanting to participate in pre-service teacher training sessions.

- Provide additional scholarships to qualified female teacher trainee candidates for enrollment in RTTI pre-service training. Of the 478 candidates attending the pre-service training at the RTTIs and expecting to graduate in June 2009, only 44 are women.

- Supply the RTTI reference libraries with relevant and current educational books, journals and reference volumes, as well as sufficient computers with Internet connectivity to allow both computer literacy instruction and individual use.

- Provide RTTI trainers and classrooms with adequate instructional aids, materials to make such aids, and appropriate furniture to optimize the use of student-centered instructional methods.

- Continue technical assistance collaboration with the UofL’s College of Education to enhance faculty qualifications and strengthen course syllabi.

**LTTP Performance in Supporting the L-PERP and Improving Schools**

- Improve the quality of schools and related facilities with involvement from local communities. Many of the schools visited were in poor condition, with little or no running water and periods of time without electricity. Parents, unified within their communities, should take more of an active interest in helping to improve the quality of the schools their children attend.

- Implement system-wide assessments at the primary education level with which to measure actual learning against accepted standards.

- Supply schools with textbooks that are developed in Liberia that reflect the student-centered, activity-based methods taught in RTTIs and in-service training sessions.

- Restore the responsibility of managing items of training, certifying, and remunerating teachers, communicating core learning objectives, providing infrastructure and supplies, building a robust monitoring and information system, and disseminating information to the MOE.

**LTTP Performance in Building MOE Institutional Capacity and Strengthening the Education System in Liberia**

- Strengthen the coordination of USAID partners and other donor agencies involved in education sector activities in Liberia to avoid repetition and overlapping within projects.
• Finalize an appropriate payroll system to address the issue of trained teachers currently working without compensation.

• Implement a professional development strategy with salary increases and other incentives linked to a performance review system.

• Establish linkages between the MOE, County and District Offices and RTTIs, through an intranet and computerization process that makes possible fluent communication and data transmission. This strategy will facilitate management and decision making processes. This action should be the mandate of a Task Force that would provide advisors and technical assistance under the form of a direct intervention in the MOE.

• Develop and implement a two-year plan to restore the proper management of Liberia’s education system, beginning with the MOE. The strategy should encompass the definition of roles and responsibilities, and the development of accountability and transparency, procurement management, and performance-based evaluation of personnel and activities.

• Develop and implement a five to ten-year plan to bring education in Liberia to high performance standards that will support sustainable development.

• Develop and implement a Public Education Campaign to increase public awareness of achievement in the education sector and of the importance of education for the future of the country.

• Ensure that the LTTP model and final materials in process and instruction is passed on to principals, teachers, PTAs, and trainers so that other NGOs could utilize the same approach in other counties. This would allow for uniformity in efforts to improve Liberia’s education system, with eventual sustainability provided under the auspices of the MOE.
ANNEX A. SCOPE OF WORK

Midterm Evaluation of the Liberia teacher Training Program

a. Evaluation goals and objectives
This mid-term evaluation will determine the level of LTTP’s success by:

- Assessing the capacity and skill level of both teacher trainers and teachers who have been trained through the project to indicate the effectiveness of the program,
- Assessing performance of teachers to determine if LTTP training is having a long-term impact on their teaching skills and ability to provide quality instruction,
- Determining the extent to which LTTP contributes effectively to the Teacher Development component of the Ministry of Education’s Liberia Primary Education Reform Program (L-PERP),
- Assessing the capacity of the Ministry of Education to improve management of the teacher training component within the sector,
- Assess the potential for “scaling-up” the provision of teacher training services to cater to larger numbers of schools and communities to enhance the overall quality of the Liberian Education system.

b. Information sources:
Sources of information can include, but are not limited to:

- LTTP/EQUIP II information database,
- Ministry of Education – Deputy Minister of Instruction, Education Management Information System,
- Rural Teacher Training Institutes,
- Teachers’ College, University of Liberia.

c. Justification
The following quantifiable areas may be examined to effectively evaluate LTTP.

