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ABSTRACT

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) started working in Egypt in the year 1975. Its work on education development over the years included supporting access and gender equity, community participation, professional development and also extended to policy reforms. Education Reform Program (ERP) was one of USAID’s initiatives in Egypt which run between 2004 and 2009. The program was intended to support the Egyptian Ministry of Education (MOE) with strategies to enhance a system-wide reform. It also piloted School-based reform in 256 schools across seven Egyptian governorates. This study attempted to investigate the sustainability of practices that were advocated as part of ERP’s professional development (PD) component after around 10 years of the program conclusion. The study adopted a qualitative research approach with the aim of better understanding the long-term impact of ERP’s professional development activities at the past ERP pilot schools. Document analysis was conducted, and followed by interviewing 38 participants including teachers, Training Unit heads as well as school administrators in four schools. Participants were questioned about the PD practices at their schools, and in what way do they think changes presented by ERP were or were not sustained. Results show different levels of practices sustainability (and discontinuity for some elements) which mostly varied between participating schools and individuals.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Background and Context

Education in Egypt is facing many challenges that have been persisting for some time. For decades policies, projects and initiatives have targeted education development, including extensive local and international efforts. Although such immense work have influenced basic education access and enrollment rates, it has had little impact on the overall quality of education. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2015). Limited progress has been achieved through implementing education policy reforms over the years (Loveluck, 2012), and Ibrahim (2010) has attributed the failure of these reforms to “…a system with characteristics that are historically ingrained and resistant to change, and into a contested context of competing interest groups and a climate of mistrust” (p. 499). Currently, Egypt's basic education rank is 133 out of 137 in the Global Competitiveness Report putting it amongst the worst education systems in the world according to World Economic Forum (2017). In all the past 10 Global Competitiveness Reports by World Economic Forum, Egypt remained within the lowest 10% economies at primary education quality (lowest 5% except for the 2010 report).

Improving students learning experiences as well their schooling outcomes are key to improving education quality. Despite the importance of developing education strategies and policies, arguably what happens at schools would have the greatest impact on school and student success (Rizk, 2016). At the school level teachers’ qualifications and preparedness to positively influence students learning continues to be an issue. Therefore, providing educators and educational leaders with trainings and professional development is essential to improving educational quality. However, wider system and policy related issues continuously impact the effectiveness of such professional development (Ginsburg, 2011). Poor education quality in Egypt can be connected to its highly centralized system that limits autonomy on local levels (United Nations Development Program [UNDP], 2004; El Baradei, 2015). The Ministry of Education (MOE) assumes control over all key elements of education in the country including:
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educational materials, curricula development, educational standards, evaluation, directorates’ budgets as well as teacher qualifications and hiring among others (UNDP, 2004). Despite all efforts and government policies supporting local management of education, schools, Idaras (units of education management at the district level) and Mudireyas (Directorates of education at the governorates level) still receive management directions from the central administrative levels at MOE (NCERD, 2007). This type of control is easily seen in the way education in Egypt generally emphasizes the rules and regulations that puts more obligations for teachers to follow the “national directiveness of curriculum and lesson planning” rather than supporting them to meet students’ actual learning needs (El Baradei & El Baradei, 2004). Teaching and learning quality as the utmost objective for any education reform, highlights the big importance of effective teachers’ professional development. Within that context, this study attempts to understand the long-term impact of the professional development component run from 2004 until 2009 as part of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/ Egypt Education Reform Program (ERP).

Among several donors and international actors, USAID has played a big part of the educational development efforts in Egypt. USAID has worked on different levels of education development since 1975 (USAID, 2012). With an investment of 77 million USD, USAID Egypt Education Reform Program (ERP) intended to support the national work of the Ministry of Education by experimenting with strategies of a system-wide reform including the central and the local levels of the national education system (OECD, 2015; AIR, CARE, EDC & World Ed, 2003). The program was originally planned as a pilot to promote school-based reform in 256 schools in the governments of Cairo, Alexandria, Fayoum, Beni Suef, Minya, Qena, and Aswan (AIR et al., 2003; Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008). It also focused on several themes such as: “Community Participation, Professional Development, Standards, Capacity Building for Decentralization (USAID, 2010). El Baradei and El Baradei (2004) mention that at this stage, the MOE was piloting reform in only few governorates to be the base for later wider national-level changes. They also acknowledge that although the theoretical set up for the piloting plans was
ideal, what was at that time expected to be challenging were the results of actual implementation.

Because these early efforts appear to have impacted the wider educational vision of the country, looking retrospectively may lead to a better understanding of the rationale behind later steps. The fact that this project targeted institutionalized change, and that it - among other initiatives- impacted and contributed to the creation of a national education strategy in Egypt and affected some policy-level changes, makes it important to understand its long term impact. Egypt Education Reform Program (ERP) followed a systems approach, but this study is more focused on the professional development component of it as this is the dimension that closely impacts teaching and learning and in which the actual product of a whole system reform is supposed to be crystalized.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Every year, government, non-government and international bodies make tremendous investments on educational development and come up with strategies and reforms. Measuring the long-term impact of these investments is sometime dubious and difficult. It is questionable what happens or why past reform efforts do not work. It is also questionable whether previous initiatives, their outcomes and lessons learned are being used to inform or guide new projects and initiatives. As stated by Ibrahim and Hozayin (2006), “…educational policy is being made almost entirely in ignorance of its own history” (p. 3). In 2017, the Ministry of Education declared that it would come up with its own solution for the long-held mystery reforming education in Egypt, while clearly stating the Ministry would disregard all past efforts that proved ineffective. Yet, learning why these past efforts failed is very essential. The problems with past reforms do not seem to have big deficiencies in highlighting what needs to be changed. Instead, the problems appear to be more at the implementation stages and in how the change efforts are instrumented (OECD, 2015). The consecutive governments gives more attention to attaining quick results, disregarding the need for setting strong foundations for long-term, sustainable impact (OECD, 2015). However, as Collins (2010) puts it, “education reforms are a development process, not a technical fix” (p. ix) and without consideration
of and inquiry into the impact of past education reforms and their outcomes, future reforms are less likely to develop successful interventions that are based on learning from past experiences.

1.3. Significance of the Study

In general, research on reform sustainability can be described as limited (Century & Levy, 2002; Datnow, 2005). Century and Levy (2002) highlight that:

“Theories about change and its viability are widespread, but few researchers have conducted field-based research on the question of sustainability of reform. Therefore, there are few concrete, illustrative findings on which researchers, educators, and theorists can base valid interpretations, actions, and theories” (p1).

Limited research on reform sustainability does not look to be an issue of the Egyptian context solely. For example, Florian (2000) refers to a similar gap for school improvement programs at the United States, too. She says:

“While these and other current reform initiatives have incorporated recommendations from research regarding the implementation of innovative programs, less is known from research about enhancing the sustainability of such programs after the initiatives end.” (p. 1).

Research, data and measurements on education decentralization reforms impact in most countries -including Egypt- are considered “weak” with inadequate evaluation efforts (UNDP, 2004). Even with the presence of empowerment, a clear vision and administrative procedures, this does not insure that the power structure is impacted (Marks & Louis, 1997). The gap between intervention and institutionalization as well seems to be present across different contexts of education development. Rondinelli, Middleton and Verspoor (1990) mention the same issue to be present across different developing countries. They mention that “[t]he major problem that international organizations and national governments must cope with, therefore, is not intervention, but adaptation and institutionalization.” (p. 15).

Specific to Egypt’s ERP, according to Smiley (2012), some team members of USAID Education Quality Improvement Program 2 (EQUIP2) Education Policy Expert
Team were “unclear” about “the value-added of the long-term system reform case studies” - including that of Egypt’s ERP (p. 25). For example, USAID (2010) mentions that for ERP1 “[t]he capacity building at the idara level has been effective and bodes well for sustainability of practice” (USAID, 2010, p. 10). Confusingly, same document was “doubtful” whether the efforts and capacity building support at the project attempted extensions at that time were adequate to guarantee enough sustainability as follows:

“In response to a request from the MOE, ERP1 teams in the governorates are now traveling to governorates not included in the original project in order to train idara and governorate staff in the units dealing with accreditation: QAU and Training Support Units (TSU). Unfortunately, this work comes across as a “top-down” initiative, in contrast to the previous capacity-building efforts built up from a base of observed school and idara needs in the original seven project governorates. It is doubtful that the current efforts will be sufficient to provide capacity building support adequate for sustainability.” (USAID, 2010, p. 8).

The same USAID (2010) document only mentions the following regarding the sustainability of Egypt’s ERP2: “In regard to sustainability, because of the importance of the topics and the absence for now of alternative analyses and tools, the impact of ERP2 is likely to be felt, for better or worse, for some time to come” (p. 13). This statement in particular is vague and does not provide a clear picture of the project’s expected sustained impact. Gillies (2010) recognizes the progress made by several reform efforts in Egypt including ERP. Nevertheless, he adds that “the sustainability and potential impact of the reforms in Egypt are not assured” (p. 62). In his introduction to Gillies’ The power of persistence: education system reform and aid effectiveness, Collins (2010) suggests that most education studies attempt to measure the effectiveness of technical and policy changes or the level of achievement of certain program objectives either of one case study or across a number of them. He adds:

“These studies contain important lessons about policy and project design, but often fail to provide useful insights into sustainability, institutionalization, and scaling up. However, these studies often fail to capture the contextual dynamics of culture, history, and political and institutional forces that shape reform adaptation and sustainability. Evaluating results through the narrow window of activities in a five-year project inevitably gives a distorted view of reality and leaves one with an impression that most projects are successful, but that education systems neither improve nor sustain reforms.” (p. viii).
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Gillies (2010), attempted to target this gap including case studies of donor-supported reform efforts in different countries including Egypt, through the lens of long-term system change. The analysis was done shortly after ERP conclusion, and it evaluated the sustainability potential as "not assured", and considered the reform to be "at an early stage". As far as the current research was able to access, there is no new documented evidence on the sustainability of Egypt ERP project outcomes.

Collecting new data after some time from the project conclusion may help provide new evidence-based results over the already achieved or not achieved long-term promises. Most reform efforts especially those of professional development get highly active at the time of their initial implementation, and then they lose momentum after some time with decreasing follow up loops and progress monitoring. Taking reform efforts into wider scale also usually get rushed without insuring whether or not this reform reached enough depth in the understanding of the people subjected to it or not. Ensuring that the reform has managed to make deep change on people’s knowledge, beliefs, professional behaviors and practices is what lays the infrastructure for reforms to last and sustain. The discussion on how or whether the changes or reform efforts were really internalized could offer another focus for education stakeholders and policy makers as they plan for more sustainable and more institutionalized changes.

Moreover, the study attempts to see the reform changes through the eyes of the actual school stakeholders specially those of teachers. Ramberg (2014) mentions that: “teachers’ voices have rarely been included in discussions about what changes are needed in education or how to implement initiatives” (p. 48). It is therefore important to understand how these stakeholders see their current context, with regards to the sustainability and impact of the past reforms. It is essential to understand how they evaluate professional development at their schools, and learn about the challenges and opportunities they live and consider it while planning any future interventions.
1.4. Research Objectives and Questions

The aim of this research is to explore the sustained professional development outcomes of ERP in its past participating schools. It attempts to track the elements that were continued and/or abandoned after several years of implementation, and to understand whether the reform efforts got institutionalized at the school level or were just tied to the presence of the donor activities. To better understand this, the study tries to answer the following questions:

1. What is the documented level of objectives/goals achievement of the ERP professional development component?
2. To what extent is the documented impact of ERP school-based professional development sustained or developed, according to the views of the school-level stakeholders?
3. What conditions are needed for sustaining professional development reforms as perceived by the school-level stakeholders in past ERP schools?

The first question is answered through an analysis of USAID project documents. The second and third questions are tackled by interviewing teachers, school administrators and Training Unit heads from four of the schools that were involved in the project’ pilot implementation.

1.5 Organization of the Study

This study is divided into 5 chapters as follows:

- Chapter 1 introduces the topic, research problem, significance as well as the main questions;
- Chapter 2 includes the review of literature as well as the theoretical framework to guide the analysis;
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- Chapter 3 describes the research methodology, sample design, data collection and data analysis. It also discusses the ethical and trustworthiness measures as well as the role of the researcher in this study;
- Chapter 4 includes findings and results;
- Chapter 5 includes discussion, implications, limitations and conclusions.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The literature review is divided into three main sections. The first section discusses the context of education reform in Egypt, its history as well as more recent reform efforts. The second section sheds light on USAID/Egypt Education Reform Program and USAID work in Egypt. Finally, the third section introduces the theoretical framework for education system change.

2.1. Context of Education Reform in Egypt

Egypt’s education system is a product of an interaction between its historical, social, and political development -including foreign educational systems transfers-, as well as more recent internal reforms (Ibrahim, 2010). This section introduces an overview of the contexts shaping both the historical and present realities of education system in Egypt.

2.1.1. Political directives and historical overview.

What is currently mainstream public education in Egypt started in the year 1805 during Mohamed Ali’s era, and ran in parallel to Al-Azhar Islamic education (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008). Since that time, western and foreign educational transfer impacted how education policy and practice was formed (Ibrahim, 2010). While the Ministry of Education was originally established in the 1838 as the “Diwan of Schools”, Egypt’s modern education system first began with higher education, which was then followed by secondary and elementary schools (Sayed, 2006). The main objective of education during Mohamed Ali’s reign was to produce and train a skilled workforce to help meet the needs of the economic and military buildup rather than empower the public and help improve their socio-economic status (Sayed, 2006; Jumay‘ī, 2012). While, Mohamed Ali did not open education to the masses, his successors during Egypt’s British occupation (1882 to 1919) further limited Ali’s reforms by halting free public education, and ignoring what
was called the academic missions, or the state funded fellowships for scholars to study abroad (Jumay‘ī, 2012). Public education was not a priority during British colonial rule, and the main goal during that period was to prepare a select number of Egyptians to work in the civil service (Sayed, 2006).

During Egypt’s period of “semi-independence” (1922 to 1952), spreading education regained its status as a national goal by providing more access to education to the local population (Ibrahim, 2010). Education was mainly focused on literacy and numeracy skills, and at the early years of independence, it reinforced the idea that the local population, especially the poor, are only allowed to fit into specific social roles which does not include mobility (Ammar, 2005). Later a wider national and social consciousness of the value of education was developed through education (Ammar, 2005). Yet, education generally remained dependent on rote memorization, and was often described as irrelevant to people’s practical needs (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008).

After 1952, education access was even more widespread. This period is often described as an “education revolution” because of a boost in literacy rates and because free education was extended to include higher education (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008). At that time education was viewed more as a means for social mobility (Ibrahim, 2010). During Naser’s presidency, education was directed towards a socialist ideology and Pan-Arabism. It moreover served as a “homogenizing and conforming factor in mobilizing the masses” (Sayed, 2006, p. 30). During Sadat’s presidency (1970-1981), education moved away from “socialism”, but continued its efforts of expanding access to the public. However, issues of education quality were also being raised as cited by Megahed & Ginsburg (2008): “Among the specific concerns raised by the MOE regarding pre-secondary education were the following: a) curricula do not prepare students for practical, productive lives; b) rote memorization dominates the learning-teaching situation; … [and] e) low teacher qualifications … (MOE, 1979; discussed in USAID, 1981, p. 5)” (p. 49). During Sadat’s time, the state announced an “open door policy” which allowed foreign investments in the country including foreign education funding (USAID, 2012). This brought about neoliberal ideas, and opened the doors of
globalization that created a new context for education reform policies in the years that followed (Ammar, 2005).

During Mubarak’s presidency (1981 to 2011), the previous quantitative progress continued (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008). Besides, in the 1980s “stability and reproduction of the current republican political system and territorial integrity continue[d] to be the two major security issues dominating the political agenda” (Sayed, 2006, p. 30).

In the 1990s the government was fighting militant fundamentalists, and the state discourse extensively included defining education as a means towards “national security”. This indicated at least an “announced” commitment to reforming education, however the state failed to bring about qualitative results (Sayed, 2006; Dixon, 2010). Donors as well viewed education development as “a stabilizing socio-political factor to maintaining a necessary national and regional equilibrium” (Sayed, 2006, p. 28). Sayed (2006) aligned this “national security” rhetoric to be identified in practice as “the survival and reproduction of the ruling political system” (p. 30). In that sense, and even with more focus had been put into education in the 1990s, the security concerns were more dominant over the “human development” national agenda (Dixon, 2010).

2.1.2. Education reform directions and progress in the past 30 years.

The 1990s witnessed vast international discussions on education which affected the local reform scene. International actors and the state’s international commitments highlighted the main directives of education reform in the country until today. The main catalysts which lead the global trends of education reform are: Jomtien World Conference on Education for All (1990) and Dakar World Education Forum (2000). United Nations Girls Education Initiative as well as the Child Rights Treaty were also among the influencing events. The first two events have in particular witnessed Egypt’s commitment to achieve better education reforms, to encourage the government to exert more efforts on reforms, and to attract international support to Egypt’s educational reform initiatives (Gillies, 2010). Following the Jomtien Education Conference, Egypt announced that the 1990s would be a decade for education, which was also followed by immense
To “decentralize, standardize, privatize and equalize” appeared to have been the main guidelines of education reform at that time (Dixon, 2010, p. 41). These objectives included 1) Putting systems in place that gave schools more control over decisions, 2) Creating standards for accountability 3) Allowing private schools to operate and 3) Assuring equality and access to quality basic education in underserved communities. In 1992 the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) introduced the Community Schools Project” which helped reach school children in deprived rural areas (Zaalouk, 2013). However, Zaalouk mentions that the community school model’s essential achievements have declined in the 2000s as some of its basic foundations were shaken. Nevertheless, this project was one of the catalysts of decentralization and community participation, followed by the One-Classroom School Project in 1993, the World Bank supported Education Enhancement Program in 1996, the Secondary Education Enhancement Program, USAID supported New Schools Program (2000-2008), USAID supported Alexandria Reform Pilot Project (2002-2004) and USAID Education Reform Program (ERP) in 2004 through 2009 (Ibrahim, 2010). During the education decade, Egypt made good progress with enrollment and literacy rates, however, the teaching quality was affected negatively with increasing student-teacher ratios and deteriorating standards of school buildings (Dixon, 2010).

While previous efforts included work to improve education access, quality and systems management, quality education became a bigger focus of education reform efforts following the Dakar 2000 conference. As international organizations got to support the discourse of decentralization, they advocated for community participation started to be integrated into the country’s education policy despite the state’s conservation over the national security concerns (Ibrahim, 2010; Sayed, 2006). Active-learning pedagogy was also one main element that was internationally advocated and imbedded in the major donor-supported programs mentioned above (Ibrahim, 2010). Besides, in the year 2003, the MOE published the National Standards for Education in Egypt which included the five domains of “effective schools, teacher performance,
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outcomes of learning and curricula, educational management and governance, and community participation” (MOE, 2007; Zaalouk, 2013, p. 212). MOE also introduced the Education Management Information System as well as the National Policy Framework of Education in 2006 (MOE, 2007). The year 2007 witnessed the issuance of the first national education strategic plan. The plan identified twelve reform priority programs to address the three themes of “quality assurance, system efficiency, and equitable access to pre-university education” (MOE, 2007, p.3). The same year also witnessed the establishment of the National Authority for Quality Assurance and Accreditation of Education (NAQAAE) (Zaalouk, 2013).

2.1.3. Major challenges facing Egypt education.

Despite the previously mentioned efforts, Egypt’s education system is still struggling. Problems of education quality in Egypt could be attributed to various factors that includes and are not limited to: System Centralization, Teacher Status and Teacher Professionalization, and Education Reform in Egypt

System centralization.

It is important for the government to maintain its dominant role in controlling and administering education (Loveluck, 2012). Enhancing “national unity and social cohesion” is one of the announced objectives of the MOE which might be reflected in how the curriculum content attempts to instill certain political views and/or specific understandings and cultural values (Loveluck, 2012). For example, following the January 2011 uprising, the MOE needed to cut significant portions of the curriculum that praised the old regime (Loveluck, 2012). The Ministry's central control of curriculum and instruction is very tight with strict inspection. This gives teachers limited space and freedom in their course structure, pace and use of supplemental material (Loveluck, 2012). Gillies (2010) refers to the “highly bureaucratic, and historically centralized” nature of education in Egypt and how in general the whole context is too complex to bypass in order to make major reforms. (p. 61).
Beside the problems of bureaucratic management, the assumption behind the criticism of the centralized education system, could reside in its inability to be responsive to the local needs. Decentralization is hence advocated as an alternative. Tiongson (2005) explains:

“Management and institutional reforms, such as decentralization programs, are designed to improve efficiency, accountability, and responsiveness in education service provision. These reforms follow from the assumption that centralized systems often are not able to respond efficiently and adequately to local needs. Decentralization reforms are meant to encourage local participation and ultimately improve coverage and quality.” (p. 265).

Historically, modern education in Egypt has emerged with a centralized nature, and reforms have been directly made through the central government (NCERD, 2007). However, Ibrahim and Hozayin (2006) tracked the presence of some waves of decentralization attempts in Egyptian education, which occurred as early as 1883. Decentralization has become part of the legislation following the approval of the 1971 permanent constitution, which is presented in the “local administrative laws” (NCERD, 2007). International organizations and donor bodies have also exerted efforts to boost decentralization and insure more autonomy for local management (NCERD, 2007). The Ministry of Education has in response shown more acceptance which was reflected in the two education strategic plans of (2007-2012) and (2014-2030). The Ministry of Education (MOE) began seeking “a decentralized educational system that enhances community participation, good governance and effective management at the school level as well as at all administrative levels” (MOE, 2007 as cited in OECD, 2015, p. 58). The 2014-2030 Strategic Plan kept the same focus, following a balanced centralized-decentralized model to reach optimum performance and learning outcomes (MOE, 2014). The (2007-2012) plan has in particular made institutionalizing reform at the school level as one of its main goals, and it also targeted that local districts adapt the plan according to their needs:

“National Strategic Plan seeks to increase devolution of administrative functions and responsibilities from the central to the other lower administrative levels, down to the school, being the focal unit of reform efforts. National Strategic Plan objectives can only be attained through pertinent actions taken at local levels. In
other words, the only way for the plan to succeed is to translate it into carefully-tailored local educational plans. It is, therefore, imperative for governorates to work out their own plans for decentralized implementation. To do so, they are required to adjust the National Strategic Plan objectives to their own local needs through decentralized planning processes.” (p. 5).

According to the (NCERD, 2007), the resistance of decentralization is due to several reasons that extend beyond education. Smiley (2012) elaborates that: “While research showed that decentralization may improve education, the extent of the improvement was minimal in most cases, and any improvements were almost always found in places where responsibilities were decentralized to schools rather than to subnational governments” (p. 20). In the case of Egypt, what usually gets disregarded is that these efforts were run and managed within certain historical, cultural, political and social contexts (NCERD, 2007). Hence, resisting it can never be easy and it should be comprehensive (NCERD, 2007). Based on international experiences and on assessment of the decentralization efforts in Egypt, El Baradie sees that “decentralization is one important means for basic education reform” in Egypt (p. 21). Yet, it alone “will not provide a panacea for all our basic problems in Egypt” (p. 20), and that many other prerequisites are needed first to help reach “successful implementation” (El Baradie, 2015).

**Teachers’ status and teachers’ professionalization.**

Arguably the teacher’s effectiveness and pedagogy play the biggest role in determining education quality and success. According to Barber and Mourshed (2007), what defines the most successful education systems is: “1) getting the right people to become teachers, 2) developing them into effective instructors and, 3) ensuring that the system is able to deliver the best possible instruction for every child” (P. 1). This cycle can be described as dysfunctional in Egypt despite many efforts in improving it. The prevailing trend in the Egyptian education generally views teachers the same way Batra (2009) described to be having an “implementing agency”. Teachers under Batra’s description are generally expected to serve the national interests of the country as a reproductive channel, guided by the official curriculum and national educational goals.
Teachers within this framework engage in “unreflective technical process” to which quality is generally measured according to standards and are usually assured through rigid “supervision, inspection and control” (Carr, as cited in Batra, 2009). On the same track, Zaalouk (2013) identifies two ideological models of teachers’ professionalism which are the neo-liberal model as opposed to the developmental human-rights model. In the neo-liberal model, teachers are expected to function according to standardized requirements of output-based education (OBE) where they are expected to fully commit to the output requirements without necessarily having sufficient autonomy, theoretical knowledge and a sense of space and freedom to question the status quo. In contrast, the human-rights model gives more weight to teachers and their input and expects them to be active social actors who have enough autonomy in developing the needed knowledge for their profession (Zaalouk, 2013).

In Egypt, around 30% of school teachers do not have proper professional teaching qualifications, which complimented with a weak professional development impacts the quality of education (MOE, 2014). Standards for Teachers’ Performance were developed as part of the 2003 National Standards for Education, but their effective use at the schools was not mainstreamed (MOE, 2007). Prior to the establishment of the Professional Academy for Teachers (PAT), there was no system for certifying teachers in Egypt (MOE, 2007). The PAT originally targeted becoming an empowerment model for teachers’ professionalization (Zaalouk, 2013). Its roles included “a) setting up the national plan for teacher training, including pre-service induction training programs; b) ensuring sustainable professional development of teachers; and c) licensing teachers according to the National Standards and linking promotion to their ability to obtain their teaching license” (MOE, 2007, p. 43). Establishing the academy was accompanied with new Teachers Cadre. The original empowering role of the PAT has then dramatically shifted towards a heavy testing and control function and became mainly focused on accrediting professional development programs, licensing teachers and guaranteeing their promotion paths (Zaalouk, 2013).

The socioeconomic and the work conditions for teaching have deteriorated significantly in the past few decades. Government school teachers are among the lowest...
paid positions in the country. This impacts teachers’ absenteeism at the schools and boosts their willingness to invest more effort in informal private tutoring outside the school walls. Private lessons themselves constitute another major challenge of the education system which in return negatively affects the quality of the classroom instruction (Dixon, 2010). Teachers also lack representation and even the teachers’ unions do not provide them with real representation or decision-making voice (Dixon, 2010).

One other dimension of the low status might also be determined with the acceptance criteria of the faculties of education. Besides, poor teachers’ preparation at these faculties means that teachers do not receive sufficient pre-service training. Zaalouk (2013) mentions:

“There is no comprehensive vision for teacher preparation, so teachers suffer from poor professional development. Curricula in universities are not well conceptualized, integrated or relevant to the needs of practice. Innovation, reflection, critical thinking and problem solving do not constitute significant components of the curricula. There is little attention to creating a culture of professionalization, research, integrated subject matter, construction of knowledge and meaning or the general knowledge one would find in a liberal arts programme. As a result of poor teacher preparation over time, practical learning and practicum school-based programmes are very weak” (p. 213).

What also limits the abilities of the teachers to address students learning needs with innovative approaches is that schooling is generally focused on summative examinations and at the end of each stage on centrally administered exams that solely decide progress to the following education stage for students. Loveluck (2012) comments on how this situation affects teaching:

“It seems that this style of teaching has largely developed in response to an intense focus on examinations, a focus that pervades the entire education system. In order to cover all the material in a fact-heavy syllabus – in accordance with the centrally devised curriculum – and not to lag behind classrooms across the country, teachers often have to rush through a great deal of content in each lesson. The same material then has to be memorized by students and reproduced in final exams that are administered simultaneously in all schools” (p. 9).
**Education reform and policy-making in Egypt.**

Education reform and policy making in Egypt is usually derived in negligence of its own origins (Ibrahim & Hozayin, 2006). Reforming education is not detached from narrow political utilization, nor from either foreign obligations or imitation (Ammar, 2005). The consecutive governments usually focus on attaining quick results without spending time and effort in setting strong foundations for long-term and sustainable impact (OECD, 2015). Ibrahim and Hozayin (2006) referred to the absence of a clear reform-making cycle which never includes “clear statements of policy, followed by tidy implementation, ending in evaluation and planning for the next cycle” (p. 4). There is an absence of “an institutionalized integrated system based on results for following-up and evaluation” (MOE, 2014, p. 44). Improvement plans with identical objectives, even with changed phrasings, are repeatedly adopted without adequate evaluations to their actual impact, and accordingly a gap continues to persist between policies, practices and outcomes (Ammar, 2005).

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 1 The deficient cycle of reform making**

Besides, education change attempts generally lack effective/supported involvement of the public stakeholders (Ammar, 2005). Issues with education reform can also be related to how the introduced reforms are developed and how relevant they are to the local realities. For example, Zaalouk (2013) comments on how the process of
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developing the National Education Standards included the adoption of global standards with minimal public discussion. She adds: “They did not fit the local culture of standards and were not internalized by educators at the school level, even though in many schools they were stuck on the wall of the school principal’s office” (p. 212). Ibrahim (2010) attributes part of the issue to the absence of a clear education philosophy. He refers to the conflicting objectives/agendas of both MOE and the different international organizations and donor bodies engaged in education reform including issues of current and historical education transfer, as well as the influence of the historical social and political transformations.
2.2. USAID/Egypt Education Reform Program (ERP) 2004-2009

This section includes an overview of USAID education assistance in Egypt, a presentation of the type of activities that ran under Egypt Education Reform Program, and then an introduction to the Professional Development activities of the program.

2.2.1. USAID education assistance in Egypt.

Following the Camp David Accords, and after Egypt announced its “open door policy” to foreign investment, it was possible for USAID to begin its work with the Egyptian government on different areas including education. In the period between 1975 and 2012, USAID had provided around 1.3 billion dollars on education development programs in Egypt (USAID, 2012; USAID 2015). USAID’s efforts along with those of other donors as well as the MOE has supported and influenced education reform and policy directions in the country. USAID assistance to Egypt has particularly aimed at “maintaining stability in the region” (Sayed, 2006, p. 27).

At the beginning of its assistance to Egyptian education, USAID started with supporting higher education and training, then support expanded in the 1980s to also include basic education (USAID, 2012). During the 1980s, most of USAID’s work was focused on supporting MOE with central governance and funding for establishing new schools with some limited involvement of local actors (Gillies, 2010). Teacher training and building school-level capacity became USAID’s focus in the 1990s, but the agency’s main work was still with MOE central authorities with work focused on the national level (Gillies, 2010). By the 2000s, sub-national level USAID projects started to operate with: “the New Schools Program (2000-2008), the Alexandria Pilot Project (2002-2004), and the Education Reform Program (2004-2009)” (Gillies, 2010, p. 59). USAID assistance utilized “an integrated approach to education-sector support that involves work at both the policy and operational levels. Funding has been channeled through both projects and direct technical assistance, with a focus on program areas and geographical locations with the greatest need” (USAID, 2012, p.3). During its almost 40 years of work with the Egyptian MOE, USAID supported several education programs targeting the five key
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areas of: closing access and gender gaps, encouraging community involvement, boosting professional development, catalyzing policy reform, and assisting tertiary education.

Access and gender equity.

USAID assisted with building and renovating schools beginning 1981 which by the 1990s granted annual access to 1 million students in a total of 1947 schools especially in rural communities with concentrations of girls (USAID, 2012). By 2012, 2056 schools were constructed, and 15 others were renovated (USAID, 2012). USAID also developed evidence-based programs to promote the education of girls. It also supported the establishment of 267 multi-grade schools as part of the New Schools Program, and extended support to other schools that were part of MOE’s One Classroom School program. Literacy and life skills trainings were provided along with scholarships. Access was also advocated through media-based early literacy and numeracy by supporting the production of Egypt’s version of Sesame Street (USAID, 2012).

Community participation.

USAID partnered with the MOE in training Community Education Teams that were providing community support for female education and were mobilizing funds and land donations for establishing new schools (USAID, 2012). USAID supported MOE with establishing 84 Parent Associations for the One-Classroom schools, initiating and activating 492 Boards of Trustees and Parents Teachers Councils, and supporting 457 civil society organizations in providing education activities (USAID, 2012). In addition, USAID helped with training 1250 social workers and social worker supervisors. Beside training 2380 district education professionals working at the Technical Support and Quality Assurance Units, USAID supported MOE in developing Egyptian School Quality Manual that was based on the National Standards of Education and was intended to guide schools to conduct annual self-assessments. USAID helped with capacity building activities for community leaders and with catalyzing the private sector support as well (USAID, 2012).
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*Professional development (PD).*

USAID (1) initially provided targeted training and shifted to improving teaching practices, (2) provided tools needed to improve teaching, (3) provided materials to emphasize reading and literacy instruction, (4) worked on improving professional development system (USAID, 2012). At the beginning of USAID’s work, its professional development work ran as targeted training to support the implementation of other projects, then improving teaching practice became in itself a major focus. USAID developed focus on improving teaching and scaffolding a change environment that could be sustained. Among the PD objectives were: “helping teachers to improve their planning and classroom management skills, and to incorporate the use of active learning methodologies needed to produce eager, active learners who can think critically and solve problems effectively” (USAID, 2012, p. 20).

USAID supported MOE in establishing the Professional Academy for Teachers, bringing about the Teacher Cadre, and developing the Standard-Based Classroom Observation Protocol (SCOPE) (USAID, 2012). USAID helped with equipping Learning Resource Centers in different governorates, and equipped schools with computers as well to support resource giving more access to teachers and encouraging the use of technology in the classroom (USAID, 2012). Collaboration between USAID and MOE also included introducing Moodle, an online Learning Management System, and supporting early grades reading instruction (USAID, 2012). Since the 1980s through 2012, USAID helped train: 70835 teachers, 2375 facilitators, 11537 administrators, supervisors and officials, 47802 professionals in English language instruction. It also provided over 24 million extracurricular books, equipped 98 information and communication technology centers, 29 Learning Resource Centers, and provided 4684 computers (USAID, 2012).

*Policy reform.*

USAID supported MOE in: (1) strengthening the quality assurance and accreditation system, including support in revising the National Education Standards, as well as piloting the schools accreditation system; (2) supporting education
decentralization, including the implementation of school-based management as well as decentralizing MOE finance and administrative functions; (3) building reform leadership capacity, through training leading government officials; (4) developing standardized tests and tools, by advocating data-based policy making and also support in designing the Management Assessment Protocol (MAP), the Standards-Based Classroom Observation Protocol (SCOPE), the Critical-Thinking Achievement and Problem Solving test (CAPS); and (5) enhancing planning, monitoring and evaluation systems, including support to developing the National Education Indicators, the National Education and Management Information System as well as the National Strategic Plan for pre-University Education; beside other program activities that impacted policy (USAID, 2012).

2.2.2. USAID EQUIP / Egypt education reform program (ERP).

Egypt Education Reform Program (ERP) or Basic Education Project functioned under the umbrella of the Education Quality Improvement Program (EQUIP) (USAID, 2010), a wider USAID project with 3 levels of activities implemented in different countries in Asia, Africa and South America (Smiley, 2012). EQUIP1 and EQUIP2 are identified as the two major scopes for Egypt ERP activities. EQUIP partnered with several organizations forming education policy expert teams of both core and resource partners as follows:

“1) core partners, including representatives from USAID, the Academy for Educational Development (later, FHI 360), RTI International, American Institutes for Research, the Center for Collaboration and the Future of Schooling, Education Development Center, and CARE; and 2) resource partners, including representatives from universities, foundations, and non-profits” (Smiley, 2012, p.7).

Initially, EQUIP1 targeted classrooms, schools, and community level improvements, while EQUIP2 focused on the policy, systems and management levels of reform that supported reform scalability and sustainability (ERP, n.d., a; Smiley, 2012; USAID, 2010). Table (1) lists the overall activities as shown in ERP initial program description. The description also included a plan for dynamic linkage between the different activities to better achieve their results. Yet, USAID (2010) mentioned that the
initial implementation showed deficiencies in the original model, which lead to revising the plan into central themes for each of the two projects to meet the goals of “Quality Education for Lifelong Learning” (USAID, 2010, p. 7).

Table 1: List of activities under Egypt Education Reform Program EQUIP 1 & EQUIP 2.

*Source: (AIR, CARE, EDC & World Ed, 2004).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIP1/ERP</th>
<th>EQUIP2/ERP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Classrooms and schools (CAS)</td>
<td>• Decentralized Governance and Management (DGM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-formal Education (NEF)</td>
<td>• Faculties of Education Reform (FOER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School Construction (SC)</td>
<td>• Integrated English Language Program-III (IELP-III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) – additional component (AIR et al., 2003c).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top priority of global education at the time EQUIP was mainly focused on realizing the Education for All goals (Smiley, 2012). It was then globally recognized that increasing access at a big scale had negatively affected school quality (Smiley, 2012). On the other hand, “alternative”, non-governmental programs - redefined by EQUIP2 research as “complementary programs” proved to have more efficient and more cost-effective impact than governmental programs (Smiley, 2012). Understanding how the education needs of the underprivileged people in developing countries were better achieved through models of alternative/complementary education became one of the main foci for EQUIP2 research to guide government and development bodies with strategies that helped them better achieve their Education for All goals (Smiley, 2012).

**EQUIP1/ERP (ERP 1).**

ERP 1 began in June 2004, and it was originally planned to target improving education quality on the local and schools’ level (USAID, 2010). The project objectives developed over three periods of time: (2004-2007), (2007-2009) and (2009-2010) (USAID, 2010). The original objectives were that ERP 1 would work on: (1) *Education Quality*, “including Teacher Professional Development (TPD); Administration and Leadership Development (ALD); Standards Implementation; and School to Work
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(StW)” (USIAD, 2010, p.7; AIR et al., 2004); and (2) Non-Formal Education, including: Integrated Literacy (IL); Life Skills (LS); and Early Childhood Development Education (ECDE) (AIR et al., 2004); And (3) Community Organization and Development, including Community Participation (CP): Girls’ Scholarships (GS); Multi-grade Schools (MGS); School Construction (SC); School Governance-Boards of Trustees (SG);” (AIR et al., 2004; USAID, 2010).

Table 2: Initial Scope of EQUIP 1 ERP activities.
Source: (AIR et al., 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIP 1 / ERP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher Professional Development (TPD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administration and Leadership Development (ALD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standards Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School to Work (STW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objectives were then restructured in the second time period to focus more on School-Based Reform (SBR) (USAID, 2010). By committing to the School-Based Reform approach, ERP aimed at assuring quality education for Egyptian Children by equipping schools with the necessary tools for continuous improvement as well as the processes needed for schools and community control over the continuous quality improvement (ERP, n.d., a). Quality education was defined on ERP website as “one that addresses the child’s intellectual, social, psychological and physical development” (ERP, n.d., a, par. 1). ERP recognized that the school is the basic unit for quality reform, which has a role in also catalyzing the effective role of the various education stakeholders represented in “teachers, school leadership and government structures, communities and parents, and the government system which supports the school” (ERP, n.d., a, par. 1). In that sense, ERP1 aimed at empowering these schools to drive their own reform. EQUIP 1
ERP worked within a “Family of Schools (FoS) on teachers’ competencies, leadership empowerment, community participation (through boards of trustees) as well as supporting the system (at the district level)” (ERP, n.d., a, par. 2).

Under the School-Based Reform focus, ERP 1 program components included: “Effective Schools; Adult Literacy; Learning, Communications and Information Management; and Other Activities Supporting School Based Reform” (USAID, 2010, p. 7). One of the strategies used to support the School-Based Reform model was initiating Teacher Learning Circles (TLC) and Teacher Recourse Centers (TRC) bedside building school- and idara-level leadership capacity, as well as supporting school Boards of Trustees (USAID, 2010). EQUIP1 targeted sustaining practices through “data-driven decision making, systematization of learning, and the sharing of new knowledge” (ERP, n.d., a, par. 4). During (2009-2010), ERP 2 ended its activities, and some of its activities were integrated into ERP1 which objectives shifted from direct school support towards more focus on capacity building at the Idara and Mudireya levels (USAID, 2010).

**EQUIP2/ ERP (ERP 2).**

ERP 2 aimed at building the infrastructure for “policy change and institutional capacity” for a reform that could be replicated beyond the project scope to the wider education system (USAID, 2010). The envisioned outcome of this was “improved learning environments for students, better student outcomes and enhanced quality of education” (ERP, n.d., d, par. 8). While ERP 2 was supposed to work on the top down level in creating a reform enabling environment, ERP 1 was planned to be the implementing stage for piloting that reform at the schools and idaras levels (USAID, 2010). The major elements EQUIP2 addressed was: Policy (especially of decentralization and community involvement), Systems and Educational Strategies (supporting EQUIP1 programs), Organizational Capacity (for implementing reforms), Civil Society Participation (engagement in education support and demand), and Knowledge of Effective Interventions (using M&E and action research) (AIR et al., 2003c).
The major EQUIP2 activities as appears in table 1 fall under three major components: Decentralized Governorate Management (DGM), Integrated English Language Program III (IELP), Faculties of Education Reform (FOER) as well as the additional component of Monitoring and Evaluating (M&E). ERP 2 also had additional supplementary activities, which were dropped by 2007, that included introducing English in the early elementary stage, work force development (School to Work STW), Community Youth Mapping (CYM), and the Creative Science Education Initiative (CSEI) (USAID, 2010, p. 11).

Many activities were run under the Professional and Organizational Development division of EQUIP 2 ERP. For example ERP 2 catalyzed new laws for accreditations as well as Teachers’ Cadre and Teachers’ Academy for Basic Education. (ERP, n.d., d). ERP 2 also played a role in catalyzing the development of the first National Education Strategic Plan of (2007-2012) followed by the development of the National Education Indicators (NEIs) (USAID, 2010). It also supported the different governorates with creating their corresponding strategic plans and guided the idaras in working towards achieving the plan’s objectives (USAID, 2010). ERP provided support to the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) in quality assurance and accreditation in 22 Faculties of Specific Education and Kindergarten (ERP, n.d., d, par. 2).

Efforts for the Decentralized Governance and Management Unit included supporting the inter-ministerial committees that formed from different ministries and governmental organizations to help “developing recommendations for regulatory and legislative changes to enable decentralization of authority to local levels” (ERP, n.d., d, par. 4).

Beside its work overlooking EQUIP 1 and EQUIP 2 activities, The Monitoring and Evaluation Unit aimed at building Monitoring and Evaluation capacity at the MOE level, and also worked with the different stakeholders in developing a system for this (ERP, n.d., f). Part of its work included helping in developing tools for collecting and analyzing data to support decision-making. This included upgrading MOE Education Management Information System (EMIS), as well as presenting the School Report Cards.
as a “communication, transparency and accountability [tool] with local communities” (ERP, n.d., d, par. 5).

2.2.3. ERP professional development component.

Professional development is one of the main four themes identified as ERP’s range of work (USAID, 2010). ERP professional development targeted the following areas: “Standards Awareness; School assessment, Improvement Plan, and Accreditation; Training System Reform Standards, and Capacity Development; Supervisory System Reform and Supervisor Standards (including Supervisors’ Network); Supervisor Training (including for SCOPE); Administrator Training (sometimes overlapping with supervisor training); Teacher Training (including SBTEU capacity development)” (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008, p.18).

The main aim for the ERP teachers PD interventions was to help teachers shift from teacher-centered towards student-centered learning including practices that develop students’ critical thinking skills, utilize active and cooperative learning and that embrace effective classroom management (ERP, n.d., b, par. 1).

One of the key principles was getting teachers to “analyze and respond to data regarding teaching methods and student learning outcomes” (ERP, n.d., b, par. 2). ERP developed tools for generating and recording such data including the Critical-Thinking, Achievement and Problem Solving test (CAPS) designed for measuring students’ learning, critical thinking and problem solving as well as the Classroom Observation Form (COF) based on the also developed Standards-Based Observation Protocol for Egypt (SCOPE) (ERP, n.d., b). ERP elaborated on SCOPE as follows:

“The SCOPE is designed to assess teacher enactment of practices that are characteristic of the standards and reform-based teaching methods outlined in the National Standards for Education in Egypt (Vol. I). It also measures student behaviors that reflect the development of problem solving and critical thinking skills. SCOPE comprises 21 items which are rated on a criterion-based scale from 1 to 5.” (ERP, n.d., b, par. 9).
ERP also introduced the Teacher Learning Circles (TLCs) for teachers to share their best practices and lessons learned guided by the assessment tools to help each other on improving their students learning outcomes (ERP, n.d., b, par. 5). Besides, ERP initiated the Professional Development Centers, which could have been a school that shows an outstanding leadership and classroom practices or a successful “school-reform model” (ERP, n.d., b). Learning Resources Centers (LRCs) were also developed to be equipped by teaching primary resources as well as computers and IT facilities to be accessible for teachers’ use and as meeting spaces for their exchange of practices (ERP, n.d., b).

According to Megahed, Ginsburg, Abdellah, and Zohry (2010), ERP used multiple strategies in implementing its professional development vision as follows: It started with a “cascade training” model to prepare a trainer-of-trainers, who were then supposed to carry on the training for more teachers. Then ERP used a “refined cascade model” to which the target trainees were the staff of the school-based training and evaluation (SBTEUs) who were to be responsible for delivering the trainings either to their school members or their assigned cluster of schools. At a later stage ERP presented the trainer-of-trainers “with supervised practice” so ERP could also supervise school-based professional developers in their initial practice of workshops planning and implementation. “Direct trainings” were also held by ERP experts directly to teachers as the content was realized to be complicated for teachers to transmit through the training-of-trainers model. ERP later used “collaboration with multiple levels of the training system” in which MOE personnel started to get engaged with ERP in planning, designing and implementing the professional development activities (Megahed et al., 2010).

School administrators and supervisors were also targeted so their training becomes aligned with the topics of the workshops planned for teachers. ERP worked on developing instructional leaders among school principals, head teachers, and MOE supervisors who are able to provide the needed classroom level follow-up, support and feedback (Megahed et al., 2010). ERP initiated geographical clusters from between 2 to 7 schools of the same educational level/stage to work together while planning workshops and providing “instructional supervision and support for teachers” (p. 13). Training was
also provided for the supervisors on using (SCOPE), which was also reflecting how the educator standards were put into the MOE National Standards for Education (Megahed et al., 2010). The Classroom Observation Form (COF), which was developed as a simplified version of SCOPE, was also intended to guide the supervisors in assessing and recording feedback on teaching practices during their classroom visits (ERP, n.d., b).

The main aim for the leadership development (i.e. principals, district educational administrators, and BOT leaders) training activities was “to empower leadership at school and district levels and to improve instruction in the school” (ERP, n.d., c, par. 1). This program objectives were: “Build institutional capacity; Help leaders and, in turn, school staff, to focus on learning; Improve leader’s knowledge to develop school and cluster level professional development programs,” and “Strengthen the leadership skills of school, BOT and district staff” (ERP, n.d., c, par. 2). Similar to the Teaching Learning Circles (TLCs), Principal Learning Circles were also initiated for school principals to discuss, assess, and analyze their leadership practices and use the outcome of this in planning and instrumenting change at their schools (ERP, n.d., c).
2.3. Conceptual Frameworks: Education System Change

For a long time and almost everywhere in the world, educators, researchers and policy makers have been making several attempts for improving teaching and learning at schools and classrooms. The result of reform attempts may vary from a certain context to the other (Datnow, 2005), and as development and change in societies and environments are inevitable, there will always be a need for education to keep up with the requirements of the changing realities and the prospective of the unknown. The emergence of progressive education movements in the 1900s is one of the factors that in particular laid the foundations for new assumptions about education, and which also created new understandings of education reform (Friedman, 2011; Fullan, 2007).

The need for education reform is undeniable, yet implementing reforms is very complex. Education reform is not a one-time fix, but rather an ongoing process that requires constant reevaluation and revision. Schlechty (2009) defines it as: “changing procedures, processes, and technologies with the intent of improving the performance of existing operating systems” (p. 3). Fullan (2007) explains that reform is about making meaning out of the relation between what and how to change. This meaning making adds complexity to the already multidimensional nature of reform, as the relation between what and how to change does not include only those who plan the change, but all those who are involved in it. Meaning making “is one of how those involved in change can come to understand what it is that should change, and how it can be best accomplished, while realizing that the what and how constantly interact and reshape each other” (Fullan, 2007, p.9). He adds: “[w]e are not only dealing with a moving and changing target; we are also playing this out in social settings. Solutions must come through the development of shared meaning”. What would then decide whether a certain reform would flourish or deteriorate is the boundaries between “individual and collective meaning and action in everyday situation” (Fullan, 2007, p.9). Reform then is both an individual as well as a socio-political process (Fullan, 2007), which sheds light on the complexity that makes major education reforms very difficult to initially achieve and then sustain (OECD, 2015).
Different understandings of reform have been presented in an extension of education literature. Some elements of the theories of education reform can be generalized, while some of them are only context-specific. The following theoretical frameworks would guide the analysis of the study.

2.3.1. Variations of education change.

Schlechty (2009) differentiates between reform and transformation. The greatest difference he makes is based on varying the objectives of each. Reform is intended to improve the effectiveness of existing operating systems by changing or developing how they perform side by side with protecting the culture and social structure. One the other hand, transformation aims at changing the entire being and functioning of the system itself by introducing new sets of culture underpinnings which also affects the roles and relationships of the social structure. This is similar to Cuban’s (1988) notion of “first order” and “second order” change. First order change occurs within existing structures to improve their functioning, while second order change is more fundamental as it shakes the structures and roles within the system. Fullan (2000) introduces the “restructuring” and “re-culturing” distinctions too. “Restructuring” is about changing the formal structures and roles within the organization and this type of change can happen through decisions and legislations. He states that “restructuring” alone does not necessarily impact the teaching and learning quality. “Re-culturing”, on the other hand, impacts deep culture and structure changes and is embedded in how professional learning communities are developed within the school as the main drivers of continuous improvement.