1. USAID Requirement
The USAID requirement of this study shall involve determining the level of achievement of mutual goal, objective and targets:

- How many of the 76 administrators and officials trained have benefited, and what level of capacity have they attained?
- How many of the 2,449 teachers and educators trained have been deployed, where do they work (urban vs. rural) and what is their skill level?
- To what extent has the capacity of the Parent-Teacher Associations and/or other school governance structures been improved or enhanced?
- What are the lessons learned so far affecting program components such as training of teachers, training and certification of master trainers, female participation in the teaching profession, school administration and supervision?
- Have teaching materials and other documents developed by LTTP enhanced the effectiveness of training and overall the sector?
• What level of support has been provided for education systems and policy reform for teacher training?

2. MOE Requirement – Liberia Primary Education Reform Program (L-PERP)
The Ministry of Education earmarks LTTP within the Teacher development component three of the Primary Education Recovery Action Plan, specifically to enhance the human capacity for effective pre- and in-service training, development of field-based teacher training activities and a residential curriculum via the rural teacher training institutes. The mid-term evaluation should assess LTTP progress in meeting these goals in support of the L-PERP, and provide recommendations on how LTTP support for the Ministry’s goals and objectives can be improved.

3. Work Requirements
In order to carry out the mid-term evaluation, the consultant team will undertake the following activities:

• Review related literature,
• Design quantitative and qualitative evaluation tools (as appropriate),
• Administer instruments and data/information collection activities,
• Analyze data/information collected,
• Develop a list of technical and administrative recommendations.

4. General requirements
This involves meeting the professional and technical requirements for evaluation instruments to be valid, data reliable and results predictable. The time line supplied must also be respected, along with the budgetary provisions.

d. Team Composition and Participation

The evaluation will be conducted over a two-month period by a multi-disciplinary four-person team. The evaluation consultant team will be comprised of:

• Chief of Party – Evaluation Specialist;
• Teacher Training Specialist;
• Evaluation Specialist;
• Logistics Coordinator.

Chief of Party/Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist
S/he will be responsible for coordinating the activities of the evaluation team, and have the authority to make budgetary and programmatic decisions regarding the evaluation. S/he will serve as the main point of contact between USAID and the contractor’s headquarters. COP will approve the final evaluation design, oversee the development of evaluation instruments, integrate the findings of different team members and coordinate the preparation of the final reports. COP will also be responsible for determining the effectiveness of the LTTP interventions in relation to their costs.
The COP will have at least ten years of experience in the administration of multi-faceted education projects in developing countries - preferably in West Africa. S/he should have experience in managing multi-disciplinary teams and developing and conducting qualitative evaluations, the ability to conceptualize and structure evaluation activities and write clearly and concisely. An MA or PhD in education administration, planning, economics of education or similar field is required. Experience working in post conflict context is preferred.

**Teacher Training Specialist**
S/he will be responsible for analyzing the skill level of teacher trainers and teachers targeted through the LTTP project, the current status of community involvement in teacher quality via Parent Teacher Associations, the impact of community involvement on sustainable education and assessing the technical and managerial capacity within the MOE. The Teacher Training Specialist should hold an advanced degree in education specializing in teacher training and/or professional development and most desirably have expertise in rebuilding education systems in a post-conflict environment. USAID anticipates this being a mid-level employee.

**Education Administration Specialist**
S/he will provide expert technical advice on evaluation of educational projects to the evaluation team. S/he will be able to peruse the existing performance monitoring plan to determine its effectiveness in assessing project performance and outcomes. The Evaluation Specialist will hold an advanced degree in Public Administration, Educational Research and/or Statistics and have extensive experience in evaluating educational programs. S/he will have at least ten years experience working with educational projects in developing countries, preferably in post-conflict environments. USAID anticipates this being a mid-level employee.

**Logistics Coordinator**
S/he will serve as the main logistical coordinator for the mid-term evaluation, and work with local partners to plan travel, data collection, interviews and assessment activities as required. S/he will work with the Contract Manager and Chief of Party to review, edit, and format the final report of the evaluation, prepare it for production, supervise the production and distribute it to USAID/Liberia. USAID expects this to be a Liberian.