Fullan (2000) also puts forth three stories of school development levels which cannot stand in isolation: the “inside story”, the “inside-out story”, and the “outside story”. He defines the “inside story” as the realities of the internal contexts and dynamics at the school which impact its own improvement. The “inside-outside” story is about the interrelation between the school dynamics and the outside forces. While the “outside story” is more about the “external reform infrastructure” that exists outside the school-based factors and is represented in “policies focusing on decentralization, local capacity building, rigorous external accountability, and stimulation of innovation.” (p. 6). Fullan
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(2000) argues that “re-culturing” does not happen solely within the school, without considering its relationship with the external community bearing in mind the expected pressures and support of the external context and stakeholders. Fullan (2000) assures the necessity for all the three stories to function simultaneously for any reform to be effective. He says:

“When the three stories of reform work together, they activate this change formula. Thus, greater energy for reform is generated in a system of integrated pressure and support in which capacity and accountability are both increased” (p. 8)

2.3.2. Accommodation, resistance, and domestication of change.

According to Schlechty (1976), school reform has more chances to be effective if the introduced changes or innovations are well-matched with “the existing social structures”. However, when this is not the case, three different trajectories become possible: (1) existing social structures may take over the reform, “domesticate” it, and result in no effect on students learning, (2) the change will be resisted and eventually abandoned with the claim that it is not contextually relevant, or (3) the tension between the introduced change and the social structures may drift towards the change and accordingly direct the system to “accommodate” this change. Schlechty (2009) then attributes change resistance and or domestication in the first two paths described above to the bureaucratic being of most school organizations. Bureaucracies are in their nature rigid in their acceptance to innovations (Schlechty, 2009). Cuban (1988), too, attributes the failure of most education reforms to the nature of the first order changes which usually strengthen the existing cultures and structures and make them more immune to accept the deeper second order change.

Change is paradoxical within the systems theory that assumes that the more a system is stable, the more “self-organizing” it would be against unexpected changes, and the more it becomes resistant and attached to its original stable existence (Gillies, 2010). Education reform needs to happen on a “system scale” and needs to be profound enough to address the multiple and complex dimensions needed to really target quality
improvement (Gillies, 2010). When planned on a single scope, reforms tend to become less effective when they start to diffuse into the host system (Covaleskie, 1994). For reform to be sustained its improvement process needs to be fully integrated and embedded in the education system (Mourshed, Chijioke & Barber, 2010; Sarason, 1996).

Schlechty (2009) also claims that introducing change within an existing bureaucratic system is very limiting to the prospective impact of that change and is a predictable of maintaining the status quo of that system. This is because systemic changes are required first for the introduced change or innovation to produce its effects. The alternative -and the more likely to accommodate change- is “transforming” these bureaucracies first into “learning organizations” which makes introducing change more acceptable and leading to more openness for supporting the projected innovation. Transformation then is a “prerequisite” but yet not a guarantee for achieving school improvement, but rather a catalyzer for better conditions for reform accommodation. Gillies (2010) states that change does not happen at once with a certain intervention. As put forth by him, change is “iterative and incremental” (p.137), which needs time and does never occur immediately with the introduction of new regulations nor trainings. What matters most for these new arrangements to have a real impact is, as indicated by Gillies (2010), changing “fundamental behaviors and mental models” (p. 137).

Fullan (2000) refers to Newmann and his colleagues’ findings regarding how schools manage to improve their performance through forming professional learning communities, utilizing assessment to understand students work and then adapting their professional practices based on that to impact students learning. As “learning and internalizing change” needs to happen on an individual-by-individual or a case-by-case basis, this necessitates that the change becomes very sound and meaningful for those who are expected to adopt it and for them to really believe in it. They then need to be empowered with “[c]onsistent, regular support and reinforcement” (Gillies, 2010, p. 137). The process also needs to be documented and understood for “longer-term trends” to track opportunities and to guide future interventions (Gillies, 2010).
One form of resistance from the teachers’ side may come due to the problems that teachers face in practice while attempting to implement newly acquired techniques or strategies. Teachers usually take time developing their confident teacher persona and their -what works- techniques for instruction and class management (Labaree, 2007). Shaking personal competency, giving up the sense of predictability and losing familiar successes, may make them feel incompetent and accordingly triggers resistance (Herrmann, 2017). As Labaree (2007) explains:

“Teacher resistance to fundamental instructional reform is grounded in a deep personal investment in the way they teach, a sense that tinkering with this approach could threaten their very ability to manage a class (much less teach a particular curriculum effectively), and a realisation that changing how they teach is akin to changing who they are.” (p. 20).

2.3.3. Aspects, elements and stages of education reform.

Mourshed et al. (2010) identify five essential aspects of school reform: The three basic elements of “the status quo, intervention and contextualizing”, plus the two supporting elements of “sustaining and ignition”. The performance of any education system falls in a continuum between poor and excellent in terms of the students’ outcomes and which they divided into stages: (poor to fair, fair to good, good to great, and great to excellent). Where the education system falls along this continuum prescribes the type of intervention that suits the conditions and needs of each stage. Improving an education system needs to be guided with the three dimensions of: assessing the stage or the performance level in which the education system falls, choosing the interventions that matches the system needs, and adapting it to suit the context of the education system including policies, culture and structure. An example of the intervention clusters aligned with the performance stage appears in table 3 as illustrated by Mourshed et al. (2010, p. 36).
Table 3: Intervention clusters for different education system performance stages

Source: (Mourshed et al., 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Journey</th>
<th>Poor to fair</th>
<th>Fair to good</th>
<th>Good to great</th>
<th>Great to excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td>Achieving the basics of literacy and numeracy</td>
<td>Getting the foundations in place</td>
<td>Shaping the professional</td>
<td>Improving through peers and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention cluster</strong></td>
<td>Providing motivation and scaffolding for low skills teachers</td>
<td>Data and accountability foundation</td>
<td>Raising caliber of entering teachers and principals</td>
<td>Cultivating peer-led learning for teachers and principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>・Scripted teaching materials</td>
<td>・Transparency to schools and/or public on school performance</td>
<td>・Recruiting programs</td>
<td>・Collaborative practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>・Coaching on curriculum</td>
<td>・School inspections and inspections institutions</td>
<td>・Pre-service training</td>
<td>・Decentralizing pedagogical rights to schools &amp; teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>・Instructional time on task</td>
<td>・Financial and organizational foundation</td>
<td>・Certification requirements</td>
<td>・Rotation and secondment programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>・School visits by center</td>
<td>・Optimization of school and teacher volumes</td>
<td>・Raising caliber of existing teachers and principals</td>
<td>・Creating additional support mechanisms for professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>・Incentives for high performance</td>
<td>・Decentralizing financial and administrative rights</td>
<td>・In-service training programs</td>
<td>・Release professionals from admin burden by providing additional administrative staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting all schools to a minimum quality level</strong></td>
<td>・Outcome targets</td>
<td>・Increasing funding</td>
<td>・Coaching on practice</td>
<td>・System-sponsored experimentation/innovation across schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>・Additional support for low performing schools</td>
<td>・Funding allocation model</td>
<td>・Career tracks</td>
<td>・Providing additional funding for innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>・School infrastructure improvement</td>
<td>・Organization redesign</td>
<td>・Teacher and community forums</td>
<td>・Sharing innovation from front-line to all schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Getting students in seats</strong></td>
<td>・Expand school seats</td>
<td>・Pedagogical foundation</td>
<td>・School-based decision making</td>
<td>・Common across all journeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>・Fulfil students’ basic needs to raise attendance</td>
<td>・School model/streaming</td>
<td>・Self-evaluation</td>
<td>Six Interventions: (1) Revising curriculum and standards; (2) Reviewing reward and remunerations structure; (3) Building technical skills of teachers and principals, often through group or cascaded training; (4) Assessing students learning; (5) Utilizing student data to guide deliver, and (6) Establishing policy documents and education laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mourshed et al. (2010) notice that the systems attempting to improve at the “poor to fair” stage are usually identified with strong “central control over teaching and learning process,” mainly because they need to narrow the achievement gaps at the schools while also being faced with the existing facts of the very limited abilities of educators (p. 34). On the other hand, as educators tempt to have better qualifications and more improved skills in the system “moving from good to great”, central directions become very limited with more space for school-led innovations to take the lead in the improvement process. In that sense the shift from central guidance towards school-based improvement is not something that happens with decisive one-time actions. However, turning schools into learning organizations happens gradually as the system moves on along the performance level continuum. For example, figure 2 shows percentages from the education systems Mourshed et al. (2010) studied and how different decentralized pedagogies are used across each improvement stage or reform phase.

![Figure 2](image.png)

*Figure 2. % of systems in reform phase that decentralized pedagogical rights to middle layer or schools.*

*Source: Mourshed, Chijioke & Barber, 2010, p. 54*

Both mandated and persuasion types include advantages and downsides, Mourshed et al. (2010) view that there is always a need for flexibility and balance in action while choosing whether to “mandate” or “persuade” change depending on the exact context of reform. Mandating reform results in consistent interventions along the system, while persuasion allows for autonomy and ownership, which Gillies (2010) identified as essential to effective reform. Mandating reform is more desired when (1) change is “non-negotiable, (2) there is no loss and no threats of the reform, (3) it impacts
the credibility and stability of the system, and/or (4) the change is subjected to time pressures (Mourshed et al., 2010). However, mandating reform makes resistance more likely to happen. On the other hand, “persuasion” guarantee that the stakeholders get more chances of ownership and accordingly be less resistant, though this would slow down the process. Balancing and planning to overcome the downsides is then needed while planning to implement any education reform.

Gillies (2010) identified 4 elements of effective education reform to which “ownership”, “project modality”, “sustainability”, and “scaling up” are essential for reaching reform effectiveness. “Ownership” does not only mean the “top ownership” of the recipient government -in the case of donor supported reforms-, but it extends to “deep ownership” of all levels of stakeholders in an education system including those of teachers and parents. This includes “the process of engagement, and the establishment of structures to reinforce and validate that engagement over time” (Gillies, 2010, p. 6).

“Project modality” is also related to ownership and highlights how policy dialogue is essential to building both the political will and the civil society infrastructures needed for empowering reform. Project modality includes: “a variety of strategies, including implementing pilot projects, introducing new ideas and knowledge, strengthening the availability and quality of information, and reinforcing processes and procedures that enable further ownership for responsive and sustainable change” (Gillies, 2010, p. 6).

“Sustainability” should be built on the previous elements, and it requires an integration between the institutional leadership, members’ ownership, reinforcing policies and procedures that retains members’ commitment even under leadership changes. Sustainability also necessitates creating a balance with being open to subsequent changes as well as committing to continuous improvement for developing the system instead of being stuck with the specific project activities (Gillies, 2010). Further discussion on sustainability is extended in the section below. “Scaling up” is built on the success of the previous elements. When these components prove to be achieved effectively, scaling up becomes more achievable with “continuity, adaptation and time” being identified as the key success factors for scaling up (Gillies, 2010). Fullan (2000) states that taking reform to scale is very rare and has been achieved in very few cases. Scaling up becomes
challenging when counties become in a rush overlooking the success factors and overlooking that:

“The human process of developing ownership, strengthening new behaviors, and changing systems is done at province-by-province, district-by-district, and school-by-school levels. The substantive reforms that affect teacher and student behavior require not simply new knowledge, but rather reculturing, as has been pointed out by Michael Fullan,” (Gillies, 2010, p. 7).

The ideal form of scaling up does not mean that the exact reform should be copied everywhere by spreading a rigid model, but rather utilize the lessons learned to be permeated to support the newly extended local and regional efforts (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008). Effective vertical (between schools and classrooms) and horizontal (through the ministry units) means of communicating the best practices and lessons learned are among the basic tools to support spreading and scaling up reforms (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008).

### 2.3.4. Sustainability of education reform.

Century & Levy (2002) define sustainability as “the ability of a program to withstand shocks over time while maintaining core beliefs and values and using them to guide its adaptation to change” (p. 4). Fullan (2000) mentions that for reform efforts to last, they require “strong institutionalization” to happen along the strong adoption and implementation of such efforts. Sustainability occurs when the reform “lasts over time and becomes an institutionalized feature of a school” (Datnow, 2005, p. 123). Datnow (2005) also illustrates that although the lexical definitions of sustainability and institutionalization may include that the first refers more to longevity and the latter to practices being established, they both are highly interconnected with the sustainability being dependent on institutionalization. She says: “[f]or a reform to be sustained, it must become institutionalized. So too, when a reform is institutionalized, it has been sustained over time” (p. 123). She further explains that it can be said that institutionalization is achieved when the reform gets to become the new status quo at the school and no longer a “special project” (Datnow, 2005). What happens is that initial success does not usually
last because it does not get enough institutionalized. Florian (2000) also differentiates the two concepts as follows:

“Sustained reform is most often defined as a continuation of classroom practices or other activities that have been implemented during the reform program's existence, and the decisions, actions, and policies by school and district leaders that support that continuation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1977, 1978; Yonezawa & Stringfield, 2000; Hargreaves & Fink, 2000). Institutionalization of education reform, in contrast, has been defined more specifically as the integration of new practices into routine activities, and having those practices survive organizational changes such as administrative turnover or budget cycles (Huberman & Miles, 1984; Yin, 1978).” (Florian, 2000, p. 3).

Mourshed et al. (2010) mention that sustaining school reform does not only require changing the teaching content and teachers’ practices, but rather embedding the change into how they perceive and think about teaching itself. For improvements to be sustained a new “professional pedagogy” needs to be created first which includes starting collaborative practices at the school level, creating a mediating layer between the school and the central authority, and developing future leaders (Mourshed et al., 2010).

EQUIP2 research found that education programs that were considered as complementary and were directed by the community and non-government entities have managed to achieve learning outcomes that were more efficient and more cost-effective than their governmental counterparts even though these complementary programs were community-led by under-compensated under-qualified locals (Smiley, 2012). However making the local community accountable is one of the success factors. Such programs usually lack the element of sustainability due to their volunteering and donations-based nature, and in most cases they get to lose their distinguishing qualities when the governments eventually takes over them (Smiley, 2012). Yet, Century and Levy (2002) distinguish between the meaning of sustainability and program maintenance. While project maintenance is a limiting perspective of putting a program into operation, sustainability is more about moving towards innovation and continuous improvement:

“A program could be considered maintained if its base elements (e.g., instructional materials, professional development program, leadership plan) were well established and were commonly accepted as standard practice. We described
sustainability, on the other hand, as the ability of a program to withstand shocks over time by maintaining core values and beliefs and using them to guide its adaptations to change. In other words, a program must be maintained before it can reach a stage of sustainability, but it cannot be stalled at maintenance; it must develop an ability to evolve and adapt” (p. 4).

They also identified three phases needed for programs sustainability: (1) the establishment phase, in which a certain reform gets introduced together with establishing its core principles which is somehow similar to the concept of program maintenance, (2) the maturation phase, in which reform implementation reaches a good level of stability and smooth functioning after being firmly established and accepted, then after reform practices are established is (3) the evolution phase, which is distinctive by growth and continuous improvement on the reform with deeper understanding of its core principles introduced in the establishment phase. After a reform is sustained, the program goals are theoretically achieved all over a school system including districts, schools and classrooms. Sanders (2012), describes these phases as “nonlinear” in the sense that each school has its own “dynamic environment” which decides the level of sustainability it becomes able to achieve. Schools and even educators within schools vary in their level of sustaining reforms on high, moderate, and low levels based on the different “local conditions, experiences with reform, and capacity” (Datnow, 2005, p. 121).

Sanders (2012) highlights that flexibility of reforms need to be considered as it should not be too rigid to adapt to changes, nor too flexible to lose its core structures. Sustainability potentials may increase if reform costs were minimized by utilizing local resources like for example build local capacity of existing professionals to carry out and support professional development onsite (Sanders, 2012). When reforms are well developed, supporting and developing leadership and maintaining effective “dialogue” with them to nurture their understanding of reform is also another sustainability booster (Sanders, 2012). “Dialogue” remains essential in how reform knowledge gets communicated with all stakeholder engaged in the reform implementation, and this dialogue should always hold consideration of the dimensions of “size, culture, and resources” within the targeted school context (Sanders, 2012, p. 867).
2.3.5. Reform and the nature of donor-recipient relations.

Achieving universal primary education access including closing the gender gaps were the framing trends for international education since the 1990s with consensus over the United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)-lead Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as the main agendas (Gillies, 2010). Emphasis has also been put on the growing philosophy of “country-led development” that was consolidated with the “Paris Declaration and Monterrey Consensus” (Gillies, 2010, p. 14). International actors have managed to achieve good results by expanding basic education access (Riddell & Niño-Zarazúa, 2016). They then got to realize that quality challenges were more difficult to achieve than those of access with many of the reached children not acquiring the necessary learning outcomes. This directed the international donors to give more weight to addressing the effectiveness of their aid and support, by having improving learning outcomes as the main objective, along with supporting the education systems with the assessment, evaluation and research tools to guide decision making for the education sector management (Gillies, 2010).

Sayed (2006) discusses how education serves as one subject for “international socialization” by which international organizations try to implement their development philosophy in recipient countries (p. 9). This includes a process of “norm-reconstruction” that align more with the donor values to which education itself is both a subject and medium. When the domestic system conforms to the new value system, this results in “domestic resonance” (p.15). The international actors were more concerned with introducing their universal vision to impact domestic policy and practices as well as attempting to get these countries "to internalize a set of key beliefs and institutionalize specific practices" (p. 10). However, what usually happens is that the internalization of the new value system gets to be faced by the education norms in the recipient countries. Contradicting the frequency of the first scenario, Sayed (2006) states that “on the contrary, educational reforms, more than others, were introduced within highly contested normative orders where they heavily disputed and measured against other, often deeply rooted social values and political ideologies” (p. 16).
Views of foreign aid effectiveness are raised in relation to similar concepts. One view sees that foreign aid fails to be effective when it is part of a top down or “big plan” that ignores local values and solutions (Easterly, 2006). It then becomes more effective when the recipient country has in place an appropriate policy structure or framework or when the aid is directed to understand the weakness of the structures which the aid addresses (Burnside and Dollar, 2000 as cited in Gillies, 2010). In many cases practice and policy choices are advocated by international donors and foreign experts through marketing instead of being rational domestic choices of the recipient countries (Sayed, 2006). This results in plans that:

“… have had few if any real links to the practical administrative, political, budgetary, and decision-making realities of the country. Too often also the ‘priorities’ have simply reflected someone’s best guess as to what the potential donor agency thinks is the right answer” (Coombs and Bigelow 1965 - As cited in Sayed, 2006, p. 22).

Effectiveness can also be maximized with a level of coordination between the different actors as well as the level of accountability from their behalf (Gillies, 2010). Salmi (2012) states that there might be a problem with donor coordination which may lead to either providing an intervention that is irrelevant to the needs of the targeted education system or causing inconsistency between their impacts and accordingly lead to “dysfunctions in the system” (quoted in OECD, 2015, p. 227). To make sure this does not happen, the recipient government needs to have an active role in achieving coordination and in directing assistance towards achieving its own priorities (Riddell & Niño-Zarazúa, 2016; OECD, 2015). Beside the donor’s level of commitment, the limited impact of aid contribution compared to its potentiality can also be attributed to the absence of local leadership that is able to boost capacity development for sustainability (Riddell & Niño-Zarazúa, 2016). Lawson (2012) also introduces how sometimes foreign aid funds in some developing countries get misused and counter-actively support corruption instead of benefiting the targeted subjects. He says:

“Numerous examples exist of hospitals, schools, and other facilities that were built with donor funds and left to rot, unused in developing countries that did not have the resources or will to maintain them. In some instances, critics assert that foreign aid may do more harm than good, by reducing recipient government
accountability, fueling corruption, damaging export competitiveness, creating dependence, and undermining incentives for adequate taxation” (p. 3).

“Sustainability” is a real challenge of donor-supported interventions especially when local ownership, local capacities, local resources, how the program fits in a national strategy, as well as the structure of the system are insufficient to maintain the impact after the donors leave (OECD, 2015). Gillies (2010) highlights how the institutional and political structures have more influence on sustainability over technical and financial gaps for example. Hence, strengthening the system itself should be the main goal of donors and recipients in order to provide more chances for the interventions sustainability (Gillies, 2010). Even though sector-wide approaches became more widespread in aid programs than isolated ones, Smith (2005) finds that the prevailing donor tactics do not yet meet the policy, budgeting nor the capacity building needed for education reforms to be created and sustained. Riddell and Niño-Zarazúa (2016) also refer to a significant gap between the potential impact of donor programs and their actual quality and sustainability outcomes especially for standalone projects no matter how successful they appear. They add: “Perversely, development agencies which focus only on demonstrable short-term impact may well be contributing, unwittingly, to an undermining of long-term impact on the education systems and their deepening development, to whose progress they are trying to contribute” (p. 23). Local capacity building for planning, implementing and managing reforms remains a big challenge for sustainability and it should be given a big priority for donor funding projects (Smith, 2005). Riddell and Niño-Zarazúa (2016) mention that one of the problems impacting aid effectiveness is that:

“… most aid agencies take the ‘easy’ route in providing an account to the public at home of the results of their interventions in the education field—by focusing mostly on reporting on the ‘numbers assisted’ rather than educating the public, .. and deepening public awareness of the complicated nature of development effectiveness (and only one of its constituents, aid effectiveness)” (p. 24).

While impact on “first order” and tangible education support requirements can be measured and attached to clear indicators, outcomes of less measurable interventions related to the education functioning represents the core impact of support programs (Riddell & Niño-Zarazúa, 2016).
Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1. Qualitative Research Methodology

This research attempts to qualitatively explore evidence about whether or not and in what ways the participating schools of USAID/Egypt ERP were able to sustain the impact of the professional development component after the project officially concluded. Answering the questions raised requires assessing some of the current practices at the school sites through learning about the perspectives of the school-level stakeholders. The factors which are among the ones that necessitate using qualitative methods according to Creswell (2009). In attempting to answer the main research questions, secondary data from project documents are analyzed side by side with primary sources collected from both one-on-one and focus group interviews at the school sites.

For qualitative interpretive investigations individual researchers can not solely understand a certain phenomenon on their own. Because interaction with the world is what shapes people’s perceptions of reality, they, in the interpretivist views, need to connect with the meanings and values made by those who are immersed in the contextual reality they attempt to investigate (Lapan et al, 2011). Hence, interacting with relevant stakeholders at the schools’ level provides an opportunity to engage with the participants without the need for restricting experimentation constraints. This also includes giving voice to the individual participants and regarding their actual contexts as the original source of meaningful data, and for which inquiry is “an interactive process between the researcher and the participants” (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p. 11). Investigators would never be able to visualize the “true” context without knowing about how the participants themselves experience it (Lapan et al., 2011). The thing which the qualitative methods used for this investigation would help achieve.

3.2. Participants and Sample Design

The original USAID project was conducted in 256 schools in the governments of Cairo, Alexandria, Fayoum, Beni Suef, Minya, Qena, and Aswan (AIR et al., 2003;
Megahed & Guinsburg, 2008). For the convenience of this research, and due to the time and resources limitations only 4 schools are chosen in 2 purposively selected governorates. The sample includes three levels of participation: governorates, schools, and individual participants.

Table 4: Steps of sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governorate Selection</td>
<td>Schools Selection</td>
<td>Individual Participants selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Purposive Sampling)</td>
<td>(Convenience Sampling)</td>
<td>(Purposive + Convenience Sampling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Governorates</td>
<td>2 schools per governorate</td>
<td>Teachers, Training Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Total of 4)</td>
<td>Heads, School Administrators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1. The governorates sample.

Originally ERP was active in the 7 governorates of: Alexandria, Cairo, Minya, Beni-Suef, Fayoum, Qena and Aswan. From these seven governorates, the research was purposively conducted in the 2 governorates of Alexandria and Minya. In general, purposive sampling is used to insure certain categories are met, and the sampling can then be stratified into, for example, geographical, demographic or socio-economic categories (Robinson, 2014). The stratification of the sample in this study aims at including a little part of the geographical and social contexts of the Egyptian governorates by including one that represents Upper Egypt and one that represents Lower Egypt realizing that variations even within each governorate do exist. Selecting samples based on geographical alterations is used to include input from different sites of different characteristics (Creswell, 2009). Alexandria and Minya are selected as the two sample governorates for this study.

Alexandria.

Alexandria is a metropolitan city located on the North West of Delta. Alexandria has a total area of 2300.00 km2 with around 70 km long coast on the Mediterranean Sea (State Information Service [SIS], 2016). Alexandria is chosen for this study as a representative of Lower Egypt. This governorate has a total number of 2359 schools,
1442 of which are governmental. The total number of students in the Academic year 2017/2018 was 1176357 student, and the total number of teachers was 51571 (MOE, 2018).

Alexandria witnessed the USAID Alexandria Pilot Project that preceded ERP, then was merged into ERP scope when it started in 2004. This governorate has in particular witness longer activities implementations counting the preceding activities of Alexandria Pilot Project. EQUIP program description mentioned the rational for originally selecting this governorate for ERP as follows:

“Alexandria was selected as the first governorate due to the strong willingness of its leadership and community to pioneer the pilot in an urban setting. The planning of this pilot has confirmed that there are concerned citizens both within and outside the Ministry of Education and private sector who are truly interested in and committed to making the public schools better. The activity is off to an excellent start but requires immediate technical support and training. This should be the first priority of the new Activity. The implementation started with 30 existing schools so that the number of schools is small enough to be manageable but large enough to be meaningful. More schools will be added after carrying out a mid-term assessment to the impact of project interventions.” (AIR, CARE, EDC & World Ed, 2003, p. 12).

Minya.

Minya is selected for this study because of its medial location as a representative of Upper Egypt ERP participating governorates. With a total area of 32279.00 km2, Minya is considered one of Egypt’s North Upper region governorates, and is mainly categorized as an agricultural governorate (SIS, 2016). Minya has a total of 3071 schools, 2836 of which are governmental (MOE, 2018). The total number of students in Minya for the academic year or 2017/2018 was 1272931 student, and the total number of teachers was 63194 (MOE, 2018).

EQUIP project originally selected Minya for the following reason:

“Minya, Beni-Suef, and Fayoum were selected because of the positive response to the New Schools Program and interest in extending these reforms. The Governor of Minya has expressed willingness and commitment to support the implementation of an Education Reform Pilot in a letter to the USAID/EGYPT Mission Director (in July 2001) and in several meetings with USAID/EGYPT’s
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officials.... The communities in these three governorates have been demonstrating their strong commitment to support the provision of access to quality education by providing substantial contributions (cash, land, time and effort) to the New School Program.” (AIR, CARE, EDC & World Ed, 2003, p. 12).

3.2.2. Schools sample.

Two schools in each of the two governorates were selected for the sample with a total of four schools. However, individual participants in this research may or may not have been part of the original ERP interventions, the schools should be. The extent to which each school was able to retain the practices introduced by the program is a major indicator in answering the subjected research question. Though different types of schools were part of the original ERP scope, this study is conducted in only basic (elementary and preparatory schools) for several reasons. First, these types of schools represent the biggest percentage of schools in the program and the selected governorates. Second, secondary and vocational education would be having multiple factors and variations which would add extra dimensions for exploration and analysis which would differ from basic education schools. The schools were selected from the ERP Family of Schools list located from ERP website, and the four schools were conveniently chosen with the reference from the respective Idara’s personnel.

School (a).

School (a) belongs to (X) district and idara in Minya governorate. It was established in the year 1963. It is a mixed gender basic education school that includes kindergarten, primary and preparatory stages. The school has around 1560 students of which around 110 student are in kindergarten, 700 in primary, and 750 in the preparatory stage. It has around 110 teachers in total, and it operates over one morning period. Participants from school (a) were all preparatory stage teachers. Participants reported average class size to be over 50 students per class.
INVESTIGATING THE LONG-TERM IMPACT OF ERP PD COMPONENT

School (b).

School (b) belongs to (X) district and idara in Minya governorate. It was originally established in the year 1960. Another building extension was added 20 years ago, and the main building was renovated as part of the USAID ERP school construction activities. Before reopening in 2010, the school operated for five years as an afternoon period in a nearby host school buildings. The school is a girls-only preparatory school with a total of 1209 students. The school operates over 2 time periods. The total number of classes is 16 for the morning period and other 16 for the afternoon. The average class size is below 40 (37.8). As reported by participants, all classes are equipped with interactive boards.

School (c).

School (c) belongs to (Y) idara in Alexandria governorate. It was established in the year 1960. School (c) is a mixed gender primary school that operates for only 1 morning period. The school accommodates around 651 students in a total of 12 classes from grade 1 to grade 6. The average class size is 54.16 students per class with lower primary classes having more density that reaches in its highest of 62 students in a primary 2 class. The school has around 25 teaching staff of both subject teachers for upper primary grades and class teachers for lower primary grades. During the data collection visits, the school principal was on an external training outside the school, and the vice principal was the one temporarily taking over her duties.

School (d).

School (d) belongs to (Y) idara in Alexandria governorate. It is a girls-only preparatory school that runs in one morning period. The school accommodates 849 female students in a number of 19 classes. The average class density is 44.68 students, with the highest density at preparatory 3 classes reaching 58 at the maximum. The school has a total of 54 teaching staff.
3.2.3. Individual participant sample.

The individual participants sample includes teachers, training unit heads and school administrators with a total of at least seven individuals from each school with a total number of 38 individual participants. Table 5 presents the size of sample in each school.

Table 5: Sample participants and size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>TU Head</th>
<th>School administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minya</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>8 teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>8 teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>5 teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School D</td>
<td>8 teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4 schools</td>
<td>30 teachers</td>
<td>4 TU Heads</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selecting individuals for this research was a mixture of purposive and convenience sampling. It was important to reach information-rich participants and to have maximum variation within the sample. Robinson (2014) illustrates that having information-rich participants is important for research that look for theoretical insights, participants need to be “insightful, comprehensive, articulate and/or honest”. The Training Unit (TU) Head at School (a) served as a gate keeper in selecting the participating teachers. Each school was asked to help suggest people who would be most informative. Arrangements were made to also make sure the sample includes different representations of for example: males/females, relatively new/old teachers. The availability of teachers and the sessions schedule had a role in affecting and adding some convenience dimension to the sample. At school (b), the 2 school deputies (one of them heading the TU as well) were the ones responsible for coordinating the interviews, and they allowed flexible choice of teachers based on their availability at the interviewing time. The school vice principals in schools (c) & (d) assigned a staff member to co-ordinate and help connect with the teachers. The principal at school (a) showed complete willingness to participate in the study during the introductory visit, then it was difficult to meet with him at the school site on the data collection day. His interview was later
attempted to be done through a phone call, but was a little difficult to arrange. Table 6 shows the demographics of participants from both Minya and Alexandria.

Table 6: Participants Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minya</th>
<th>Alexandria</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total years of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience 0 – 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of years at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or less (joined after ERP)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 9 (joined before or during ERP)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in ERP activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were assigned numbers according to the table included in appendix H. Interviews were given codes according in the following pattern (Interview type abbreviation followed by the letter referring to each school name, followed by a letter representing the order of the interview in that specific school). Interview type abbreviations are represented as follows: (II: Individual Interview, FGI: focus group interview, MFGI: mini focus group interview).

3.3. Methods for Data Collection

Two types of data are used for the purpose of this research. Secondary data from project documents are used to help answer the first question and generate the interview questions and general themes, and primary data collected from one-on-one and focus group interviews are used to answer the second question.
3.3.1. Document analysis.

Bowen (2009) defines document analysis as: “a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents—both printed and electronic” (p. 27). Bowen mentions five specific uses of document analysis in research as follows: (1) Documents serve as a main source for background information and the historical insights needed by researchers to make sense of the issue or context under investigation, (2) The information driven from documents can help generate questions and areas of observation for the research, (3) It supplements research data, (4) “documents provide a means of tracking change and development”, and (5) It can support evidence from other resources (p. 29-30). In elaborating on the fourth function, Bowen particularly mentions that “[t]he researcher may also examine periodic and final reports (where available) to get a clear picture of how an organization or a program fared over time” (p. 30), which among the other full functions mentioned is very relevant to the needs of this research. The following documents among a few other resources including ERP website were used to achieve this purpose:

- *Education Reform Program: support in the area of professional development: documentation research - final report* (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008)
- *Active-Learning Pedagogies as a Reform Initiative: The Case of Egypt* (Megahed, Ginsburg, Abdellah, & Zohry, 2010)

Both documents were prepared for USAID by ERP Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and they document the results and final evaluation of the project PD component.

3.3.2. Semi-structured interviews.

The main data collection method used for this study was interviewing participants. Using interviews for data collections allows for better exploration of “the views, experiences, beliefs and/or motivations of individuals” (Gill, Stewart, Treasure & Chadwick, 2008, p. 292). The participating individuals themselves or the interaction they make during the interviews is considered to be the main data source of qualitative interviewing (Mason, 1996).
One-on-one, focus groups, and phone call interviews were used for this study. They were all conducted in a semi-structured way. Semi-structured interviews allow for more flexibility with follow up and clarifying questions, which would provide a better opportunity for understanding the participants input with a better chance to elaborate on their responses (Gill et al., 2008). The interview questions (appendixes C and D) were prepared based on the available ERP information and documents. They were derived from the activities of the professional development components, with a focus on the school-level elements and not including outcomes that need either muderiya or idara level assessment. Interviews varied in time between 20 to 50 minutes based on the different flows of the discussions and/or time availability of participants.

One preliminary visit was made to each of the 4 schools beforehand to introduce the nature and purpose of the study, and request an arrangement for the interviews dates and times without interrupting the work flow at the schools, and with making sure the timings suit the information rich participants. The initial visits to Minya were done during the last week of the mid-year break of the academic year 2018/2019, and the interviews were made during the second week of term 2. Alexandria initial visits were made during week 4 of term 2, and the interviews were made during week 5 of the same term.

School (a) interviews were conducted in the school’s science lab and male teachers’ staff room. The science lab was moderately quiet with a few students accessing it during the interviews. The male teachers’ staff room was located in an upper floor and looked relatively small. School (b) interviews were made at each of the male and female teachers’ staff rooms, and the principal interview was made in a corridor overlooking the school entrance and playground. School (c) interviews were made at both the teachers’ staff room and the principal office. The staff room was the only teachers’ room at the school. It was not very big in size and had one classroom entrance only accessible through the teachers’ room. Students and teachers voices in the nearby classroom were audible during the interview and the class door was frequently opened. School (d) interviews happened at the Arabic teachers’ staff room and the science lab. Both spaces were relatively quiet, with the Arabic teachers staff room being relatively spacious compared to the other staff rooms at all other schools.
**One-on-one interviews.**

One-on-one interviews were originally planned to be conducted with both TU Heads and School Administrators. However, and because the interviews were made during a regular teaching day, some teachers' interviews were also set to be conducted on a one-on-one basis according to the teachers’ availability and the timing of their classes as suggested by the gatekeepers coordinating the interviews.

**Focus-group interviews.**

Focus groups provide a better opportunity to get insights from the collective shared understanding of participants and encourage eliciting more information between them (Creswell, 2009). The focus group method was originally selected for interviewing all participating teachers as it would have been challenging to reach an adequate number of representing participants on a one-on-one basis solely.

**Phone call interviews.**

Phone call interviews were conducted when it was not possible to have the face to face interview during the field data collection visits. Three phone calls were made with school (b) TU Head, School (d) TU Head, and school (d) Principal. They were all met in person beforehand and introduced to the purpose of the study during the introductory visit before data collection.

3.4. Ethical Considerations

Qualitative research in general faces complex ethical challenges because it heavily depends on interaction with human subjects represented in individuals or communities (Mertens, 2011). It was essential for this research to put all agreed upon ethical issues into consideration. The research committed to showing full respect and courtesy to all participants, not causing them any kind of harm, and ensuring careful considerations to all this while administering the research. As the constructivist paradigm views reality as socially constructed, it is essential to give authentic value to the views of
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each individual participant in the research (Mertens, 2011), and show authentic will to understand and connect what all participants add to the investigation. Besides, from a transformative viewpoint, it is also essential for the research to remain “culturally responsive” while being aware of power structures either within communities or between the researcher and participants (Mertens, 2011).

3.4.1. Access and permissions.

Documents and list of schools.

Publicly accessible documents, papers on ERP and EQUIP publications including ERP information were originally used with attempts to access further details through the MOE. The full list of ERP participating schools was not accessible through currently available online documents. Initially a letter was directed to the MOE Public Education Directorate that approved access to information and redirected the request to the MOE Department of International Relations to help locate the sample as well as provide more information for this study. This department (as well as the MOE Information Center) reported not having the requested information. The Foreign Relations Department offered contacting USAID Education Office on the researcher’s behalf, then reported not receiving any response to their communication with the USAID Education Office. Emailing USAID directly on the contact available on its website was also attempted, followed by a visit to USAID Cairo Office. A brief talk with someone from the Education Office at the security gates concluded in the difficulty of obtaining information of a relatively old project as ERP as after the project conclusions all data are sent to D.C. for archiving and become no longer available.

Later, it was possible to retrieve ERP website using the Internet Archive website. It was also possible to access the project proposals after contacting Professor Mark Ginsburg, who served as a member of ERP monitoring and evaluation team (after stepping down as director of the Faculties of Educational Reform team), and who was generous enough to provide the requested documents. The school list was located on the website as part of the information that was open and available to the public during the
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project implementation period. Megahed and Ginsburg (2008) mention the total number of schools as 256 school, yet the available list had only 202 school. It did not include the schools from Cairo governorate, some officials from Alexandria Mudireya later commented that this list mixes the school from each of the two Idaras. Though not being full, the list located through ERP website was the only available means for identifying ERP schools followed by the following steps for schools access.

**Approvals and access to schools.**

Following the approval from AUC Institutional Review Board (IRB) (appendix A), approval from the Central Agency for Population Mobility and Statistics (CAPMAS) (appendix B) was obtained. CAPMAS advised that the respective Mudireyas and the Security Department in each should provide their permits too and facilitate conducting the study. Beside the CAPMAS decree, the Mudireyas in both Alexandria and Minya also required letters directed from the affiliated university department confirming the student status and mentioning the purpose and title of the study before giving their permission. Another level of approvals was also required from the Idaras as a final step before being able to access schools. Because the researcher did not have the full background on the locations, accessibility and the full professional development history of the schools on ERP list, the security officials at both X Idara in Minya and Y Idara in Alexandria were the ones that recommended the sample schools and added the school names to the permits. Copies of CAPMAS, Mudireyas approvals, Idaras permits fully facilitated the schools entry, and the principals of the 4 approached schools approved their schools access when met in the preliminary visit.

![Figure 3: Schools access approval process.](image)

3.4.2. Informed consents.

For this study, all participants were informed of the nature and purpose of the research beforehand. They were informed that their participation is anonymous, voluntary
and non-obligatory. They were asked to read and sign a written consent form (appendixes E & F), and an oral consent process was given to the participants who were not comfortable signing the form as well as for the interviews conducted over the phone. Interviews were recorded only with participants’ approvals. Interviews were not recorded for participants who expressed not being comfortable with recording nor for the phone call interviews.

3.5. Data Analysis

3.5.1. Transcription.

Most interviews were recorded, and the recorded audio was transcribed in Arabic, the main interview language. English translations were made only for the interview segments that need to be quoted in the findings section. Several readings of the transcripts were made to develop initial ideas and throughout the analysis.

3.5.2. Field notes and post interviews notes.

Handwritten notes were taken during and directly after the interviews. Extensive notes were taken particularly for the not-recorded interviews (as requested by a few participants) and for the phone-call interviews too. All handwritten notes were then added to a single word document to be included for the analysis.

3.5.3. Coding.

Creswell (2012) explains coding as “the process of segmenting and labeling text to form descriptions and broad themes in the data” (p. 243). Codes are described as “labels used to describe a segment of text or an image” (Creswell, 2012, p. 244). Codes could be used to label different topics including “setting and context”, “perspectives held by participants”, “participants’ way of thinking about people and objects”, “processes”, “activities”, “strategies”, as well as “relationship and social structure” (Creswell, 2012, p. 244). Themes and categories are “codes aggregated together to form a major idea in the database” (Creswell, 2012, p. 245).
INVESTIGATING THE LONG-TERM IMPACT OF ERP PD COMPONENT

The “documented achievement of objectives” was decided as the main theme for research question 1. Categories under this theme were generated from the documents analysis to include: “teachers’ professional development”, “instructional leadership development”, as well as “local PD support”. Table 7 then lists the codes and main findings that were found in the documents under these categories.

Findings from the document analysis were then used to generate the interview questions, and also served as the main themes of data analysis for research question 2. ERP PD components were filtered while developing the interview questions to include only the components that could be assessed at the school level making the major theme for the second question as “local and school-based professional development”. Findings deduced from the documents were used as the general themes and categories for the data analysis of research question 2 (table 8). For research question 3, more inductive open coding was used as a set of new themes and codes emerged from the interviews content (table 9).

3.5.4. Reporting findings.

Findings are organized by each research question. For questions 2 and 3, findings are divided into categories, to report each professional development component. Based on the current views of participants of this study, the general trend under each category is mentioned and compared to the past outcomes. In case of variations across schools, the perspectives of each school are mentioned independently. In cases of contradictory evidence, the conflicting views are mentioned with reference to the categories of participants who voiced such views. For a few case group interviews that were not audio recorded, it was difficult to identify the exact teacher who voiced the opinion. In that case, the quotes are followed by the school name and the interview code listed in the table in appendix H.

3.6. Trustworthiness

Guba and Lincoln (cited in Guba, 1981), suggested four elements trustworthiness in naturalistic investigations. They presented the terms: credibility, transferability,
dependability and confirmability as the alternative terms for the trustworthiness aspects of: truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality.

One mean for increasing credibility, the research attempted to develop familiarity with the exact schools prior to the data collection stage. Some kind of pre-engagement was attempted, but for the time constraints it was not possible to be fully achieved. One preliminary visit was made to each of the school sites to set the stage for the interviews, build rapport with the participants, plan for the exact data collection and interviews times, as well as share expectations and introduce the research objectives.

For transferability, “thick descriptions” of the contexts, collected data, and the analysis process is attempted throughout the methodology section. Guba (1981) mentions the importance of thick descriptions for findings transferability. He says:

“If the thick descriptions demonstrate an essential similarity between two contexts, then it is reasonable to suppose that tentative findings of Context A are also likely to hold in Context B (although, to be safe, an empirical test of that presumption should be made)” (p. 81).

For confirmability, triangulation of data sources is attempted through differentiating the governorates as well as interviewing three different stakeholder informants within each school: school principals, TU head and teachers. Triangulation in data collection methods was also attempted through using individual as well as focus group interviews. An audit trail was attempted by recording and transcribing interviews beside using direct quotations from that in the analysis process. Continuous reflective cycles were also made throughout the process.

3.7. Role of the Researcher

In qualitative researching, the researcher’s subjective understanding serves as both “a source of data” as well as “a mean to generate new hypothesis” (Firestone & Dawson, 1982, p. 2). Yet, the qualitative researcher should adhere to a “disciplined inquiry” that minimizes “researcher’s biases, under- or over-attention to various aspects of the studies setting, and selective memory” (Dawson as cited in Firestone & Dawson, 1982, p.2).
3.7.1. Exposure to the phenomena.

Having been in the education field for six years, I have been exposed to some issues of professional development at and outside the places I worked in. Before giving examples of observations from my professional exposure, I would recall an incident from high school. As a secondary student, I was attending a governmental school that was part of a World Bank-funded project. I still recall that chemistry teacher who was trying to conduct an experiment using some equipment at the chemistry lab, but he ended up not able to. When he was asked by a student if anybody had shown him before how it works, he said they had the training in the summer, but he lost the notebook. As a result, he was not able to use the equipment when he wanted to implement with us as his students.

When I started teaching, I have seen teachers confusing and misunderstanding the rationale of some teaching strategies, despite having been in the teaching career for a long time and despite having attended so many school trainings. I have also seen how professional development in many cases inefficient and unpractical to help us teachers address our classroom needs. My teaching experience had only been in private and international schools that definitely have lots of contextual differences from governmental schools.

For few months, I had worked in a national professional development program that allowed me interaction with several governmental school teachers. Despite the examples mentioned, I did not have a firsthand exposure as either a teacher or a professional who lives the everyday reality of professional development at governmental schools for an extended period of time.

3.7.2. Developing interest in the topic.

My interest in the topic has developed accumulatively since I started working in Education. At one my early classes at the Professional Educator Diploma, we had a guest speaker who created us an activity and asked us to put some statements into their historical timeline. The statements were either from policies or speeches on education, and surprisingly most of the quotes that were used looked to us like very recent or new.
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Yet, as she corrected the timeline we suggested, we found out that what we thought to be very recent statements turned to belong to many decades ago.

As I started working with one of the most recent teacher professional development programs, I witnessed how the initial training model looked very promising, but was planned without adequate needs analysis. Interaction with government school teachers at this project raised in my mind so many questions that were the most direct trigger for this investigation. As I got exposed through the MA courses to papers and reviews including past reforms, I began to wonder how and such professional development programs impacted schools and classrooms in reality and on the long term. It was very confusing that with the amount of efforts and scopes of interventions that we came across in the class readings, our problems in education continue to be the same. The research seed idea wanted to understand deeper the model of school-based reform, and to what extent is it suitable for the Egyptian context. While searching for papers on this, I came across a video on ERP which looked to have presented very promising ideas. ERP then turned to become the scope that the main idea of this study revolved around.

3.7.3. Possible selective or biased perceptions.

During the field visits, each school showed different level of hospitality. Teachers at Minya schools looked very appreciative that a young female is coming to them all way from Cairo. School (b) teachers in particular had shown readiness to stay after their working hours on the preliminary visit day trying to save me another trip. In Alexandria, I had the opportunity to get inside a few classes for a few minutes and had the opportunity to witness more incidents of teacher-student interactions inside and outside the classrooms. This in particular may have affected how I view the schools and their general atmosphere. In general, the environment at the 2 Minya schools was way calmer and less stressful than the 2 schools in Alexandria. Though it is not a direct focus of the study, I also could not avoid noticing the different patterns of interactions of the school principals. Firestone & Dawson (1982) mention the following on how the selective or biased perceptions and memories may affect the qualitative interpretation:
“People cannot deal with all information to which they are exposed; instead, they tend to select that which is familiar or interesting and to screen out other information (Sadler, 1981; Trankel, 1972). Fieldworkers observe some aspects of phenomena more completely than others. People sometimes give undue weight to first impressions, have difficulty dealing with conflicting or missing information (Sadler, 1982), or have limited access to their thoughts and behaviors—e.g., are unaware of whether or how a particular stimulus influenced a response (Reichardt, 1981). Informants may report on events that they remember poorly (Dean & Whyte, 1969). Researchers’ memories are especially likely to be faulty because of information overload at the beginning of fieldwork or because they do not record notes soon enough.” (Firestone & Dawson, 1982, p. 6)

To partially avoid the selective memory thread, interviews were recorded for full transcription (when approved by participants), extensive notes were taken as much as possible, and post interviews notes were recorded right after the field visits and within a maximum of two days following data collection.

Some teachers looked more honest and open, while other teachers appeared to only highlight the positives and avoiding including criticism. In all cases the analysis attempted to use what was said by participants as is, without carrying out any assumptions as much as possible.
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Chapter 4

Findings

This chapter presents the findings and results as appeared through data collection. Findings are organized by research questions, and a content analysis table is added for each research question highlighting the used themes, categories and codes.

4.1. Findings Related to Research Question 1

*RQ1: What is the documented level of objectives/ goal achievement of the ERP professional development component?*

*Table 7: Content analysis table for research question 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Documented achievement of objectives | • Teachers Professional Development | • pre-service / in-service training in learner-focused teaching and assessment methods  
• promoting students’ participation in learning, active learning, critical thinking and problem-solving  
• encouraging teachers to use and analyze data as a tool to plan for improving teaching methods and students’ outcomes through SCOPE and CAPS | • Majorly reported changes  
• More gains on behavioral than cognitive dimensions  
• Mostly in primary schools  
• Few exceptions | • Varied perceptions  
• Impacted teaching  
• Not very effective  
• Progressive strategies  
• Misuse of resources  
• Not recalling |
| Instructional leadership development | • developing school administrators’ instructional leadership roles | • Majority reported changes (for supervisors)  
• Limited awareness (for school principals) | | • Extended in research question 2 |
4.1.1. Document analysis.

Support in teachers’ professional development (including promoting active learning pedagogies), as well as instructional leadership development were part of ERP PD related activities attempting to boost education quality (Megahed et al., 2010). Training teachers and supervisors on “active-learning, student-centered methodologies” was one of ERP goals towards achieving this (AIR et al., 2004, p. 17; Megahed et al., 2010, p. 10). ERP sub intermediate result (2.4.) was: “Teachers receive pre-service education and in-service training in learner-focused teaching and assessment methods” (AIR et al., 2003, p. 17) (Full list of results and Sub-Intermediate results added to appendix I). Megahed et al. (2010) also connected this to the other Sub-Intermediate Result (3.1.) that is leading to “students engage in participatory learning, critical thinking and problem-solving” (AIR et al., 2003, p. 17). ERP proposals also targeted raising school administrators’ awareness of “effective instructional leadership concepts and practices” so that they get to assume “instructional/educational leadership roles within their schools” beside also assuring that “supervisors become supportive instructional leaders and not ‘inspectors’” (AIR et al., 2003 p. 24; USAID/Egypt (2003a, p. 19) as cited in Megahed, et al., 2010, p. 9). The following section reports on documented level of reaching these objectives.