**OBJECTIVES**

**Objective 1:**
Assessing performance of LTTP trainers and teachers to determine if training has a long-term impact on their teaching skills and ability to provide quality instruction,

Output:

Assessment of LTTP teacher performance and recommendations on improving/maintaining high skills level.

Illustrative activities:

- Conduct quick assessment of trainers instructional abilities and quality.
• Conduct an assessment of teachers’ learning and performance outcomes.
• Comparative review of student performance among randomly selected schools as an indicator of teacher performance.

**Objective 2:**
Assessing performance of LTTP in supporting the Ministry of Education’s L-PERP and progress to improving the quality of primary education in Liberia,

Output:

Assessment of LTTP performance within the context of L-PERP and recommendations on improving its contributions to the teacher development component.

Illustrative activities:

• Conduct quick assessment of LTTP performance outcomes in support of L-PERP.
• Review of progress on specific goals within the Teacher Development component of L-PERP for which LTTP is responsible.

**Objective 3:**
Assessing performance of LTTP in building the capacity of the Ministry of Education to manage and oversee the teacher training component of the national education system,

Output:

Assessment of LTTP performance within the context of MOE capacity building and recommendations on enhancements/improvements in this area. Determine extent to which project went beyond its scope to address issues directly or indirectly related to MOE administrative and technical management.

Illustrative activities:

• Conduct quick assessment of MOE staff technical capacity and management skills with regard to teacher training.
• Assess current MOE policy and systems development as related to teacher training.
• Develop list of recommendations to ensure appropriate skills transfer and systems development within the MOE.

**Objective 4:**
Scale up LTTP to cater to higher primary school enrollments and teacher training requirements according to L-PERP and the national education strategy.

Output:

A revised/updated LTTP that is cost effective and provides quality teacher training to improve the quality of instruction and capacity building of MOE counterparts.
Illustrative activities:

- Make specific recommendations on teacher education, training, certification and incentives provided through LTTP.
- Make concrete suggestions on LTTP materials supply, demand and suitability.
- Recommend any future application of the LTTP approach in enhancing the teacher training system in Liberia.
- Cost analysis of current program to determine administrative costs as a percentage of total program costs and recommendations to reduce administrative costs.

REPORTS

Financial Reporting

1) Quarterly Past Expenditure And Projection Report
The contractor must submit a quarterly past expenditure and projected expenditure report to the CTO and submit a copy to Office of Financial Management in Liberia (OFM/Liberia) at the end of the quarter. The contractor must submit this report 10 calendar days after the quarter ends. In addition to reporting monthly expenditures for the previous quarter and the projection of monthly expenditures for next quarter, the contractor must report all significant variances of actual quarterly expenditures versus the projected quarterly expenditures for the previous quarter.

2) Accruals
On quarterly basis, the contractor must submit an accrued expenditure report to the CTO and OFM/Liberia by the 15th calendar day of the last month of the quarter. OFM/Liberia will supply the contractor with the template.

DELIVERABLE SCHEDULE

The consultant(s) undertaking the evaluation will conduct an initial briefing with members from the Education Office, Program Office and Mission Management to discuss the work plan and once a week thereafter to brief USAID/Liberia on progress. A draft report with outcomes from the evaluation will be submitted to USAID/Liberia one day prior to the final briefing. The final report will be no more than 30 pages (5 copies) along with a diskette (in Word XP) of the final report.

In accordance with requirements of this statement of work, the evaluation contractor will provide the following deliverables:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Delivery Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial in-briefing</td>
<td>Initial discussions and overview with USAID/Liberia Mission</td>
<td>First full day in-country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft work plan</td>
<td>The contractor shall submit a draft work plan</td>
<td>3 business days after start of the period of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final work plan</td>
<td>The contractor shall submit a final work plan</td>
<td>2 business days after USAID approval of draft work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly update reports</td>
<td>Document which outlines weekly progress on conducting the evaluation and deliverables</td>
<td>On the Monday following the completed week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft executive summary and main findings</td>
<td>The contractor shall draft executive summary and main findings for presentation to the USAID/Liberia Mission, the Education Donor Partners, and the Ministry of Education</td>
<td>35 business days after start of the period of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft final report</td>
<td>The contractor shall produce a draft final report.</td>
<td>37 business days after start of the period of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final out-briefing</td>
<td>Close-out discussions with USAID/Liberia Mission on evaluation findings</td>
<td>During the final week in-country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>The contractor shall produce the final report</td>
<td>3 business days after receipt of comments from USAID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final evaluation report will include:

a. Findings on status of project implementation and impact (items outlined in Section IV of the Statement of Work), and  
b. Recommendations (if appropriate) for midcourse changes in the present project.
## ANNEX B. PERSONS CONTACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contacts Interviewed</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear Consult</td>
<td>Seamus Cleary</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education, UofL</td>
<td>Moses Jarkpawolo</td>
<td>Head, Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George V United Methodist</td>
<td>Namel Meiter</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School, Kakata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>Felix K. Marah</td>
<td>LTTP National Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>Teresa Sesay</td>
<td>Education Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>Inok Epony</td>
<td>Deputy Field Manager, Zorzor (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>Theresa Sese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karloken Community School</td>
<td>Daniel Appleton</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTTI</td>
<td>Roland V Korboi</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTTI</td>
<td>Henreitta Kamara</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTTI</td>
<td>Cephas D. Larmie</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTTI</td>
<td>Jackson Monroe</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRTTI</td>
<td>A. Gono Duolaygbe</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Joseph Korto</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>James Roberts</td>
<td>Deputy Minister, Planning, Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Hester Williams-</td>
<td>Deputy Minister for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catakaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Matthew Zazu</td>
<td>Deputy Minister, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>James G. Gaye</td>
<td>DEO, Kataka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Marcus Sokpah</td>
<td>Asst. Dep. Minister, Teacher Education and Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Esther G. Molubah</td>
<td>Director, Division of Textbook Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Anthony A. Nimely</td>
<td>Educational Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Gehorge B.K. Davis</td>
<td>Director, Division of Instructional Materials, Development, and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Benjamin G. Sumo</td>
<td>Director/Certification, Bureau of Teacher Education, Certification, and Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Malba</td>
<td>DEO, Soma Kotu (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution/Media/Program</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-MOE</td>
<td>Nigel Wakeham</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP Resource Center</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP</td>
<td>Augustus Naplikai</td>
<td>Education Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP</td>
<td>Charles S. Chie, II</td>
<td>Field Program Manager, Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP</td>
<td>Victor Walker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP</td>
<td>Joseph Fayiah</td>
<td>Deputy Education Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP</td>
<td>Christopher Ashford</td>
<td>Chief of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP</td>
<td>Sayku Waritay</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP</td>
<td>Teresa Mancini</td>
<td>Senior Finance &amp; Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTTP (?)</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Finance and Monitoring, Zwedru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Consortium for International Development</td>
<td>Corinne Anderson</td>
<td>Senior Technical Advisor (LTTP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>Gloria Reichmann</td>
<td>Zwedru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleebo Elementary School</td>
<td>Ibrahim Weltue</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soma Kotu School</td>
<td>Joseph Ford</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>John Sumo</td>
<td>Education Socialist, Girls’ Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Gib Brown</td>
<td>Basic Education Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Rick Scott</td>
<td>Deputy Mission Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Gail vonHahmann</td>
<td>Senior Education Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Pamela White</td>
<td>Mission Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Maris Academy (?)</td>
<td>Sister Mary Lorraine</td>
<td>Principal (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Maris Academy (?)</td>
<td>Mrs. Karoma</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorzor Demonstration School</td>
<td>Lawson D. Kpaiwolo</td>
<td>Vice Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Justin Kanneh</td>
<td>Academic Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>David N. Kunukie</td>
<td>Business Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Momo G. Kawatar</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Jonson</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Luther B Mulbah</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Daniel Yekeh</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Mulbah W. Taylor</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>J. Dozmah Peters</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Samuel F. Moliwub</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Harvey K. Ocansey</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZRTTI</td>
<td>Moses M. Yorgbor</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX C. INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

RTTI INSTRUCTORS
INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview Preparation

Collaborate with RTTI principal to select a group of about 4-8 representative instructors to interview in a group. As discussed in the research methodology, the sequencing of questions begins with positive aspects and accomplishments that respondents are proud of and moves later to probe aspects that are problematic.