**Teacher’s professional development.**

ERP initially “documented the nature and extent of training resources and gathered data on staff training needs from education officials and teachers” through district mapping exercises in the participating governorates (EQUIP1/ERP, 2004, p.5 as cited in Megahed et al., 2010, p. 11). Through this mapping, PD activities were planned to include critical thinking, active learning, and assessment (including the comprehensive education assessment system) with different activities addressing either a specific stage or subject
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teachers. For assessing ERP impact, Megahed et al. (2010) and Megahed & Ginsburg (2008) combined quantitative and qualitative methods using both interviews and focus groups as well as the ERP developed instrument SCOPE (The Standards-Based Observation Protocol for Egypt), which includes dimensions related to teachers behaviors including class and time management, the behavior and cognitive dimensions of ERP, as well as students behaviors in the class. (Arabic version of SCOPE added to appendix G).
The Quantitative data generated using SCOPE indicated that:

“between 2005 and 2006 as well as between 2006 and 2007 there is evidence of significant average gains. On average, teachers in ERP-supported schools made somewhat greater gains on the Behavioral Dimension scale (ranging from .28 to .48) than on the Cognitive Dimension scale (ranging from .18 to .36). While these changes in pedagogical approach are modest, given that these are five-point scales, they represent consistent moves toward implementing active-learning pedagogies to an extent greater than expected by chance. While recognizing the importance of this evidence of change in instructional practices, we should note that on average teachers started very close to the “traditional” style (i.e., a score of 1.0), and as of April 2007 had not moved even to the midpoint on the scale (i.e., 3.0).” Megahed et al., 2010, p. 15).

Qualitative data also showed that teachers were able to move “from just lecturing to discussion and engaging in dialogue with students and using group work, role play, brain storming, and problem solving” (Megahed et al., 2010, p. 16), while also recognizing that at the same time this achieved impact “was not an easy process, and progress to date had been slow.” (Megahed et al., 2010, p. 16). Megahed et al. (2010) mentioned that this view was not only by teachers but also for SBTEU staff and local supervisors, who also indicated that the change was more visible in the primary schools contexts than for other schools level. They mentioned:

“Interviewees in these categories stated that the changes were more noticeable in primary schools than at the other stages, and that the movement, while noticeable, was generally not dramatic.” (Megahed et al., 2010, p. 17)

They also referred that a few participants from this category contradicted the prominent views on the achieved change:

“However, a few participants in these focus groups reported that they did not perceive much, if any, change in teachers’ classroom behavior. For instance, a supervisor from Minia governorate expressed: “In the French language, no change
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has taken place in the last 20 years – no active learning, nor even passive learning!” (Megahed et al., 2010, p. 17 footnote).

ERP also targeted encouraging teachers to use and analyze data as a tool to plan for improving teaching methods and students’ outcomes (ERP, n.d., b, par.2). Some of these tools included using the Standards-Based Classroom Observation Protocol for Egypt (SCOPE) and the Critical-Thinking, Achievement and Problem Solving test (CAPS). Providing financial, human and technological resources was also one of aspects ERP targeted in developing the professional development system (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008). Learning Resource Centers (LRCs) were equipped to provide teachers with access to primary teaching resources as well as computers and technological facilities. It was also targeted to become a place where teachers could meet and exchange practices (ERP, n.d., b).

ERP played a role in providing the “technical assistance in developing the SBTEUs and the school clusters” (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008, p. 7). Implementing needs assessment and training programs through the SBTEU was one of efforts made by ERP towards decentralizing the professional development system. The PD Documentation Study includes that this made some progress in “limited areas” and that it was affected by a lack of understanding of the decentralization concept (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008, p. 5). Challenges of this PD reform as identified by the documentation study participants included: “large numbers of students in limited classroom space, lack of incentives for adopting reform pedagogies, non-supportive attitudes of other educators, and limited number of educators receiving ERP-organized training.” (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008, p. 7).

**Instructional leadership development.**

Instructional leadership development was needed as essential and complimentary for teachers’ professional development. Megahed et al. (2010) explained:

“The EQUIP1/ERP proposal notes that “teacher training will require follow-up through classroom support and a system of supervision and professional feedback mechanisms,” and identifies as one of its core tasks: “Training instructional leaders (MOE supervisors, school principals/head teachers) in instructional
supervision skills, linked to the MOE standards, including classroom observation and monitoring skills, mentoring and training skills, and teacher conference skills (i.e. giving feedback), etc.” (AIR et al., 2004, pp. 9 and 11).” (Megahed et al., 2010, p. 12).

Megahed et al. elaborated on the role of using: “multi-level TOT approach, ERP staff/consultants organized training programs on educational leadership skills, strategies for activating school clusters, and standards-based classroom observation.” (Megahed et al., 2010, p.12). School clusters were introduced by ERP as a form of organized professional development through which teachers could receive instructional support (Megahed et al., 2010). The school cluster is:

“a group of [2-7] schools with the same education level (primary, preparatory or secondary) … located close geographically … [that] collaborate in planning and preparing training programs, but [with] each school implementing the training” (EQ-ALD/ERP, 2006, pp. 6-7 as cited in Megahed et al., 2010, pp. 12-13).

The other area of developing instructional leadership was on training the instructional leaders on using standards-based classroom observation. The SCOPE instrument was developed in line with the National Standards for Education, followed by trainings and workshops for administrators and supervisor on using it for “evaluating, guiding, and supporting the professional development of teachers.” (Megahed et al., 2010, p. 13).

For the role of the local supervisors, Megahed et al. (2010) mentioned that most participants of their interviews and focus groups reported a change in its effectiveness. They mentioned:

“When asked to describe how their role had changed in the last three years, almost all participants in the local supervisors’ focus groups reported movement from being more of an inspector to becoming more of a source of guidance and support for teachers. They mentioned that they met more often with teachers, tended to use a three-stage model of supervision (pre-class, during class, and post-class), and made systematic use of a classroom observation form (and discussed the findings with teachers)” (Megahed et al., 2010, p. 20)

They also mentioned that a minority of the participants did not really think that a serious difference had occurred:
“For instance: “There are no new ways of supervision in the schools; supervisors are as they have always been” (Qena Supervisor). “The supervisor, the principal, the headmaster, and senior teachers all are trained on using the observation form, but few of them really use it – mostly supervisors” (Aswan Supervisor).” (Megahed et al., 2010, p. 20)

On the other hand, developing the instructional role of the school administrators was not viewed to have witnessed a good progress compared to the changes that were viewed for the supervisors’ role. (Megahed et al., 2010; Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008). There were in general “less movement among school administrators toward becoming guides/supports of teachers in performing their instructional role” (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008, p. 7).

*ERP Professional Development Documentation Study* referred to the obstacles that faced achieving a satisfactory advancement on this regard as participants referred to the “supervisors’/administrators’ work load and lack of understanding of and support for this reformed instructional supervision role by others in the system.” (Megahed & Ginsburg, 2008, p. 7).

### 4.1.2. Perceptions on ERP activities as viewed by current study participants.

Perceptions and familiarity with ERP differ across teachers and schools. It varies between positive and negative. Across the 4 schools, teachers who were not at the school at the time of the program implementation reported not being at all familiar with the nature and outcomes of ERP activities. Minya teachers who were at the schools during ERP time were in general more familiar with ERP than were Alexandria teachers. A few teachers needed some time to recall whether or not they were part of any ERP activities or trainings.

**School (a).**

Most school (a) participating teachers were familiar with ERP, but had a mixture of positive and negative feedback on it. The majority in this school thought it was not very effective. There was an attitude by some teachers towards ERP that the program spent too much financial resources on the trainings which the schools could have made better use of if they were distributed directly to them. School (a) TU head said:
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“For reform to happen it should not be done the way they did. It was an attitude of someone who has money and wants to spend it anyway during 5 years. Yet the expenditure terms were unfair. It was only about spending and incentives, not for the teachers but for the project staff with very little that reaches teachers. They spent loftily for tools and materials that the schools never saw. It was more on appearances than education.” TU head 1 – School (a)

Another school (a) teacher (Teacher 1) referred to the same idea, and mentioned she withdrew from the training believing she had been already capable of doing better than what the training provided. She also mentioned that teachers were paid for each training day and were provided with a meal which were in her view a waste of resources that could have been better used in equipping schools to support the advocated practices. Issues with practicality of implementation was highlighted by another teacher, yet he believed the training itself was useful to him. He said:

“There were good programs, and we learned. They gave us sessions that included many things, but in practice we collide with reality at the school. Implementation was a bit difficult.” Teacher 2 – School (a).

According to the views of another teacher, the program was very useful:

“There were extensive trainings on different phases. Some professors came to train us and they used to make class visits and see if we really utilize the strategies we learned or not [...]. Yes, it was very useful.” Teacher 4 – School (a).

“Some people went to the training, saw strategies and that’s it. Those who improve are the ones who want to. It depends on a personal desire.” Teacher 4 – School (a).

School (b).

School (b) participants were the most familiar with ERP as they clearly recalled the school being reconstructed by the program. Once they were introduced to the research topic, school (b) teachers immediately started mentioning examples of ERP impact even during the preliminary visit. They spoke about how their classes used to be very traditional before ERP, and ERP introduced them to more progressive strategies for the first time.

“It was very, very useful for us as teachers because it developed the teacher’s performance on many levels. I am not speaking only about my subject. From the discussions with other teachers too they said the same thing. The programs were
beneficial for the whole educational process and useful for both the teachers and students. It impacted and supported the teacher’s performance in class and helped [them] in a realistic way. [...] This was also reflected on the students, and how they comprehend the lesson with different methods and strategies. We were following a specific style, but this changed. I tell you it changed, and got to depend more on students’ active participation than the original ways. The teachers before were more indoctrinating, talking tools, lecturers.” Teacher 18 – School (b).

“We got to use new teaching methods. There is now more activation to better and more convenient professional behaviors, and we got to benefit from statistics and technology in exams.” Administrator 1 – School (b) principal.

“They conducted trainings on different topics including for example active learning, student-centered learning. They made trainings of the trainers, if I see some qualities in a teacher how do I prepare him to be a trainer, what qualities are needed for a trainer. How do I change educational materials into a training material, how do I decide on the training needs of any staff category whether administrators, teachers, students, board of trustees. How do I do an improvement plan and set goals and objectives, etc.” TU head 2 – School (b).

School (b) principal also added how ERP helped the school in its later process of accreditation:

“The roads of ERP and Accreditation both intersect. The pathway of NAQAEE Accreditation is the same ERP pathway.” Administrator 1 – School (b) principal.

School (c).

In general School (c) participating teachers did not recall ERP. Only one teacher, the TU head and the school principal were able to recognize the program in varied degrees.

“It was about caring for the students, respecting them, and training teachers. Progress was slow meaning the numbers of weak students was increasing. After the program the number of weak students decreased. We, teachers, there were some information we did not know, and we were trained on.” TU head 3 – School (c).

Teacher 22 has in particular shown big enthusiasm towards ERP. According to her, she was the most engaged with the program activities among teachers in her school. In response to the question on what did she learn or what were the gains of ERP, she said:

“So so many, like for example what is reform, what is decentralization specially in developing new strategies, how to become up-to-date with modern developments, how to use high tech and low tech, how to utilize the materials
from the environment, how to self-develop yourself, how to be a trainer. I’m now an accredited professional development, active learning and literacy (qira’eya) trainer. We learned a lot from ERP more than you could imagine with the evidence that I can talk to you now with awareness and not just pointless talk.”

Teacher 22 – School (c).

School (d).

School (d) was the least aware of ERP among the 4 schools. Only the school principal was able to recognize it from the beginning of the interview. She thinks the idea is continued till now, but in different forms. In her opinion, it got to develop with each of its consecutive MOE programs which she thinks all follow the same pattern. It was not clear if she was speaking about Education Reform Program in particular, or if she was referring to “reform” as an idea. A couple of teachers started to remember being engaged with some trainings around ERP time as the interview questions went on, but they did not provide any specific impression on it. They were in the school for a long time, attended so many trainings and could hardly remember the particular ERP activities they attended.

4.2. Findings Related to Research Question 2

RQ 2: To what extent is the documented impact of ERP school-based professional development sustained or developed, according to the views of the school-level stakeholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Local & School-based professional development | Role and effectiveness of the Training Units | • Assessing teachers’ needs (preparing training needs questionnaire)  
• Role beyond PD  
• Limited expectations from the TU  
• Ineffective role  
• Individual efforts  
• School staff engaged with TU work  
• Lack of physical space  
• Lack of resources  
• TU head holding other responsibilities |
| Serving teacher needs & utilization | | • Rare & routine paper work/ inactive questionnaires  
• Regular/ utilized PD needs questionnaire |
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| of the PD needs questionnaire | • Administration not qualified to do needs analysis  
• Top-down, external and not school-based trainings  
• Very theoretical trainings  
• Repetitive training content  
• Teachers participating in analyzing PD needs questionnaires  
• Tools from current PD programs  
• Unclear selection of training attendees  
• School-level intervention plans |
|---|---|
| Practices sharing | • Regular/ documented subject meetings  
• Irregular/ routinely done/ ineffective subject meetings  
• Informal sharing of practices  
• Obstacles for practices sharing  
• Impact of administrative follow up |
| School Clusters | • Discontinued  
• No motivation  
• Crowed schedules |
| Learning Resource Centers | • Limited awareness of resources availability  
• Turned into traditional training providers |
| Instructional support | • School supervisor support  
• Ministry inspector support  
• School leadership support  
• Training Unit support  
• Major inspector role  
• Major school supervisor role  
• Limited school leadership role  
• Subject meetings (regular/ irregular)  
• Subject meetings (effective/ ineffective)  
• Principal impact mainly administrative not instructional  
• Issues of favoritism  
• Incentives & penalizing  
• Cooperative administrators/ uncooperative administrators  
• Class visits (regular/ irregular)  
• Class visits (effective/ ineffective) |
| ERP developed tools | • SCOPE  
• Generally discontinued  
• More familiar to teams working on school accreditation |
| • CAPS | • Discontinued  
• Not remembered |
| Teacher practices | • Teacher centered vs. student centered  
• More student centered  
• More teacher centered  
• Both, based on context  
• Based on subject  
• Misunderstanding the concept |
| • Critical thinking and problem solving skills | • Well supported  
• Not practical  
• Challenges to activate  
• Concept not well understood |
| • Active learning | • Well supported  
• Instant association with a list of strategies  
• Conflicts with opinions on student centered level  
• Challenges to activate |
4.2.1. Local and school-based professional development.

Supporting local and school-based professional development was one of the main aspects of the professional development activities of ERP. This section introduces results related to this aspect including the participants views on: the role of the school-based training and evaluation unit, the degree to which the PD system supports serving teacher’ needs, the existence of collaborative teacher learning practices, the sustainability of the learning circles and school cluster structures, as well as the role of the Learning Resource Centers (LRCs).

**Role of the school-based training and evaluation unit.**

*School (a).*

School (a) participants varied regarding their opinions on the SBTEU role. They were also differed in reporting the frequency of trainings provided by the unit. It varied between once or twice per month to once or twice per semester. Teachers reported the training unit is responsible for some other roles at the school beyond PD. One school (a) social studies teacher mentioned the training unit is responsible for:

“Setting the schedule, school control, activities, different teaching methods and strategies, quality assurance and accreditation, so many things.” Teacher 2 – School (a)

School (a) TU head believes that in general the role of the TU differs across schools. School (a) TU head (who is also a math teacher) mentions that its program focuses more on training novice teachers, while it also provides activation or refreshing trainings for the more experienced staff. It becomes more effective at schools that have a majority of novice teachers.

“I prepare a list of programs for teachers to choose from during the year. We do trainings in a twice per month frequency. Some of them are optional, some are for activation, and some are introductory for new teachers.” TU head 1 – School (a).

“If the majority of the school teachers are novice, its effect becomes stronger; if the majority are experienced, the TU role decreases, and this differs between each school and the other. Because most of the programs are repetitive, it becomes
more challenging to catch the teachers’ attention. More options should be present to include a broader range of topics.” TU head 1 – School (a).

“Its role is not effective” – said multiple school (a) teachers in a focus group (FGI: A1). One of them continued:

“There is no physical space for the training unit at the school. There are no real programs for development. What is said exceeds what is available. Most of it is theoretical and not open for discussion. Resources are not available.” Teacher 5 – School (a).

Another teacher, who happened to formerly lead the TU thinks it has a good role, yet is faced with many challenges similar to what the teachers in the focus group mentioned.

“It is effective, but also has obstacles for activations. There are no resources nor a budget. We are compelled to use our pocket money to do things, work on a USB and print materials on external computers. It is all from our pockets. No budget.” Teacher 2 – School (a).

School (b).

All school (b) participants evaluated the role of the TU as effective. They mentioned its role in distributing the teachers’ needs questionnaires, and assigning teachers to prepare training agendas and conduct them. Some of the participating teachers mentioned they do take part with the TU in assessing the training needs and in conducting the trainings themselves. Besides setting the training agenda, a teacher mentioned:

“It also cooperates with the subject supervisors to diffuse new experiences through the weekly subject meetings.” School (b) teacher (FGI: B1).

The TU in school (b) had a relatively large training hall equipped with a computer and an interactive board. Like school (a), school (b) participants also mentioned it has responsibilities in setting the schedule and the exams control. It is worth mentioning that school (b) TU head is the only TU responsible in the 4 schools sample who stopped teaching and currently holds administrative responsibilities as the school deputy. TU heads at the other 3 schools are still having teaching schedules. School (b) TU head mentioned the unit’s role extends beyond providing teachers professional development.

“Initially we do collect the training needs through distributing a questionnaire in which each teacher adds what they need either in the specialization subject or in education technology or any other topic. We also use the previous year exam
results, and we focus on the subject that has lower passing rates. [...] We also work on quality assurance and accreditation. We have 9 teams and each team is responsible for evaluating [its] area and deciding on what needs improvement. We got used to the work and everybody knows what should be done. We identify the performance gaps and prepare 9 quality assurance plans in each area to be applied throughout the year.” TU head 2 – School (b).

“Our role is not solely for teachers, but students too. We do awareness and seminars on public health, age-group properties, first aid, hygiene, etc. We can also invite mothers and speak with them about dealing with their girls. The mother should be well-cultured. One of this age-group properties for girls could be excessive shyness, with teachers getting into active learning they could help girls go out of their shyness and start having an active role. Some people from the community also help us like from Al-Azhar, culture palaces, doctors, school staff, etc.” TU head 2 – School (b).

When asked about his evaluation of the TU’s effectiveness, the school principal said:

“It has a very good role. It just needs people’s mindsets to transform, believe in change, and help people in their duties. All resources are available.”

Administrator 1 – School (b) principal.

School (c).

When asked about the role of the TU at the school, participating teachers mentioned it is useful and effective, but in general they were personifying their explanation around the TU head and praising her as a person instead of speaking about the unit as an entity. One of the teachers said on TU effectiveness:

“Beyond your imagination. Enough that when you attend an external training she chases you asking what did you take, what did you learn, when do you want us to implement, what’s new, please explain this part to our colleagues, to the extent that when we come early we sit together for sharing if there is no other time. Can you imagine? She’s an amazing person that you can rarely meet alike people.”

Teacher 22 – School (c).

The TU head also used the first person pronoun when talking about the unit’s work.

“Providing professional development for the teachers because I give them access to new information, new strategies, and using technology tool.” TU head 3 – School (c).

Although the teachers mainly spoke well on the TU head, maybe based on their personal connections or because of the extent of their expectation of the unit’s role, the school
vice-principal had a different opinion. He thinks the unit is doing the best that could be done at the school level, yet he believes practical and effective trainings require different conditions. He elaborates:

“The TU at the school is enough, but what is the maximum that it could provide? It is a simple internal content. It cannot do a workshop that includes application. How long could a training inside the school be? An hour? You cannot ask the unit for more than this. It cannot stop the educational process to do a training.”

Administrator 3 – School (c) vice-principal.

School (d).

The participants in school (d) mentioned the role of the training unit is generally about collecting the self-reported training needs and organizing trainings.

“It prepares the training needs by handing out forms to investigate the needs from a list, and some trainings based on the subject inspectors (al tawgeeh). It collects this and gradually schedules trainings for topics with high demands.” Teacher 29 – School (d). (MFGI: D1).

However, participants’ opinion on its effectiveness varied. The TU head herself thought it is effective “to some extent”. She is a teacher who has been leading the unit for 3 years, which is the less duration compared to the TU heads in schools (a), (b) and (c). She continued:

“We do all trainings. The role is coordinating one for all trainings that happen at the school.” TU head 4 – School (d).

Some participants thought the role is only about allowing teachers share the information they receive from external trainings:

“When someone attends a training outside the school, the TU asks them to share it with other teachers.” Teacher 26 – School (d).

“But explain what was done.” Teacher 28 – School (d).

Yet, some teachers did not think the TU is by any means effective:

“It is artificial. Because most of it is mere talk, no practical trainings that we do ourselves. How we work inside the classes is mainly based on personal diligence.” Teacher 25 – School (d).
“There are trainings, and these trainings have different names, but similar content. Nothing new.” Teacher 26 – School (d).

**Serving teachers’ needs.**

The direct answer to the question on how does the school assesses its professional development needs was that the training units across the 4 schools prepare lists or questionnaires for teachers to self-report the topics they need trainings on. Variations among the schools appeared on the process of doing so, and on the use of extra procedures the schools differed.

**School (a).**

School (a) TU head mentioned he prepares a list of topics and hand it to teachers to choose from. The program is based on orienting teachers with what they do not know together with activating what teachers already know. School (a) teachers only mentioned the training unit questionnaire, and they did not appear to have a positive attitude towards it and mentioned it is just filling papers. When asked about how the school identifies its professional development needs, one school (a) teacher said: “the school administration is not qualified do this.” Another teacher said: “There is a defect in the whole system.”

**School (b).**

Participants from school (b) provided an extensive description of how do they do needs analysis, basically because the teachers in this school do help in this process as part of the TU work they engage with.

“There are the TU forms that decide the percentage of needs for each school teacher, and based on this we start to build a training plan for them [teachers].” Administrator 2 – School (b) deputy.

“This is the job of the training unit, and we work with the TU head on this. We do questionnaires to see in which directions we need trainings. We analyze the questionnaires, tally the numbers, decide each subject needs, compare the force and shortage, and decide on the school needs.” Teacher 12 – School (b).

When asked if the trainings are only based on the self-reporting questionnaires, school (b) teachers mentioned that trainings can also be recommended based on the school deputies’
follow up and [classroom] visits. They also mentioned using data based on the previous year’s exams as well as entry exams done to students at the beginning of the year. The school principal added the ministry supervisor reports might also be used to know the needs.

“Through the ministry supervisor’s reports, class visits, and our follow up.” Administrator 1 – School (b) principal.

“I do visits, and the subject first teachers are also assigned to do their visits. After we both complete, we bring the reports into line.” Administrator 1 – School (b) principal.

“We have a record for the five subjects. They do an analysis and see the strengths and weaknesses of each subject. For weaknesses, we do an intervention plan, and for strengths we target continuity and reaching a higher indicator. For example, if we are at the 3rd scale we target the 4th and plan for what it takes.” Teacher 17 – School (a).

“We use statistics. We analyze exam results.” School (b) teacher (FGI: B1).

“We also use the previous year’s exam results, and we focus on the subject that has lower passing rates.” TU head 2 – School (b).

Teacher 18 – School (c).

School (c) TU head mentioned she meets the teachers once or twice per term and agrees with them on their needs. Teachers mentioned the same process, and one teacher adding tools she uses from a current PD program which she was the only one to mention using.

“There is a form and we mark the topics we needs.” Teacher 18 – School (c).

“There is something called self-assessment form; there is something called training needs related to the TU in the school; there is something called [program x, a current PD program]. We sit together to discuss what are the problems, how do I evaluate how do I work, and this includes doing an action plan, an activity plan. I have an almost monthly meeting with [program x], and the experience I take there I come to transfer to my colleagues because I am the team leader. There is something called 180 degree form for self and peer evaluation. There is also 360 degree form for the principal annual evaluation.” Teacher 22 – School (c).

However, Teacher 22 was the only teacher to mention using these tools in her school. The vice-principal was somehow critical on the process of collecting teachers’ needs in the school. He said:
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“The TU investigates the requirements, by making the list and everyone selects their needs; then we make a training for each. But this is inadequate. This is very limited compared to what teachers need.” Administrator 3 – School (c) vice-principal.

School (d).