Introductory statement. Inform respondents of the purpose of study: “looking at the role of the RTTI in training teachers, the work of the LTTP in assisting the RTTI in its work, and your own personal roles both as instructors and with the LTTP staff. I will ask you some questions and will take notes. Need for you to feel free to tell me honestly what you think. And I promise to be careful with your opinions because they are very important. Will not quote you by name and will integrate what you tell me with the statements of many other RTTI instructors around the country.”

Write down names, sex, subject(s) taught, years in teaching, and previous training and education, including certificates and diplomas. Note length of time working with LTTP staff.

Interview Questions

1. Would anyone like to tell me about anything in your teaching that is going particularly well that you would like to see more of? Something that you are very happy about or proud of? This could be in your own work or in the RTTI itself? Have three or so describe their accomplishments.

2. Why are you pleased about these accomplishments?

3. Tell us a little bit about what your goals and objectives are in instructing the trainees?

4. What have you discovered about the students who have enrolled as teacher trainees? Are they ready for learning the content that you are teaching them? Why or why not? Are they motivated to become good teachers?

5. (If applicable) What are you doing to make up for the trainees’ lack of adequate education and training before entering the RTTI?

6. What is your opinion of the LTTP-facilitated training of trainers that you were given? Did it prepare you well for the actual tasks of training young pre-service trainees?
7. Are you able to apply the practices of active-learner, child-centered pedagogy in your classes at the RTTI? If yes, how do you do this? If no, why are you not able to do this?

8. How much support do you and your RTTI colleagues receive from LTTP in being able to successfully train pre-service teachers?

9. What other kinds of constraints, if any, impinge negatively on the environment at your RTTI? How is this being addressed?
Interview Preparation

Collaborate with RTTI principal to select a group of about 4-8 representative trainees to interview in a group.

Introductory statement. Inform respondents of the purpose of study: “looking at the role of the RTTI in training teachers, the work of the LTTP in assisting the RTTI in its work, and your own personal roles both as instructors and with the LTTP staff. I will ask you some questions and will take notes. Need for you to feel free to tell me honestly what you think. And I promise to be careful with your opinions because they are very important. Will not quote you by name and will integrate what you tell me with the statements of many other RTTI instructors around the country.”

Write down names, sex, home county, and previous training and education.

Interview Questions

1. What motivated you to go into teaching?

2. Thinking about your instruction here at the RTTI so far, what do you think has gone well? What are you particularly happy with or proud of here at the KTTI?

3. What aspects do you think should have some improvement of some sort?

4. What do you think will be the best things to take away from your experience here.

5. What are you learning so far about teaching that may be different that how you were taught in school? What is your opinion of those skills and approaches?

6. What constraints, if any, do you see in the instructional process of your trainers or in the larger institutional environment of the RTTI that affect the quality of training?

7. Do you have adequate learning materials, texts, additional reading materials with which to study the key subject material? How good are the resources of the RTTI library?

8. Where, or in what kind of school, would you like to become a teacher? Are you prepared to teach in a rural school?

9. What is the biggest challenge facing the improvement of education in Liberia today?
Interview Preparation

Select a grade level and subject: grades 4-6 preferred. Collaborate with teacher to select a group of about eight representative students from the class to interview.

Introductory statement. Inform respondents of the purpose of study: “looking at the subjects you are learning in school, how well you are learning it, and how you could learn better. I will ask you some questions. But, it is not a test. Need for you to feel free to tell me honestly what you are thinking. And I promise to be careful with what you tell me because it is very important.”

Write down names, sex, age and grade level of students, the name of their teacher, the name and county of their school and the date of the interview. Note whether the teacher has received LTTP training and/or prior teacher training.