When the question of how does the school assess its professional development needs, teachers in school (d) focus group appeared discussing the process and not giving a direct answer on the questionnaire like other schools did. From the teachers’ input, it looks like school (d) is less consistent with using the self-reporting questionnaire than other schools, despite the TU head and the principal mentioning it being done. However, teachers suggested this happens, but not on regular basis.

“We have an inventory list that we give out to teacher. They chose the topic and we prepare the timing.” TU head 4 – School (d).

“At the beginning of the year, we spread the training needs, and who needs something writes it down. We collect the common topics and do the training.” Administrator 4 – School (d) principal.

“There are announcements of training (nasharat), and who feels in need of something goes to attend.” Teacher 26 – School (d).

“When there is a training in general, we go, but nobody says I need a training on something specific.” Teacher 26 – School (d).

“Sometimes after a training they hand you a paper to add what you would need for upcoming trainings.” Teacher 25 – School (d).

School (d) teachers mentioned most of the trainings happen outside the school and are not school-based. When asked whether observations during class visits are part of giving out training arrangements or recommendations, school (d) TU head mentioned that the topics of trainings teachers participate in are mainly based on personal preferences. Yet participants also mentioned some trainings are not offered for them to select. Sometimes the choice is based on internal recommendations, sometimes it is pre-decided by the idara, and sometimes it is not clear for teachers on which basis are the selections made.

“Sometimes it’s based on the school recommendation.” Teacher 23 – School (d).

“Sometimes it’s related to the subject of specialization.” Teacher 25 – School (d).
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“Some trainings we receive a pre-decided list from outside mentioning certain names, based on what? We don’t know.” Teacher 26 - School (d).

“Some teachers attended the training X, and since then when there is any other training it’s always them.” Teacher 23 – School (d).

**School-level practices sharing.**

Practices sharing at the schools level happens in different ways, including the non-organized and informal teachers’ conversation. The majority of teachers in all schools generally agreed that is done regularly between them.

“We’ve been together for years, so you find us as one family. If someone has weakness in something, they ask and with no timidity. We are honestly a one family.” Teacher 20 – School (c)

School (d) Teacher 26, referred to some challenges that could happen with informal sharing of practices, especially when teachers are not on good terms.

Practices sharing could also happen during the subject meetings at schools. The frequency and function of these meetings varies across schools and subjects. School (b) appeared more consistent with conducting these subject meetings, with arrangements clearly put in the schedule for these meetings to occur on weekly basis.

“Sharing practices also happen during the weekly subject meetings.” School (b) teacher (FGI: B1).

“There is a meeting for the staff of each subject. It should be planned, and includes exchange of practices and feedback. Someone could present a model demo, and they discuss several subject related issues. It gets documented and we have a record of each meeting agenda. There is a slot in the school schedule dedicated for this meeting on weekly basis.” Administrator 1 - School (b) principal.

“Each subject discusses within its scope, learning difficulties, and curriculum units. Meetings also included exchange of experiences and [it] is considered a form of professional development.” TU head 2 – School (b).

School (b) participants also referred to having qualified members who can help provide trainings for the whole school either in the weekly meetings or in independent trainings.

“The school here has a self-sufficient cadre. We have people who are capable of conducting trainings. We have people who attended US-based trainings, and we
have masters and PhD holders at the school from whom everybody benefits. If there is anything beyond what we could provide, we reach out to the Idara [..] but we are self-sufficient.” Administrator 1 – School (b) principal.

“Now, for the specialized subjects, teachers, who are well acquainted with technology access the Egyptian Knowledge Bank. They find things in Math and Science then make training materials out of them, which they could then share during the subject meetings.” TU head 2 – School (b).

School (c) participants also mentioned a similar role of the meetings, which is done every two weeks in their case:

“Inside the school, each subject meets with its supervisor every 2 weeks. Meetings across subjects also happen when there are complementary lessons that they could work on together. Plus the sharing that happens during the TU trainings.” School (c) TU head.

“Sometimes they get trainers from outside, and sometimes, if there is somebody who has the experience at the school, they do it.” Teacher 21 – School (c).

“Meetings are held every 2 weeks, and there is a follow up record for them.” Teacher 19 – School (c).

Unlike schools (b) and (c), school (a) and school (d) teachers did not report that the subject meetings were conducted regularly. It looks like there is less administrative follow up on these meetings and that it could be dependent on the diligence of the subject supervisor.

“We have a monthly meeting as subject teachers to discuss subject related topics, new ideas, and new strategy. This happens in my monthly subject meeting, and I’m not sure about others.” Teacher 2 – School (a).

“Teacher discuss segments of the curriculum and speak up their opinions. This happen on each subject level. Sometimes the inspector (al mowageh) comes to these meetings.” School (d) teacher (MFGI: D1).

The training units in the schools also coordinate activities in which teachers who attend trainings outside the school can provide an overview on them for their colleagues.

“Teachers who attended trainings outside, at the beginning we didn’t have these calibers but now we do and the supervisors too. If there is anything new, we ask them to provide training on it. Caliber teachers now train on the new system.” TU head 3 – School (c).
“Each teacher who attends the training comes back to re-do it here in the school for others to benefit.” School (d) principal.

However, some school (d) teachers contested the idea that the overviews provided by their colleagues after attending the trainings are enough for them to get the full picture nor gain the original experience.

One school (b) teacher (teacher 17) referred to a more recent way of sharing practices which is an online platform that relates to a current PD program that his school is part of.

**Learning circles and school clusters.**

Participants mentioned that practices and experiences sharing between schools can happen during normal trainings when teachers sometimes share the experiences relevant to the training topic. Some shared visits may happen, but not in the same form and objective of the ERP school clusters or regular learning circles.

“We do exchange visits between the schools BOTs and principals, but the ERP learning circles no longer exist.” Administrator 1 - School (b) principal.

“No, no! Between schools for school principals, this does not happen.” Administrator 3 - School (c) vice-principal.

“Sharing mainly happens at the school level, if it was done between schools maybe during meetings of a more recent training program, not on a general base like during ERP days.” Teacher 22 - School (c).

Despite the fact that school clusters and learning circles are no longer there for the 4 sample schools, participants from school (b) mentioned some sort of visits exchange (again not in the clusters or learning circles type) between the social workers at the different schools. There are sometimes visits from rural schools and visits between preparatory and secondary schools too. Participants also mentioned that other schools leadership sometimes engages exchange visits with school (b) to learn more about their experience in quality assurance. School (c) also mentioned other schools come to them to train on using the interactive board. Another mean for the current across schools activities was the technical office meetings referred to by school (a) TU head.

“There is the technical office meeting that happen once per month, which is attended by a representative of the school, usually the subject supervisor. He
meets his peers from other schools and might discuss any subject related topic.”
TU head 1 – School (a).

School (b) TU head reflected on how much she misses the activities organized by ERP within school clusters. She was recalling this as part of the original duties of the school training unit that were dropped over time. She said:

“There was a really nice thing for training units which no longer exists. There used to be school clusters for each 4 schools in the same area. Each school used to identify its needs and make a plan. Then from the plans of the 4 schools and the common topics between them, there used to be a collective plan for the cluster and all topics were presented. It was a very good and useful program as each school presented differently and this used to enhance the capacities of the trainers. We also used to share the training materials.” TU head 2 – School (b).

When asked why this may have stopped, school (b) TU head said:

“Maybe for time constraints. Crowded schedules gives no opportunity for teachers to go to other schools. There used to be teacher exchange visits. Now each teacher is already swamped by his schedule quota and has no time to go outside.” TU head 2 – School (b).

“It stopped because of the problems at the schools. There is nothing that motivates and encourages this way of professional development anymore.” TU head 2 – School (b).

Learning Resource Centers (LRC).

Participants across the 4 schools reported that Learning Resource Centers still existed, but they indicated that they do not use the LRC for accessing teaching resources nor for exchange of practices meetings. The Center mainly provides trainings, about which participants had differing opinions regarding their effectiveness. When asked if they at all access resources through the center, none of the participating teachers mentioned that they currently do.

“Most of it is training. They could afterwards give us dry and theoretical papers that do not mean anything for us.” School (a) teacher (FGI: A1).

“They do revision sessions for Thanaweya ‘Amma [general secondary] students. They could suggest trainings. They once did an English course.” School (b) teacher (FGI: B1).
“Some schools do not have the capacities of time and place to do trainings. LRC makes them a day or two of trainings, and some teachers go to listen to a lecture.” Teacher 17 – School (b).

“They provide special trainings, and they offer them to schools. They notify us with the trainings they have and request people to attend.” – TU head 3 – School (c).

“We send the school training needs through the training unit, and they organize this into a program. They then send those who need these trainings, like computer courses for example.” Teacher 19 – School (c).

“We receive notifications on trainings from the LRC, and they ask for teachers to attend. As much as possible the school used to free teachers. They used to do this depending on the time, and used to take two by two. Now this is not even there; the ones who train are also teachers who have tight curriculum [plans].” School (d) teacher (MFGI: D1).

“Currently there are no benefits. If it was for trainings, we have similar trainings provided by the TU. […] They could send me now asking for a math teacher to attend the training immediately. The teacher will go stay for an hour and miss a class. What did he benefit?” Administrator 3 - School (c) vice-principal.

“Merely more trainings, we don’t benefit anything from.” Teacher 25 – School (d).

A few teachers knew the original role of the Learning Resource Center, but they too confirmed this role is no longer active.

“They used to provide us with materials, but this now decreased.” Teacher 24 – School (d).

“At the beginning, it was based on teachers going there for making teaching aids. If a teacher needed something, they could go there and design it for a nominal subscription of around 5 pounds. Now, it is not used by any means for activities materials nor teaching tools […]. They now use it to conduct internal meetings and trainings for the idara. They put what they see not what we need, and give us very short notices to send teachers to attend. It’s no longer how it used to run.” Teacher 22 – School (c).

“At the beginning when we started we made some teaching aid, and there was showcase of different schools participations. There were people from outside who came and spoke to us. But for us this happened only once; they asked us to do so only once. Maybe it still happens, but they no longer inform us.” Teacher 24 - School (d).

In general, the sample teachers from school (b) were not very aware of the existence of resources at the center and only referred to the trainings it provides, maybe because the
school is already has all the materials needed as mentioned by the principal. The school principal and the TU head were the only ones referring to the current availability of resources at the LRC.

“Nothing that is at the LRC is available at our school. We have a list of the resources, and we reach out to them when we need something that is not here” – Administrator 1 – School (b).

“More than a visit was done, either to make tools or make use of the available resources and what the LRC could provide if they [teachers] want to make a certain teaching aid. The [person] responsible of resources could get them a mobile resource if needed.” TU head 2 – School (b).

Participants, especially from schools (a), (c) and (d) referred in several occasions during the interviews to the lack of resources available at their schools. They mentioned that most of the activities are either self-funded by the teachers or students are asked to get them. However, they did not seem to view the LRC as a means of addressing these resource gaps.

**4.2.2. Instructional support.**

In general the instructional support is divided between the school principal, the school subject supervisor, and the ministry inspector (*al mowageh*). The 4 schools were different in their evaluations of the weight or the extent of support that each of these instructional leaders provide.

*School (a).*

In general school (a) participants referred to a bigger role of the subject supervisor. They do make class visits, organize regular meetings as much as possible and provide their fellow teachers with the support when they need it. However, as most of the participating teachers from school (a) were themselves subject supervisors, the answers were mostly subjective based on their own views on the work they do. Yet, they also spoke about the obstacles they face in providing the needed support:

“There [is] supposed to be a schedule (for the subject meetings), and it should happen regularly, but the one who is responsible for it is the subject supervisor. How would he get the time to do so. Free him first to have time to do the class
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visits and to prepare training materials and to mentor peers. You are giving him a schedule and squeezing him in a class, then you ask him to train?” Teacher 1 – School (a).

Teachers in the focus group were somehow in question of the instructional support at the school in general. Most participants agreed the role of the school principal is more administrative and regulatory than academic or educational. Some teachers spoke about his role in acknowledging hard work, maintaining discipline, and making sure sessions run smoothly and punctually. Some teachers completely rejected the idea that any kind of instructional support is present at the school.

“No support. The school principal says he is responsible for maintaining order. When supervisors come, they look for negatives and drawbacks and not for the positives as well, and this frustrates the teachers. The supervision concept is wrong, and this upsets the teachers.” School (a) teacher (FGI: A1).

“For example, when you do your work, the one responsible for the school does not have the capacity to distinguish if you did a good job or not. Favoritism also gets in the way. If you’re a relative of someone, then you’re outstanding in your work [versus] someone who does not have any acquaintances. It is a matter of personal biases and prejudice.” Teacher 2 – School (a).

School (b).

School (b) participants placed a big value on the role of follow up by the subject supervisors at the school and the role of the weekly meetings they attend. Teachers mentioned they host visits from the subject supervisors, ministry inspectors, school deputies and school principals. The also highlighted the moral support they get from the school administration. The participants referred to the support the other school cadres can also provide.

“There are subject meetings which the principal attends regularly. If there is any needed support, we ask the accredited trainers form the idara, but the school principal (wishing him health) is versed and enlightened and can cover most things. Supervisors also come and provide support to the teachers each in his specialization, and of course the training unit and specially its trainers. We have a selection of highly experienced teachers/trainers. The school is nearly self-sufficient. When we need some financial and administrate training, the principal is capable of conducting them.” TU head 2 – School (b).
“There is moral support to a big extent. When someone is distinguished in something, they get honored, receive certificates and sometimes have celebrations.” School (b) teacher (FGI: B1).

“Support, in fact, differs. The support I give might be technical or administrative at the same time. Or it might be that my part does not focus on any technical aspect. However, what teachers receive from the inspector (al mowageh) is purely technical. Support is also not only about trainings and theoretical stuff. It could also include moral support in which hard-working/conscientious people get rewarded, and careless people get penalized.” Administrator 1 – School (b).

Teachers did not speak in details about how the school principal help them after making class visits for example, but in general they kept a tone of respect and appreciation to how he leads the school. Even though this was not a direct part of the interviews questions, school (b) participants spoke about the conditions the principal has created and which helps them [perform] their job in a good environment.

“The school principal is very cooperative and down to earth and he makes you like the school.” Teacher 15 – School (b).

“Bear in mind, he is the lenient strict. People fear him from distance, but when you talk to him he has dialogue skills and is very understanding. This gets reflected on the performance of teachers and the performance of students. I recall a problem that is very common in many schools, like substitution. He solved it in a nice and equitable way […]. He has got the spirit of the law.” Teacher 15 – School (b).

“One very important point is maintaining the system he developed, which took a big effort by him. He worked really hard on his first and second year as principal, and in the third things went on automatically.” Teacher 16 – School (b).

“When there is delinquency, he approaches it in a pedagogical way.” Teacher 17 – School (b).

School (c).

Teachers mentioned classroom visits are made by the principal, subject supervisor, and the ministry inspector. They highlighted a bigger role of the inspectors’ follow-up. They also mentioned most of the support comes in the form of trainings.

“We get trainings from the Idara, technical support in each specialization subject. The inspector (al mowageh) guides me with preparing lesson plans, informs me with changes in the curriculum and how we deal with it, etc.” Teacher 21 – School (c).
“If the inspectors noticed a shortage during a visit, they [schedule] a training [before] work in order not to interrupt the session, and do this during free time.” Teacher 22 – School (c).

“The supervisor inside the school directs attention through his follow-up notebook.” Teacher 22 – School (c).

“The inspector (al mowageh) is the main supervision provider.” Administrator 3 – School (c).

“I think the inspector (al mowageh) will be technical support in the specialization subject, but the principal will be more administrative things.” Teacher 21 – School (c).

After any training, the TU head mentioned she follows up on one or two of the teachers who attended the training to check if they have implemented the training elements or no. Teachers continued that the professional support mainly depends on offering trainings, but in teachers’ opinion this is not done at the suitable time:

“Professional development is mainly based on trainings. Unfortunately the number of trainings increased extensively, so that more than one, two or three teachers have to leave the school at the same time (during the school working hours). These teachers miss classes, then they are asked to present what was missed to the students and this puts pressure on us. What I was supposed to say in 45 minutes, I’m asked to present in for example 10 minutes.” Teacher 22 – School (c)

The school vice-principal stated that there definitely is a daily follow up by the principal for the full staff, and that she (the principal) should at least do a weekly class visit for each teacher. When asked about what the school administration does if a teacher needs support, he said:

"We try to provide him with the necessarily trainings to improve his performance and of course the inspection (al tawgeeh) will be involved in it.” Administrator 3 - School (c) vice-principal.

School (c) vice-principal also highlighted the administration role in differentiating between a shortage that is a result of needing support, and the shortage that is a result of carelessness that requires penalizing. When asked about their role when a teacher faces difficulties in class, he said:
“There should be a system for solving issues. This depends on decentralization (or decentralized decisions) to be solved. If the teachers are facing a problem in class, they will not depend on us as administration, they will solve it themselves.”
Administrator 3 - School (c) vice-principal.

**School (d).**

Visits from school subject supervisors and ministry supervisors are made. Teachers reported receiving guidance on managing the sessions, improving students’ performance, focusing on inclusion of students. In general they used “follow up” more than “guidance” in their speech. Some teachers saw this follow up negatively:

“Follow up by hunting for mistakes.” Teacher 24 – School (d).

Similar to school (c), school (d) teachers placed more weight on the academic support being received from the ministry inspectors. They contested the idea that the school principal provides any technical or professional support.

“The principal follows on paper only as they say.” Teacher 27 – School (d).

“She has particular duties that are not technical.” Teacher 28 – School (d).

The principal in this school mentioned she mainly follows up on things like attendance and dismissal, punctuality, work in class, teachers’ relationship with students, among other more administrative roles.

4.2.3. Using ERP tools.

*The Standards-Based Classroom Observation Protocol for Egypt (SCOPE).*

In general most teachers did not seem familiar with SCOPE when its name was mentioned nor when they saw a printed copy of it. Teachers who worked on the schools’ quality assurance teams mentioned they dealt with it (or an equivalent of it) during the school’s work towards the accreditation. Others referred to the existence of alternative tools used by either the school administrators, the school supervisors or inspectors.

“No, not a single person in my school has this paper now. It was there but now forgotten.” Teacher 1 – School (a).
“There was a paper like this around 5 years ago. The problem was that whoever comes to evaluate is not able to do it right. Only a few understand this, and a good training was not conducted. Very few understand it.” TU head 1 – School (a).

“I don’t think it’s used frequently now.” Teacher 20 – School (c).

“We do the form of training effect on the trainees, but this form in the classrooms, no”. TU head 4 – School (d).

“There used to be something similar. The one who makes the visit does not enter the class with a paper or form in front of the students. They write in a notebook, then they move their notes to the visits record notebook. After the session, he provides comments to the teacher and writes down his notes in the visits record.” School (c) teacher (MFGI: D1).

A teacher in school (a) focus group (FGI: A1) mentioned the absence of effective observation in general and that visits happens in a routine manner and are not really effective. School (a) teachers mentioned they are not used to see any similar observation form during class visits.

However, after going through the SCOPE form, some teachers mentioned that they already pay attention to the included elements in their preparation notebooks and that these elements are in many ways implemented in their classes and/or observed by the subject teachers during class visits. Similarly, and despite mentioning not having the exact form, school (b) participants appeared to be familiar with the idea itself.

“It is activated in our preparation notebooks, and activated in the sessions. The form is not the same, but we are used to the concept as an essential thing. We worked with a very similar form during the process of accreditation”. School (b) Teacher (FGI:A1).

“For classroom and effective class management trainings. It is part of our evaluation elements[…]. [The concept is there] yes, but in a different from.” Teacher 3 – School (a).

“There are follow-up forms for the principal and deputies, but not the same ERP one; they said it’s cancelled”. TU head 2 – School (b).

“We see for example to what extent was the teacher able to achieve the lesson objectives, managed time, did assessment? What type of assessment, how did he reach objectives? Through these things we do classroom observation, and if there were any defects, we give our comments.” TU head 2 – School (b).
Some teachers commented on the language used in the Arabic version of scope. “It’s written in specialized research jargon”, said school (a) Teacher 2 - referring that the language of the tool is not very accessible for some teachers.

“We do something similar at the beginning of the year to know what indicators we want to reach or improve. It is fully applied. As a general rule, let go what is written on papers. What is actually being done is more important. [...] Naming things is not important. It is supposed to be written so I can use it.” Teacher 17 – School (b).

Adding to this idea of the applicability side of the tools, one teacher mentioned the tool is flexible to be adapted based on the needs, and that she herself is used to doing this.

“I’m one of the people who designs similar forms. I redesigned this. We have something in the Arabic subject called skills table and I tailored it. They gave us the idea (observation form) in the training, and I reused it on the computer and distributed it to my colleagues.” Teacher 22 – School (c).

Participants who worked or interacted with the school’s quality assurance and accreditation application mentioned coming across the form or a similar one.

“It was there when the school was applying for accreditation, but not now.” School (a) teacher (FGI: A1).

“We worked with a very similar form during the process of accreditation”. School (b) teacher (FGI: B1).

“We had something like this when we were applying for accreditation.” Teacher 24 – School (d).

“We use it in quality standards [...] supposedly to evaluate the situation in the school [...] .. It is continued for all teachers. [...] It changes based on the special cases for quality assurance. There are indicators and they are renewed not fixed. We have 9 fields each has a team and teachers PD is one of them.” Teacher 19 – School (c).

*The Critical-Thinking and Problem-Solving Test (CAPS).*

Out of the 38 participants, only 2 knew clearly what CAPS was. Unlike with SCOPE, it was not possible to arrive at resources of CAPS to show it to participants. When they were asked if the Critical-thinking and Problems Solving test was used, most responses were directed towards mentioning the type of trainings teachers attended on critical
thinking and problem solving strategies in the classroom, but they were mostly unfamiliar with the assessment instrument itself.

“During ERP, we were trained on problem solving and critical thinking especially for teaching science, but as a teaching method. One of the up-to-date methods is that I make the lesson in the form of a problem and create assumptions. This is one of the teaching methods that teachers were trained on as a strategy.” TU head 2 – School (b).

School (b) principal mentioned they once did it before, and that they are ready to try out any experiment. It is not clear whether he was talking about the same CAPS instrument used by ERP because he mentioned that the school is the one that prepares the exam and does the evaluation. Probably he was talking about a different thing.

One school (c) teacher (Teacher 22) mentioned it could be there but not activated, but she herself did not hear about it since ERP concluded. She said:

“It was conducted on samples at the schools not all the grade levels only samples, let’s say for example grade 4, and according to the results they identified weak students and did intervention program and something like this, and that was it. […] It could have been done in one year, may be two, 3 at maximum. Bear in mind they used to take high achieving students not any student to be clear, and despite this there was a big percentage of failures because the [test] targets a certain mentality of students, maybe good or excellent ones.” Teacher 22 – School (c).

Schools (b) and (d) teachers (both preparatory schools) mentioned that what they do is a placement exam done at the beginning of the year to decide on the students’ levels on basic reading and numeracy skills to identify weak students. School (b) participants also mentioned following it with the needed intervention.

4.2.4. Teachers practices.

This section in particular needed more tools than just interviewing and asking people. Maybe an observation tool could have added a more evidenced dimension. Interviews and external observation of the schools environment might tell a little here. Analysis is attempted of what teachers had to say, realizing that this section has some limitations, and that it only tells the views of the participants, based on their various understandings of the concepts and not according to a unified perception. Without in-depth class observation
and with just the outside observation of the general schools environments, there appears to be a gap between how some teachers view the concepts and what exactly gets implemented in the classrooms.

*Teacher centered vs. student centered.*

Participants’ evaluation on the extent of activating student-centered pedagogies in their schools varied among teachers. Some believed it is solely the teacher, some thought their classes were student-centered, while the majority referred to it as a shared process and balanced interaction between the teacher and the student. Furthermore, some participants highlighted that it depends on the subject and the lessons presented.

“Both- no education happens without the teacher; neither the teacher without the student.” Teacher 1 – School (a).

“Fifty-fifty. It varies depending on the lesson, and the students’ levels too.” School (b) teacher (FGI: B1).

“It’s based on the curriculum, we try to make it student centered, and we’re getting better with this. Students do participate”. TU head 1 – School (a).

“Both.” Administrator 1 – School (b).

“Both.” School (d) teacher (FGI: D1).

“Both, coming and going.” TU head 4 – School (d).

“Some subjects need both teachers and learners. For example, *al nahow* (Arabic grammar) it cannot be student centered nor mathematics either. Student centered classes could work in subjects like science for example. I need indoctrination (*talqeen*) based on the nature of the lesson and the subject.” TU head 3 – School (c).

One the other hand, some teachers did not consider instruction in their schools to be student-centered. Some also related this to the level of students and how they think they lack basic skills needed first before student-centered methods could be used.

“The teacher.” School (a) focus group – all participants (FGI: A1).