Interview Questions

1. How many of you enjoy school learning? What do you like best? (Select a few students)

2. What are you being taught in this class? (Ask a few students to name something they have recently learned in class.)

3. Do you understand most of what your teacher is teaching you? If not, what do you have trouble understanding? (Select a few students)

4. What do you do to try to understand and remember what is being taught?

5. What does your teacher do to help you understand the subject?

6. (If they do not mention it) Do any of you write notes of what the teacher tells you about the subject? (If yes) what do you do with these notes?

7. Do you have a textbook for [this subject]? Do each of you have your own textbook? (If not) How many of you share one book?

8. Do any of you have any other books on [this subject] at home? Do you use them?

9. Does your teacher give the class homework to do? (If yes) What kind of homework?

10. Does your teacher pass out any kind of material about the lesson? (If yes) What are those materials?

11. Does your teacher test how much you know during the year or just at the end of the year?
12. Is there anything that you do not like about school? (If yes) What are those things? (Select several students to name them)

13. Does your teacher know about this thing? (If yes) Does s/he ever say anything about it?

14. What do you think would allow you to learn more than you do now?

15. (Ask follow-up questions on any of the answers)
MOE SENIOR OFFICIALS—INITIAL MEETING
MEETING/INTERVIEW GUIDE

Meeting Setup

Self-introduce team members. State purpose of the evaluation: two-fold—evaluation progress of LTTP and analyze context of basic education and its institutional support. Give brief overview of multiple data sources, field visits, central-level interviews, and document review. State need for follow-up meetings with individual MOE deputies and department managers but want to use this meeting as team orientation of the MOE’s perspective on basic education provision in Liberia and as Ministry orientation of this evaluation. Agree on amount of time for the meeting and the team’s need to speak with individual officials afterward to set up follow-up meetings.

List name, title of MOE official interviewed.

Meeting Questions

1. Would the Minister of Education like to provide us with his perspective on both the LTTP and on the larger concerns of the Ministry in providing basic education to the nation’s children?

2. To what extent is the Ministry of Education involved with the LTTP?

3. What is your understanding as to what the project would do in the area of basic education?

4. What indications do you have that the project is engaged in those activities to the expected extent?

5. Does the project’s planned program of activities seem appropriate for the needs of Liberia’s education system? Why or why not?

6. To what extent have the project staff collaborated with Ministry staff and kept you informed of their activities and concerns?

7. What kind of concerns or obstacles, if any, has the LTTP experienced in trying to meet their own goals and objectives? To what extent have these concerns affected the MOE?

8. (If yes to previous question) Does the Ministry have any suggestions on how to address these concerns and obstacles?

9. Moving on to the larger context of education, what limitations does the Ministry see in providing adequate education to all Liberian children?

10. What, in particular, do you think this team should look at in our site visits to a sample of RTTIs, schools, and county and district education offices in Liberia?
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
LTTP Managers and Staff

1. In looking over the last two years of operation, what has gone particularly well with the LTTP?

2. Your initial assessment of the primary teacher training system uncovered a number of serious constraints that LTTP would face in starting operations. Can you describe how these constraints, ranging from a huge number of untrained teachers to non-functioning teacher training institutions, affected your planning and implementation of project activities?

3. What has been the nature of LTTP’s relationship with the Liberia Ministry of Education in undertaking LTTP activities? Has the MOE been an active and effective partner in working toward the project’s goals?

4. LTTP chose to simultaneously launch both a resurrected pre-service training program and a geographically limited in-service training system. What has been your experience in using both these modes to tackle Liberia’s large teacher training needs?

5. Your goals also included helping to improve the capacity of the MOE to manage an adequate modern teacher training system? What has been your experience in achieving this goal?

6. What kind and severity of constraints have you faced in trying to help Liberia overcome the effects of its past conflict on education?

7. After two years, how far has LTTP been able to go in improving the quality of teacher training in Liberia?

8. What is the nature of your activities with regard to strengthening the College of Education at the University of Liberia?

9. Do you have any indication that the early trainee graduates of the revised training programs are applying these more modern, participatory teaching skills in actual classrooms?

10. What has your experience to date indicated about the direction that technical assistance to basic education should take in Liberia?
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