“The teacher is the one who explains and does everything.” Teacher 28 – School (d).
“The teachers and a few students.” School (d) teacher (MFGI: D1).

“Based on students level and the lesson. Sometimes we resort to lecturing.” School (a) teacher (FGI: A1).

Understanding of the meaning of student centered pedagogies was a little distorted for some teachers. One teacher explanation looks like her understanding of the concept is that the end goal of what they are doing is the student – without relating it to the instructional techniques. Another teacher’s response to this question was on technology being an opposing idea to how the teacher’s role should be.

“All meetings and discussions on how interaction with students should be, how teachers should not be late for their class, deal pedagogically with students. All this is done for the sake of the student, It’s all about the learner” Teacher 2 – School (a).

“Now he [the minister] wants to cancel the role of the teacher by making everything electronic, but he will never be able do it.” School (d) teacher (MFGI: D1).

A few school (c) participants believed student-centered pedagogies are well used in their school.

“There is collaborative learning, active learning with students’ participation, for example, acting scene, peer-learning, dramatizing curricula, role play, etc.” Teacher 21 – School (c).

“It’s more on the student. We developed a lot. The teacher is no longer a chalk like in the past. There should be interaction with the student.” Administrator 3 – School (c).

**Critical-thinking and problem-solving skills.**

Almost all school (b) participants mentioned they think their classes support the development of problem solving and critical thinking skills; they thought it is activated “to a good extent” and on “above average” level, as mentioned by a teacher and the TU head.

In contrast, all participants in one of school (d) focus group strongly rejected that this happens in their school. Teachers form schools (a), (c) and (d) mentioned some obstacles
they face as they attempt to use strategies to help students develop critical thinking and problem solving skills. The obstacles included students’ abilities, class densities and teacher’s abilities as well.

“I don’t think so. We attempt to use questioning and brainstorming to encourage students to think but we find no real attainment. Critical thinking needs students with higher cognitive abilities, knowledge and perception, which is not the case for most of the students. It is all about memorizing as the student is not able to think, so he just memorizes what he can to pass the exam.” Teacher 2 – School (a).

“The student is a recipient more than a thinker for many reasons, including high class densities and low achievement levels.” School (d) teacher (MFGI: D1).

“To an extent, but the class densities do not help.” School (a) teacher (FGI: A1).

“Not any teacher. Critical thinking needs someone who comprehends first to be able to teach it right.” Teacher 22 – School (c).

Some responses did reflect a limited level of comprehension to the ideas of problem solving and critical thinking:

“We use this. For example if you have a lesson about manufacturing, you come across the pollution problems. When your lesson is about population, you speak about the problems of over-population. When the lesson is on monuments you speak about conservation. Each time you discuss and issue or a problem with the students and discuss how they are solved.” Teacher 21 – School (c).

“To a big extent […] There are discussions in the class, teachers make discussions and see the negatives of everything and they solve it.” Administrator 3 – School (c).

“This is how we start the lessons with the kids. We create a problem and this helps us catch the students’ attention” TU head 3 – School (c).

“Sure. Teachers see the direction of each student’s thinking.”

Active learning.

The majority of participants think it is activated. Even some of the participants who do not think classes are student-centered enough. When asked about how they evaluate active learning in their schools, and what strategies are used, almost the same list was stated by most participants. Once active learning is said in the question, participants tend to immediately mention brainstorming, role play, dramatizing curricula, cooperative
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learning as a list of strategies they directly associate to active learning. Most participants thought their schools activate active learning to a good extent.

“It is used like for example in brainstorming, dramatizing curricula, role play etc.”
TU head 1 – School (a).

“To a good extent.” Teacher 2 – School (a).

“It is definitely activated. Any lesson should include active learning strategies. A teacher might say active learning is my favorite strategy, another could say it’s role play. Each teacher based on how they manage their classes.” Teacher 4 – School (a).

“To a big extent.” TU head 2 – School (b).

“To an extent.” Teacher 26 – School (d).

“Active learning, yes we do active learning. […] Having students do things with their hand, do a science experiment. All this is active learning.” Teacher 30 – School (d).

“95% because there is a lot. For example, brainstorming, discussions and all this is a must. Without which how would we work?” TU head 3 – School (c).

“We have an active learning coordinator. We definitely use the strategies in any lesson, like brainstorming, problem solving, all this.” TU head 4 – School (d).

“It is used like, for example, warm up questions, managing class by dialogue and discussion, asking questions away from the lesson to raise student’s curiosity, group work, etc.” Teacher 5 – School (b).

“Used, activated, and we have interactive boards everywhere available for everybody.” Administrator 1 – School (b).

One teacher at school (a) (Teacher 1), challenged the practicality of using active learning in light of the challenges she faces in her classes. She mentions that the shortage of resources makes it difficult for her as a science teacher to provide the necessary material for students to actually do the activities and experiments in groups. She says:

“I usually don’t have the materials for the experiments, and I sometimes borrow these materials from a nearby school to be able to do it myself in front of the students. How can I provide it in quantities for students to do it in collaborative groups? Sometimes the nature of the experiment makes it unsafe for students to independently do it, like when it uses heat or flammable materials. Do I give students fire and gasoline? So, there are many drawbacks for some strategies, including the lack of resources at schools. Some curriculum equipment is not
available in the science lab, and the ministry does not provide it for us. The ministry stopped getting the school tools and materials.” Teacher 1 – School (a).

Same teachers elaborated on her opinion on how collaborative learning affects the students in her context negatively.

“We divide them into groups, and find the one who dominates the discussion is the student who attends private lessons. We find the ones who do not take private lessons pity themselves for not knowing as much. They go home, tell the parents the teacher does not explain things. [They say] our peers are the ones who do it; and [then they] ask for private lessons too.” Teacher 1 – School (a).

When asked to give examples of how he uses active learning in class, a school (a) teacher said:

“Through collaborative learning. Despite the presence of some challenges, we try to do as much as we could. I sometimes assign the students some activities to do at home, then we come and discuss it together in class. We could do role play for historical characters or any other topics related to my subject” Teacher 2 – School (a).

Some teachers mentioned that these practices were always used a long time ago [i.e., before ERP], and what trainings including ERP did was just presenting a technical term for it.

“We have our style that is the same whether with reform or not. It is the same teaching style with just modernizing the work strategies. It was not written, but now it is. We used to do active learning, collaborative learning, role play and all this without writing it … It has a name now. In the past, we couldn’t name it.” Teacher 2 – School (a).

“We all do active learning. From the beginning we were doing it without knowing this name. Everything was done in class without naming it. […] we got introduced to the varieties of active learning strategies, differentiated between them, but we were already using them.” Teacher 29 – School (d).
4.3. Findings Related to Research Question 3

RQ 3: What conditions are needed for sustaining professional development reforms as perceived by the school-level stakeholders in past ERP schools

Table 9: Content analysis table for research question 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions impacting sustainability of PD reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextually responsive curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class densities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules overload &amp; teachers shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting struggling students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To address research question 3, participants were asked about the factors they think as necessary for any professional development reform to sustain. Answers were mainly derived from the challenges they face in their schools, and they were reported in this section accordingly.

**4.3.1. Teacher status.**

Many teachers from schools (a), (c) and (d) spoke extensively about not feeling appreciated on both the moral and the financial levels. Some teachers showed complete
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frustration regarding their current status. For example, school (a) TU head suggests that teachers should not be blamed all way about the dysfunctions in the education system.

“To stop blaming the teachers for being the weakest side of the education system, and putting attention on other issues too. Not to always say that we need programs for teacher and that they are the ones responsible for destroying education.” TU head 1 – School (a).

Participants spoke about the issues of the teacher’s status, including the financial side of it. They said that this low status lead to teachers resorting to private lessons. Private lessons impact the classroom and reinforces the lower status in a closed cycle.

“The teacher’s level should be enhanced. Financially and psychologically.” School (d) teacher (MFGI: D1)

“Teachers rights. Because this is not well realized, teachers resort to private tutoring to cover their costs of life.” TU head 2 – School (b).

“The basis is that there should be continuous follow up and motivation for the teachers. There is frustration. This could be because the ones appraising the teacher do not appreciate him financially, and life requirements are very difficult. There accordingly is a combat from parents who give their children private lessons. The student thinks that he is more aware [i.e., knowledgeable] than the teacher.” Teacher 2 – School (a).

“Putting attention on giving teachers their incentives. Not the financial, but at least the moral. Motivating teachers, caring for them, etc.” Teacher 3 – School (a).

Multiple participants spoke about teachers in their schools having to self-fund their classroom or school activities, which adds a burden for them given the already small pay.

“Salaries and availability of resources [should improve], especially given that teachers take on the costs of the materials and tools they use for classes. Nobody helps, and you buy these things from your personal income.” Teacher 17 – School (c).

Some teachers were a bit uncomfortable with how the students and parents are given more privileges over themselves.

“Now the student is right in all cases, and let the teacher go to hell. The teacher’s rights are wasted.” School (d) teacher (MFGI: D1).
“Parents and students now have more rights than the teachers. They are taking these rights over ours. Theirs are increasing and ours decreasing.” Teacher 26 - School (d).

One school (d) teacher in the interview (MFGI: D1) mentioned she thinks the ministry directions regarding not beating students had weakened the teacher’s control over teaching and disciplining students.

4.3.2. Contextually responsive curricula.

Despite the fact that all participating schools were in urban areas, participants especially from school (a) referred to the importance of having curricula that are responsive to the nature and needs of each context in particular.

“There are other problems like the absence of integration between the subjects. Curricula should also be suitable for the environment, and should serve each student in his context. The student in Cairo is different from the student in Minya. There should also be shared goal setting with the community.” TU head 1 – School (a)

“You should start with curricula. Curricula should be responsive to the environment. The end purpose of curriculum is to serve the environment, and this is usually written as an objective for my subject [showing the science subject objectives in her preparation book] and to utilize the resources of the environment. If this was one purpose for teaching my subject, why should there be a unified curriculum nationwide thought there are different contexts.” Teacher 1 – School (a).

4.3.3. Resources availability.

Recourses availability was another element that teachers spoke about as a necessary element. Same idea was also referred to earlier when some teachers spoke about their perception on ERP impact. Other responses include:

“There are no resources [available for me]. If there is a school event, external support from parents is sought” Teacher 18 – School (c).

“The most important thing is availability of resources. They should be available for teachers whenever they need. You could provide me with a training, while I
d’ont have any tools to help out. You should decide what tools I need and provide them.” Administrator 3 – School (c) vice principal.

4.3.4. Classes densities.

Participants highlighted the importance of having manageable class sizes to allow teacher and students do teaching and learning better.

“Classes density is a very important factor. High class density is not only an issue of buildings, but also a result of inaction in recruiting teachers for the subjects that has shortage, while at the same time having a surplus in other positions that are not as effective as teaching, like administrative and social work positions.” School (a) Teacher (FGI: A1).

“There should be less class densities, especially for the subjects that need practice sessions, like languages, for example, so we could make sure the student acquire the language and get the opportunity to practice in class and not just be a recipient without learning anything.” Teacher 5 – School (a).

4.3.5. Schedules overload and teachers shortage.

Teachers in one of school (d)’s focus group interview (FGI: D1) spoke about a big shortage in their school in the staff of the non-academic subjects like art and music. They also said there is only one PE teacher for the whole school who also has to be half days in another nearby school. They said this is not only unfair for the students, but also for the subject teachers who are permanently substituting the sessions themselves adding to their already overloaded schedules.

School (b) TU head, referred to the schedules overload as one of the reasons that could have gradually lead to the disappearance of the school clusters in her area for example. She added that despite her schools does not have currently issues with the number of teachers, this is very likely to happen.

“Shortage of teachers especially for science and math teachers. In our school we do no currently have this issue, but it is very likely to happen with a number of teachers retiring soon”. TU head 2 – School (b).
4.3.6. Support with struggling students.

Due to the previous element of crowded schedules, together with not having the literacy and numeracy skills well acquired at the early elementary stage, participants found supporting weak students as a very essential element and that requires different adaptations.

“I really hope they focus more on supporting weak students. I have a crowded schedule and this prevents me from helping them. There should be a special teacher in each school responsible for supporting weak students. There is waste of resources because the student who comes struggling from the primary stage, keeps struggling in preparatory and continues to do the same in secondary. I hope there is a solution for weak students.” Teacher 3 – School (a).

“There is also the problem of not having the time to make improvement plans for weak students because of the crowded schedules. Weak students get lost.” School (a) Teacher (FGI: A1).

“I have 12 students in one [preparatory school] class who cannot read nor write. How can I deal with that and how can they study my subject. The basic skills they gain at the elementary school were not sufficient. Whoever wants to reform education should start with basic education.” School (d) teacher (MFGI: D1).

Teachers also found the curriculum obligations as one obstacle they face when trying to support weak students.

“How can I support weak students while having to keep up with the curriculum plan? There should be another teacher to work with struggling students and they should have summer plans like in the past.” (MFGI: D1).

“We are very restricted with curriculum, and the available time for doing this is not enough.” Teacher 27 – school (d)

“Curricula should paced practically with the time available. We are required to complete the curriculum regardless the outcomes. Did the students learn or not? The objectives are not achieved. We should know what information the students retained at the end of the year, and not just passing exams. Education is still concentrated on memorization and indoctrination.” School (a) Teacher (FGI: A1).
4.3.7. Training conditions.

The trainings conditions were in themselves a big part of what participants shared in response to the question on reform sustainability. Some spoke about the need for a realistic training content that relates to their context instead of being brought from either academia or a foreign resource.

“For the trainings to be practical, contextual and not just taken from education books and translated content [and] then trainers come to indoctrinate it. Trainings need to be corresponding to the context and reality, and should be applicable when working with 60 students.” School (a) Teacher (FGI: A1).

“Anything that is organized should be realistic and suitable for the context where are and with the teachers capacities. This should also be flexible to be adapted and changed anytime.” Administrator 1 – School (b).

Despite that the teachers said training needs were collected, and as many teachers said they have choice over attending some trainings, other teachers referred to the obligations they might have to attend certain trainings regardless their needs or interests.

“Give me the choice to select the trainings I need and do not impose attendance.” School (a) Teacher (FGI: A1).

The timing for conducting the trainings was a big issue. Participants prefer that trainings do not happen during the teaching days for so many reasons, including disturbing the sessions flow, and interrupting the curriculum plans.

“Having continuous training especially during vacations and not during teaching days, because this disrupts the sessions.” School (a) teacher (FGI:B1).

“When you say training, don’t tell me it’s 4 days and that’s all. It needs extensive leadership and practices support. I could be a self-leading person, and I could be someone who needs support, advice, supervision or mentorship” Teacher 22 – School (c).
Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusions

5.1. Discussion.

This chapter presents the discussion of the 3 raised research questions. It then introduces the implications as well as the limitations of this study. The chapter ends with the conclusion and summary of the main findings.

5.1.1. Discussion related to research question 1.

*RQ1: What is the documented level of objectives/goals achievement of the ERP professional development component?*

ERP documentations reported major changes in the outcomes of the program’s teachers’ professional development. It also reported positive changes in the instructional leadership roles of the ministry supervisors (inspectors), but also acknowledged limited impact on the instructional leadership roles of the school principals. Findings showed that several practices were initiated in supporting local professional development programs even though progress with PD system decentralization through the SBTEU was still limited.

Although ERP documentation described an improvement in teachers practices towards being more student centered. It seems (at least to an external observer) that this was advocated in a way that would fit into Zaalouk’s (2013) explanation of the output-based education (OBE) that generally depends on fitting into standardized requirements in a neo-liberal teacher professionalism model. This also includes having teachers act with implementing agency (Carr as cited in Batra, 2009). Even the original PD objective statements are written in a way that mainly focuses on improving the outcomes, which is highly desired in all cases. For example, a big focus was placed on how active learning pedagogies were supported through the program, with less highlight on the teachers roles as reflective practitioners which is also highly needed in a school-based reform context. This also appears in how the documentation mentioned that the quantitative results using
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SCOPE showed higher improvement on the behavioral dimension than the cognitive one. It appears to have been a reform that fits Schlechty’s definition of “changing procedures, processes and technologies with the intent of improving the performance of existing operating system” (p.3). Yet, and again with the immediate impact seem to have been more on output instead of becoming a cultural transformation that changes the culture, values, and structure within the social system of the reform context in Schlechty’s (2009) explanation.

**5.1.2. Discussion related to research question 2.**

*RQ 2: To what extent is the documented impact of ERP school-based professional development sustained or developed, according to the views of the school-level stakeholders?*

According the responses of the participants, the formal structure of Training and Evaluation Units at the schools continues to be present. However, the impact and role of these units as a basis for school-based professional development varies. Participants in three of the four schools mentioned that most teacher trainings are not school-based. Trainings are not planned based on teachers’ specific needs despite the usage of a “training needs questionnaire”. The ERP developed tools of SCOPE and MAP, are not familiar to most of the participants. The Learning Resource centers shifted from their original role into becoming more of a traditional professional development provider. As previously found through ERP documentation, the role of the school principals remains highly administrative with limited engagement from their behalf on providing teachers with adequate instructional support leaving this role to either the school subject supervisor, or the ministry inspectors.

Findings clearly show that the different participating teachers and schools sustained the elements of ERP PD in different degrees. Datnow (2005) among other researchers mention that the reform outcomes do vary across different contexts. Findings show that the variations were not limited to the geographical contexts, but to the specific school contexts under which variations also exist among teachers. Gillies (2010) also
highlighted how internalizing change has to happen on an individual-by-individual and case-by-case basis (p. 137). This aligns with Fullan’s (2007) argument that what decides the success of reforms comes from the interaction between the individual and the collective meaning making.

Smith (2005) suggests that local capacity building for planning and implementing reforms is a big challenge for reform sustainability. Participants’ responses in general indicated inefficiency of instructional leadership at their schools. School (b) is the school among the sample to have more sustained elements. It is worthy of mention that the training unit head and school principal were trained for the same roles for ERP. The school having more sustained elements, especially that of the SBTUE role, could mean that some changes were institutionalized. However, it is not clear if this resulted because the reform model was internalized across the school, or sustained because it is still the same leadership trained by ERP. This case is unlike the other 3 schools, whose leadership, and TU heads were relatively newer to their positions, and were only trained by ERP as class teachers.

Even for the relatively successful model of school (b), it is not assured what could happen after these people retire (which is very soon to happen with the SBTEU head) or for other reason leave the school. The question would still remain whether the same or similar practices would continue to exist and be developed. Yet, having teachers and trainers engage with and claim ownership and participation in other school-based activities is a positive indicator that increases the possibility of maintaining the attitude – provided that future leadership emerges from them, and provided that this leadership maintains a continuous development mentality. According to Florian (2000), “Hargreaves and Fink (2000) report that succession in leadership, staff retention, and community support also influence the continuation of innovative change” (p. 4).

This is not a generalizable observation, but beside leadership, the conditions in school (b) including class facilities, densities, TU effectiveness are other elements that might have played a role for creating a better PD environment and a general culture at the
school level. The same elements were mentioned by teachers at other schools as some challenges that negatively impacts their school environments.

Although the training unit exists as an obligatory structure within all governmental schools by a ministerial decree, the effectiveness of these units is not determined only by its presence or not. Fullan (2000), does speak about the difference between “restructuring” which might still exist at schools (a), (c), and (d), and “re-culturing” as appears to a big degree in the speech, understanding and the general environment of school (b).

Although some teachers appeared critical about the status quo, most of the interview narratives (except for very few) only relate to the technical aspects of their teaching practices or the technical process of professional development. At least from what appeared in the interviews, most teachers did not refer to clearly anything that indicates the commonality of organized or personal reflective time as part of their professional development. Teachers for example mentioning a set of strategies as equivalent to active learning shows how they relate the concept technically, without necessarily understanding the pedagogy behind it in some cases. It also appeared from what they mentioned about the inspectors that they provide guidance and support from one direction. That some teachers also referred to not being appreciated, and that they needed to rigidly follow the plans set for them, also indicate that in most cases teachers fit into the position of what Batra (2009) called the “implementing agency”.

One possible reason for not having a high degree of reform sustainability could be the fact that some ideas might have not been suitable for the level of the education system described by Moursched et al. (2010). According to them, the ideas like “school-based decision making”, “collaborative practice”, and “decentralizing pedagogical rights to schools & teachers” as examples, are interventions that proved being more suitable for education systems at the stages of moving from “good to great” or “great to excellent”, but the system in Egypt in 2004 is at a less advanced stage. According to the model they presented illustrated in table 3 in the literature review section, other interventions may have been more appropriate for systems at lower performance stages. Maybe what ERP
attempted to do was kind of an advanced intervention compared to the existing level of development of the Egyptian school system. Accordingly, the incremental process starting from where he system stands might have started without the foundational base needed for earlier stages like that of the ERP context.

5.1.3. Discussion related to research question 3.

RQ 3: What conditions are needed for sustaining professional development reforms as perceived by the school-level stakeholders in past ERP schools?

Participants’ responses may have been more focused on the challenges they face on everyday teaching, more than focusing solely on elements that directly related to professional development reforms. They mentioned: teacher status, contextually responsive curricula, resources availability, class densities, schedules load, support with struggling students as well as the training as the elements they consider as essential to support arriving at and sustain effective professional development reforms. Again these issues expands beyond professional development solely. The emerged themes relate to different components of the education system highlighting the importance of the interaction that happens between the “inside story”, “the inside-outside story”, and the “outside story” explained by Fullan (2000). As he explained, these stories need to function in parallel to each other and not in isolation for changes to success.

Findings from other questions could be connected to this one too. Florian (2000) identified five sustainability factors of reform changes as follows:

“a. Ongoing engagement and development of human capacities engaged during reform initiative;
b. Schools and district cultures that value learning, innovation, and collaboration;
c. District and school structures, policies, and resource allocations that support reform goals;
d. Leadership of schools and district that maintains a consistent vision, a well-designed strategic plan, and positive relationships with members of the education system; and
e. Political context demands, pressures, and supportive activities.” (p. 12).
It could be said that the first four elements were clearly present at school (b) according to the participants’ responses. The training unit is still apparently able to continuously working on an ongoing development at the school level. It was clear from some responses from the same school that a culture of continuous improvement is to an extent present. The school apparently has enough resource allocation, and in comparison to the other three schools, not a single participant from school (b) raised any issue on the absence of resources. They also spoke very positively about their school leadership. The fifth element mentioned by Florian (2000) was in a way out of this study’s scope, yet it is assumed that the political context demands for example would be the same for the other 3 schools too, unless school (b) was for any reason supported differently by the idara or mudireya. If that was the case, how and why would the school be supported differently could be another area of exploration regarding the presence of more successful reform elements at this school.

5.2. Implications

1. Teachers need to be engaged in the reform initiatives they are subjected to. Considerations need to be done to their social and professional conditions, and education reforms need to put this as a priority in order to be successful.

2. Professional development reforms need to be developed to fit each specific school context, instead of being nationwide one-size-fits-all initiatives. Schools differ in their needs, conditions, and staff capacity.

3. Variations do exist between schools in terms of professional capacity, resources, facilities as well as class densities, among other factors. There might be big performance gaps between government schools of the same type and which are located only a few minutes apart. Understanding why school conditions are different, and what impacts their culture and performance would help in understanding of why some schools are more able to retain and make better use of reforms. Such understanding is necessary for providing a better view of what constitutes a successful model of reform.

4. School-based professional development, as was initially targeted by ERP, seems to have been a very promising model, yet implementation seems to not have taken
it to higher reform levels. Effective investment in capacity building, especially at the Training Units and the Instructional leadership levels, might mean that more teachers could be reached for ongoing support and continuous professional development. Yet, besides capacity building, the roles and responsibilities of those responsible for the Training Units as well as the school leadership should become more focused on real instructional leadership, instead of just fitting into the administrative and paper work requirements.

5. There is either a problem on reform documentation or at least a problem of accessing such documentation at the MOE level and USAID website as well. The search for information on ERP at the MOE did not end up with sufficient information with a little found on USAID publicly accessible database. People at MOE were very friendly and showed a genuine tendency to help out (or at least they appeared so). However, they were not able to help in finding something as basic as which schools participated in the project pilot, not to mention other documents. ERP and other initiatives worked on the development of an Information System, but apparently such a system still need a lot of elements to be added to.

6. A culture of documentation, cyclical monitoring, evaluation and follow up (in its positive connotations) need to be advocated. Clear reform making cycles which Ibrahim & Hozayin (2016) stated as “clear statements of policy, followed by tidy implementation, ending in evaluation and planning for the next cycle” (p. 4). MOE documents including the 2014 strategic plan did acknowledge this, but again as each attempt looks to be done in isolation to its precedents.

7. Past education reforms should not be ignored. A real understanding of their impact, and a deep study into their lessons learned is essential as a basis for new models to build upon. Education policies need to be developed with conscious awareness of all past efforts either through learning from the process or through understanding the ongoing impact and/or struggles. More research needs to be done on the other elements of the system targeted by either ERP and/or the other initiatives the followed or preceded ERP.
5.3. Limitations of the Study

1. The sample does not exceed 2% of the original participating schools. It also does not extend over the full participating governorates. They neither represented schools in non-urban locations. Representation of teachers of less than 10 years of experience was also limited.

2. This research was meant to be done at the school level. Understanding the conflict of interests that might be residing on the ministry of education different management levels and how the central management is genuinely willing to giving up power to local school communities could be an influencing factor that is outside the scope of this research. Besides, having governmental school teachers speak openly about their school environment to an outsider with an etic position might be having its own limitations.

3. The comparison was made with the general ERP final documentation results for the four schools included in the sample. No individual school evaluation was accessible to be compared to the current practices, and track the actual outcomes continuation or development at each school site individually.

4. Having teachers evaluate teaching practices at their schools in oral interviews might not be the most adequate technique. In-depth class observation are needed to give accurate and more uniformed evaluation of teaching practices. Though triangulation of participants (data sources) was attempted, triangulation of data types and data analysis was missing. Beside interviews, an integration of another tool (like observation) or a quantitative method as for example a self-reporting survey could have added other dimensions to the study and provided a better confirmability position.

5. Data collection and analysis were mainly based on one investigator. Firestone & Dawson (1982) view combining the intuitive and intersubjective approaches as the strongest analysis strategies. The study could have benefited from including another investigator.
5.4. Summary and Conclusions

This study attempted to investigate the sustainability of practices that were advocated as part of the professional development (PD) component of USAID/Egypt Education Reform Program (ERP) after around 10 years of the program conclusion. The study adopted a qualitative research approach with the aim of better understanding the long-term impact of those PD activities. Collected data included an analysis of ERP documents, as well as interviews with 38 teachers, Training Unit heads as well as school administrators in four of ERP pilot schools. Participants were asked questions about the PD practices at their schools, and in what way do they think changes presented by ERP were or were not sustained. While this study was intended to investigate the sustained elements of ERP program in particular, it as well provides insights on the current realities of PD at the participating schools level.

Results generally show different degrees of practices sustainability which mostly varied between participating schools and individuals. In general the existence of the Training and Evaluation Units at the school as formal structure continues to be present. However, the impact and role of these units as a basis for school-based professional development varies greatly. As mentioned by participants in three of the four schools, most teacher trainings are not school-based. Trainings are not planned based on teachers’ specific needs despite the usage of a “training needs questionnaire” is still somehow present at all the schools. ERP developed tools of SCOPE and MAP, are not familiar to most of the participants, with the usage of MAP being clearly discontinued. The Learning Resource centers shifted from their original role into becoming more of a traditional professional development provider rather than a space for teachers to access supplementary materials, technology devices and primary teaching resources. The role of the school principals remains highly administrative with limited engagement from their behalf on providing teachers with adequate instructional support leaving this role to either the school subject supervisor, or the ministry inspectors. Participants also reported that they think teacher status, contextually responsive curricula, resources availability, class densities, schedules load, support with struggling students as well as the training are the
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elements they consider as essential to support arriving at and sustain effective professional development reforms.

Further research could include tracking sustainability of other programs in comparison to ERP, exploring the sustained impact at more school sites, and integrating observation methods in assessing continuity of practices. It could also include a deeper investigation of the schools that were more able to sustain reforms, and track the elements that helped them achieve this.
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Appendix C: Interview Questions (in English)

Investigating the Long-Term Impact of ERP Professional Development Component

Interview Questions

Participants in each school:

Individual Interviews: 1 School Administrator, 1 Training Unit Staff

Focus group interviews: 1 group of 5 to 7 Teachers

Expected duration per interview: 40 to 60 minutes each

A) Familiarity with ERP
1. Are you familiar with the work done by USAID/ERP? Were you directly involved in any of its activities?
   [If yes: how did you engage with it? What do you think were the main takeaways of this program? What specific policies/activities do you know still active? What is not?]

B) School Professional Development Plan & Role of Training and Evaluation Unit
2. How does your school assess its professional development needs and set PD plans?
   [Probe: What tools do you use to assess/develop improvement plans? / To what extent are professional development plans data driven?]
3. What role does the Training and Evaluation Unit play at your school? To what extent do you think it is effective?

C) Standards Awareness & ERP Tools Utilization
4. To what extent are you familiar with:
   a) The Standards-Based Classroom Observation Protocol for Egypt (SCOPE)?
   b) The Classroom Observation Form (COF)?
   c) The Critical-Thinking, Achievement and Problem Solving test (CAPS)?
   [Are any of them being currently used at your school?]

D) Learning Circles & Practices Sharing
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5. How are best PD practices shared between schools/ principals/ teachers in your Idara?
   [Probe: For example do you participate in any professional learning network
   (Principal Learning Circles or Teacher Learning Circles”?)
   [If yes: how frequently do you meet? / what activities are being done? / how effective
do you think it is?), (for principals: In what way is teachers professional development
part of such networks activities?)

6. Is there a nearby learning resource center for your school to use?
   [If yes: how do you & teachers at your school use it?]

   E) Instructional Support

7. What kind of instructional support/follow up do teachers receive from the: school
   principal, departments heads, ministry supervisors?
   [Probe: what happens when a teacher is not fully competent in his instruction and/or
   subject knowledge? / Are you satisfied with the support you receive/give? / How did
   it change over the years?]

8. What support do you receive from either the Idara/ or Mudireya on PD issues?

   F) Classroom Practices

9. To what extent do you think classes in your school are:
   a) student-centered / teacher-centered?
   b) focused on developing students critical thinking and problem solving skills?
   c) utilizing active learning strategies?
   d) using sound classroom management strategies?
   [Can you give examples please elaborating on why do you think so? / what specific
   strategies being used most for each element?]

10. How did your teaching/ classroom instructional leadership practices
    changed/developed over the past 10 years (if applicable)?

   G) Perception on PD programs sustainability

11. What conditions do you think are needed for sustaining professional teaching
    practices after a certain training or reform initiative?
Appendix D: Interview Questions (in Arabic)
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A. Personal (Manager or Administrative 
In the school - Responsible for Training and Quality Unit) 

B. Group 
(made up of 5 to 7 teachers)

The expected duration per interview:

from 40 to 60 minutes

A. The direct experience with ERP Program Development Education (PD) Component

1. Have you had any direct experience with the ERP Program Development Education (PD) Component? What was your role in the program? What was your opinion of the program? What educational activities or policies are still ongoing, and what were discontinued?

2. How do you conduct the school's needs for professional development and set up development plans? 
What are the tools used to evaluate and implement the professional development plan? To what extent do you believe that the professional development plan is based on data and information? 

3. What is the role of the training and quality unit in your school? What is your opinion of the impact of the training unit?

4. What is your knowledge of:
A. Scope Assessment Program? 
B. COF Observation Model? 
C. Critical Thinking and Problem-solving Ability Assessment Program? (Do your teachers use any of these?)

5. How do you share the best practices of professional development between schools? (For example: Do you participate in professional development networks as teacher or principal circles?) 
(If the answer is yes: How often do you conduct interviews? What are the common activities you perform in these networks? How do you see the effectiveness of participation? (For principals: What is the role of professional development for teachers in these networks?)

6. Do you benefit from using a learning resources center? 
(If the answer is yes: How do teachers use it in your school?)
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8. طبيعة الدعم التعليمي الذي يتلقاه المعلم من مدير المدرسة، رؤساء الأقسام، الموجهين؟
(ما الذي يحدث عندما يكون هناك قصور في طرق التدريس أو المعرفة بالمادة العلمية؟ إلى أي مدى أنت راضٍ عن الدعم الذي تتلقاه أو تتعطيه؟ كيف تغير/يتغير ذلك الدعم بمرور الزمن؟)

7. ما طبيعة الدعم والהתبعية التعليمية التي يتلقاها المعلم من كل من: مدير المدرسة، رؤساء الأقسام، الموجهين؟
(ما الذي يحدث عندما يكون هناك قصور في طرق التدريس أو المعرفة بالمادة العلمية؟ إلى أي مدى أنت راضٍ عن الدعم الذي تتلقاه أو تتعطيه؟ كيف تغير/يتغير ذلك الدعم بمرور الزمن؟)

6. ما طبيعة الدعم التعليمي الذي تتلقاه المدرسة من الإدارة التعليمية/ مديرية التربية والتعليم؟

5. الممارسات الصفية

4. إلى أي مدى تعتقد أن الفصول الدراسية في مدرستك تتميز بالتالي:
أ. تستخدم أسلوباً متمركزاً على المعلم أم المتعلم؟
ب. تركز على تنمية مهارات التفكير النقدي وحل المشكلات لدى الطلاب؟
ج. تستخدم استراتيجيات التعلم النشط؟
د. تستخدم استراتيجيات جيدة لإدارة الصف؟
(من فضلك اذكر أمثلة توضح لماذا تعتقد ذلك؟ ما الاستراتيجيات الأكثر استخداماً لتفعيل أي من هذه الجوانب؟)

3. كيف تطور أسلوب تدريسك أو قيادتك لدعم الممارسات التعليمية على مدار ال 10 سنوات الماضية؟

2. استمرارية برامج التنمية المهنية

1. كيف ترى ما هي التعوقات التي يجب توافرها لضمان استمرارية الممارسات المهنية بعد أي مبادرة إصلاح أو تدريب مهني للمعلم؟
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Appendix E: Consent Form (English)

*The American University in Cairo*
Institutional Review Board

**Documentation of Informed Consent for Participation in Research Study**

**Project Title:** *An Investigation into the Long-Term Impact of the PD Component of USAID/Egypt Education Reform Program (2004-2009)*

**Principal Investigator:** Alaa Mohamed Badran.
**Phone number:** 01226654750

*You are being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of the research is to discover whether the practices developed as part of the PD components of the ERP project are still impacting the PD realities of its participating schools till today or not. The findings will be part of an MA thesis and may be published in a specialized journal or presented in a conference.*

The procedures of the research will include one-on-one interview or a focus group that would extend between 20 to 60 minutes.

*There will not be any risks or discomforts associated with this research.*

*The information you provide for purposes of this research is confidential.*

*Questions about the research, my rights, or research-related injuries should be directed to Alaa Badran at 01226654750*

*Participation in this study is voluntary. Refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or the loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.*

Signature

______________________________

Printed Name

______________________________

Date

______________________________
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Appendix F: Consent Form (Arabic)

استمارة موافقة مسبقة للمشاركة في دراسة بحثية


الباحث الرئيسي: آلاء محمد بدران
البريد الإلكتروني: alaabhadran@aucegypt.edu
الهاتف: 01226654750

انت مدعو للمشاركة في دراسة بحثية عن واقع التنمية المهنية بمدرستك.

هدف الدراسة هو معرفة إذا ما كانت الممارسات التي أنتجها جانب التنمية المهنية بمشروع تطوير التعليم ERP ما زالت تؤثر في واقع التنمية المهنية بالمدارس المشاركة في المشروع حتى الآن أم لا.

النتائج ستنشر كجزء من بحث استكمال درجة الماجستير وربما يتم نشر النتائج أيضا في دورية متخصصة أو مؤتمر علمي أو كليهما.

إجراءات الدراسة تشمل على مقابلاتشخصية أو جماعية والمدة المتوقعة للمشاركة في هذا البحث تتراوح بين 20 و 60 دقيقة.

لا يوجد أي مخاطر متوقعة من المشاركة في هذه الدراسة.

السرية واحترام الخصوصية: المعلومات التي ستستلم بها في هذا البحث سوف تكون سرية.

لأي أسئلة متعلقة بهذه الدراسة أو حقوق المشاركين فيها أو عند حدوث أي مخاطر ناتجة عن هذه المشاركة بإمكانك الإتصال بالباحث على الرقم الموضح أعلاه.

إن المشاركة في هذه الدراسة ماهي إلا عمل تطوعي حيث أن الامتناع عن المشاركة لايضمن أي عقوبات أو فقدان أي مزايا تحق لك. ويمكنك أيضا التوقف عن المشاركة في أي وقت.

الامضاء: ..........................................................
اسم المشارك: ...................................................
التاريخ: ........./................/..............
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Appendix G: SCOPE Tool

Tقييـم الأداء الصـفى باسـتخدام المعاييـر
Standards-based Classroom Observation Protocol for Egypt (SCOPE)

** بيانات أساسية **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>المحافظة:</th>
<th>❑ الإسكندرية</th>
<th>❑ أسوان</th>
<th>❑ بني سويف</th>
<th>❑ القاهرة</th>
<th>❑ الفيوم</th>
<th>❑ المنيا</th>
<th>❑ قنا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>كود المدرسة:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>اسم المدرسة:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مستوى المدرسة:</td>
<td>❑ ابتدائية</td>
<td>❑ إعدادية</td>
<td>❑ ثانوية</td>
<td>❑ فنية</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الصف الدراسي:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المقرر الدراسي:</td>
<td>❑ لغة عربية</td>
<td>❑ لغة إنجليزية</td>
<td>❑ رياضيات</td>
<td>❑ علوم</td>
<td>❑ دراسات اجتماعية</td>
<td>❑ أخرى</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** المدرس الخاضع للملاحظة **

| الاسم: | __________________________ |
| الكود: | ❑ ذكر | ❑ أنثى |
| الخبرة بالتدريس: | ❑ أقل من 3 سنوات | ❑ من 3 إلى 5 سنوات | ❑ أكثر من 10 سنوات |
| صفة المدرس: | ❑ مدرس أول | ❑ مدرس قدير (أي تلقى تدريبًا بالخارج) |
| أعلى مؤهل دراسي: | ❑ ثانيوية | ❑ تأهيل معلمين | ❑ ليسانس/بكالوريوس | ❑ دبلوم عام | ❑ دبلوم خاص | ❑ ماجستير | ❑ دكتوراه |

** أنشطة التنمية المهنية المقدمة في الثلاث سنوات الماضية (غير برنامج تطوير التعليم): **

- متوسط عددها في السنة الواحدة: ❑ صفر | ❑ مرة واحدة | ❑ من مرتين إلى ثلاث مرات | ❑ أكثر من 3 مرات
- الجهه التي قدمتها (غير برنامج تطوير التعليم): ❑ مصرية (وزارة التربية والتعليم) | ❑ غير مصرية | ❑ مشروع المدارس الجديدة |
- مدة في المتوسط: ❑ أقل من يوم | ❑ من يوم إلى يومين | ❑ من 3 إلى 5 أيام | ❑ أكثر من خمسة أيام

** أنشطة التنمية المهنية المقدمة من برنامج تطوير التعليم السنة الماضية: **

هل تلقيت تدريبات من برنامج تطوير التعليم خلال العام الماضي: نعم ❑ لا ❑ 
عدد التدريبات ❑ عدد الأيام الإجمالية للتدريبات ❑ موضوعات التدريبات ❑ 

** الدروس الخاضعة للملاحظة **

| تنسيق المكان وإعداد المواد التعليمية: | ❑ مقاعد ثابتة في صفوف | ❑ مقاعد متحركة في صفوف | ❑ مقاعد متحركة توضع في تنسيق متغير |
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 مدى توفر المواد التعليمية والوسائل المُعينة: □ غير متوفرة □ قليلة □ كافية
 مدى توفر التكنولوجيا التعليمية: □ غير متوفرة □ قليلة □ كافية
 عدد الطلبة في الصف: □ ذكور فقط □ إناث فقط □ ذكور وإناث

اذكر موضوع الدرس وأهم الأنشطة التي أداها المدرس والطلاب في أثناء الدرس، وذلك من واقع ملاحظاتهم التلقائية المباشرة.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الاسم</th>
<th>كود الملاحظ (انظر القائمة المرفقرة):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>تاريخ الملاحظة:</th>
<th>بدأت الساعة:</th>
<th>وانتهت الساعة:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

اعط درجة لكل عبارة من العبارات الآتية مستخدما مقياسا يتدرج من 1 إلى 5. اختر درجة واحدة فقط لكل عبارة.

- ارفق البيانات والمذكرات التي دونتها في أثناء الملاحظة بالاستمارة بعد تعبئتها.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>السلوكيات المدرس</th>
<th>الدرجة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- يدير وقت التدريس الصفى إدارة فعالة.
- يظهر علناً استعداده ومهارات الإدارة الصفية الفعالة.
- يستخدم موارد واستراتيجيات التدريس المختلفة استخدامًا في شرح المفاهيم والمهارات المتعلقة بالمناهج التعليمية، وفي تقديم نموذج يحتوي على ذلك.
- يستخدم اساليب تدريس متعددة لإزكاء المشاركة الطلابية النشطة في التعلم.
- يعمل على ضمان مشاركة الطلاب في استماع التعلم في مجال التعلم في مجال التعلم، وثبات التحصيل الدراسي، والاحتياجات الخاصة، والمهارات، وثبات ذلك.
- يستخدم استراتيجيات تدريس متعددة لزيادة المشاركة الطلابية النشطة في التعلم.
- يشجع الطلاب على أن يكون لهم صوت في بيئة التعلم.

يبلغ للطلاب فرصة للإجابة على أسئلة ذات صلة مع ما بين مجالات المحتوى التعليمي المختلفة، ثم يربط هذه المجالات بتجارب الحياة اليومية.
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|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | يتيح للطلاب فرصا معدة سلفا لتطبيق ما فهموه من أفكار وما اكتسبوه من مهارات في التعامل مع موافقات ومشكلات الحياة اليومية. |
| 12 | يتيح للطلاب فرصا معدة سلفا لتأمل ما تعلموه. |
| 13 | يقدم - ويساعد الطلاب على تقديم - القدر الكافي من التعزيز التلفزيجي لبناء وتدقيق. |
| 14 | يستخدم ما لدى الطلاب من معارف وخبرات سابقة في تخطيط وتعديل تدريسه. |
| 15 | يتيح للطلاب فرصا لتمارسة مهارات التفكير الاشعاعي والتكييف اللفظي. |
| 16 | يتيح للطلاب فرصا لاكتساب ووصف مهارات حل المسائل. |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|   | 17 | يقومون بجمع وتصنيف ودمج الأفكار أو المعلومات المختلفة، ويتوصلون إلى استنتاجات يمكنهم إثبات صحتها. |
|   | 18 | يسألون أسئلة نقية أو يعبرون عن تعلقات نقية تدور حول المعلومات والأفكار والافتراضات والمعلومات التي يرد ذكرها في الكتب المقررة أو في النشاط الصفي. |
|   | 19 | يحددون المشكلات والمشكلات ويقترحون أسئلة وقضايا تفضي إلى مزيد من البحث والتقسيمي. |
|   | 20 | يقترحون طرقا بديلة لحل المسائل والمشكلات المماثلة. |
|   | 21 | يقومون فعالية الطرق المبدلة في حل المشكلات، ويجدون أكثرها فعالية مع تقديم البراهين على ذلك. |
### Appendix H: Information of individual participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Total Teaching years</th>
<th>Years at school</th>
<th>Participated in ERP</th>
<th>Type of interview</th>
<th>Interview code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A TU head 1</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Math teacher – TU Head</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>II: A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A Teacher 1</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Science teacher - supervisor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>II: A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A Teacher 2</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Social studies teacher - supervisor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>II: A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A Teacher 3</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher - supervisor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>II: A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A Teacher 4</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A Teacher 5</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30 (-8 abroad)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A Teacher 6</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>First Teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A Teacher 7</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>First Teacher</td>
<td>Social studies teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A Teacher 8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B Teacher 9</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Social studies teacher</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>B Teacher 10</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B Teacher 11</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B Teacher 12</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Total Teaching years</th>
<th>Years at school</th>
<th>Participated in ERP</th>
<th>Type of interview</th>
<th>Interview code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teacher 13</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Teacher 14</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Administrator 2</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>First Teacher – A</td>
<td>School Deputy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mini-focus group</td>
<td>MFGI: B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Administrator 1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>School Principal Arabic teacher</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mini-focus group</td>
<td>MFGI: B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 15</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mini-focus group</td>
<td>MFGI: B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Teacher 16</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mini-focus group</td>
<td>MFGI: B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher 17</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Science teacher</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mini-focus group</td>
<td>MFGI: B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TU head 2</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Senior teacher</td>
<td>School deputy – TU Head</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phone Interview</td>
<td>PI: B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Teacher 18</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>First Teacher</td>
<td>PE teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Teacher 19</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>First Teacher – A</td>
<td>Social studies teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Teacher 20</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Teacher 21</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>First Teacher – A</td>
<td>Social Studies teacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>TU head 3</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher / TU head</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>II: C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Teacher 22</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>First Teacher – A</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>II: C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Administrator 3</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>First Teacher – A</td>
<td>School vice-principal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>II: C3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Total Teaching years</th>
<th>Years at school</th>
<th>Participated in ERP</th>
<th>Type of interview</th>
<th>Interview code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>D Teacher 23</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>D Teacher 24</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>First Teacher – A</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>D Teacher 25</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>First Teacher – A</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>D Teacher 26</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>First Teacher – A</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>D Teacher 27</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert Teacher</td>
<td>Arabic teacher</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>D Teacher 28</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>First Teacher</td>
<td>Social studies teacher</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>FGI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>D Teacher 29</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Science teacher</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mini-focus group</td>
<td>MFGI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>D Teacher 30</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>Science teacher</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>mini-focus group</td>
<td>MFGI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>D TU head 4</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Expert teacher</td>
<td>Math teacher – TU head</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phone Interview</td>
<td>PI: D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>D Administrator 4</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>School principal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phone Interview</td>
<td>PI: D2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix I: List of ERP results and sub-intermediate results

Source: (AIR et al., 2003, pp. 16-18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-I.R.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The business community, civil society, and community leaders provide leadership, funding, and programs to support education.</td>
<td>CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Families actively engage in their children’s education.</td>
<td>CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Policymaking authority is decentralized and funding is diversified.</td>
<td>CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IELP-III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Performance standards for teachers and students are developed, monitored, and applied</td>
<td>CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IELP-III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOEs develop and implement standards in pre-service teacher preparation programs; Collaboration between FOEs and MOE in development and implementation of standards; Performance standards for all content areas, following the lead of those developed for EFL are developed and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>MOE administrators, supervisors, and principals receive on-going training in leadership and management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School administrators and staff prepared to assume authority to make decisions on school policies, standards, and plans; a system of training for continuously enhancing the instructional leadership ability and managerial competence of administrative staff, from top-level mudtriyya to school principals and supervisors; Private sector encourages the application of decision making authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DGM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff, from top-level governorate and MOE central staff are competent in leadership, resource management skills, and delegation of authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Teachers receive pre-service education and in-service training in learner-focused teaching and assessment methods.</td>
<td>Teachers' performance in the classroom improved through in-service training; teachers meet performance standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IELP-III</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved and institutionalized MOE capacity for professional development of EFL in-service training; support for the introduction of English at the first, second, and third grades and for the FOE’s reform of pre-service teacher preparation in EFL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of reforms in pre-service teacher education programs including teaching practice; Improved pre-service training systems through the FOEs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Students engage in participatory learning, critical thinking and problem solving.</td>
<td>Improved student performance in academic subjects, particularly through critical thinking and problem solving; Assessment practices measures critical thinking skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved student-teacher performance to meet standards for newly graduated teacher; Assessment practices measure critical thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Students learn about the world of work and are prepared for the global economy. (Cross cuts with Workforce Development SO17, IR17.2 below)</td>
<td>Limited creation of materials for experimental use in program schools and in teachers creating their own supplementary materials; Secondary schools, particularly in urban areas, providing instruction promoting student skills that respond to job market needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SO17 IR17.2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased institutional capacity for providing market-responsive,</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Private sector is mobilized and leads the school to work systems creation and the delivery of internships and market relevant programs in schools; Job referral system established.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 3.3 | Instructional materials are developed locally and distributed widely. | IELP-III | New material resources for EFL and use of legacy resources developed by IELP-II
| | | FOER | Support for collaborative and individual authorship among professors in developing textbooks; FOEs training teachers in how to develop instructional materials
| | | CAS | Existing NSP, AEMTEP, & IELP-II resources utilized, built on; New instructional resources developed as needed.
| 4.1 | New schools are built to serve populations far from existing schools or in overcrowded areas. | SC | Approximately 30 new schools built for entire program in family of schools areas in 6 governorates to complement the need for achieving reform results.
| 4.2 | Communities provide non-formal education to complement and support the formal system. | NFE | More students and other family members participating in formal and non-formal education programs; Supplementary books and other materials in schools; Kindergarten materials produced and appropriate methods used
| | | FOER | FOE support NGO kindergarten programs and develop professional cadres of trainers;
| 4.3 | Qualifying financially disadvantaged students receive scholarships. | NFE | Systematic selection and support of girls who can not otherwise attend school |