



Caderea Bastiliei nr.33, Bucharest, tel: 401- 212 07 80; fax 401 212 07 79  
[www.cedu.ro](http://www.cedu.ro)

***ROMANIA  
EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT  
PROJECT  
EDUCATION 2000+ (1999-2002)***

***IMPLEMENTED BY CENTER EDUCATION 2000+  
Bucharest – Romania***

***PRELIMINARY FINAL REPORT***

***Bucharest, May 2002***

## ***1. BACKGROUND***

### ***1.1. Structure of the Romanian educational system***

The structure of preschool, primary and secondary education is currently 3+8+4, which may well be changed to a 3+9+3 model in the near future. As it now stands, education is compulsory through grade 8, and may soon be compulsory through grade 9. Approximately 5% of graduates do not continue on to secondary education. After 8<sup>th</sup> grade, there are three sorts of higher secondary education: a. four-year academic lycees; b. four-year technical lycees and c. two- or three-year vocational schools. Management of the school system remains largely in the judet (county) level inspectorates, which report directly to the Ministry of Education. Each judet has its own Teaching Staff Center (Casa Corpului Didactic, or CCD) responsible for in-service teacher training.

The tertiary sector is comprised of approximately 45 state universities and 52 private universities that provide fee-based programs in a variety of academic and professional areas. University departments (was 'faculty', which means something very different in English) control admission through department-specific entrance examinations in addition to the (Baccalaureate) exam taken by students at the end of their four-year academic or technical lycee.

The total number of pupils in 2000-2001 was around 4,200,000. Enrollments are declining due to demographic factors. Dropout and non-attendance are also thought to be major issues, but no reliable figures are available (400,000 according to some sources).

The number of teaching staff by levels is 37,000 in pre-school education; 161,000 in primary and lower secondary (grades 1-8); 61,000 in upper secondary; 5,000 in vocational schools and post-lycee. More than 60% of teaching staff received initial training at the university level. Pre-school and primary school teachers are generally trained at pedagogical lycees. In-service training is provided by the Ministry of Education through universities and CCDs. There is no formal qualification provided for head teachers or educational administrators. Teacher salaries are low and falling in real terms because their annual increase cannot keep pace with inflation. At the same time, there is an over-supply of teachers, and pupil/teacher ratios are low. A significant number of teachers are unqualified, especially in rural areas.

Textbook provision has improved significantly over the past six years, as a result of a World Bank project (1995-2002) in which the World Bank collaborated first with OSF Romania and subsequently with Center Education 2000+, which is the former Education Department of OSF Romania. About 250 new titles had already appeared by the year 2000/2001. A commission of experts appointed by the Ministry of Education selects three textbooks for each subject from a tender from publishing houses. Each teacher is free to choose from among these three books. The books are generally of better quality and there

is now a strong private academic publishing sector. Supplementary materials, however, are still in scarce supply.

As far as the lycee is concerned a free market system was introduced in 1999 by the Christian-Democratic/Liberal coalition. After 2000 with the new elections and a Social-Democratic Government this educational system was profoundly affected and many of the liberal measures taken between December, 1996 and December, 2000 are at risk of being undermined or even dismantled entirely.

### ***1.2. Current situation in education***

After a slow and difficult start (1990-1995), there was evidence that change in education was reaching the classroom (in the form of better choice of textbooks and new curricula as well as many other liberal measures). Between 1996 and 2000 the Ministry's leadership was strongly reform minded and supportive of the main reform projects under implementation. The General Education Reform Project, co-financed by the Romanian Government and the World Bank, made a slow and uneven start in its first two years of implementation (1995-1996).

The introduction of a coherent National Curriculum Framework in 1998 was a major step towards such needed reform. It is innovative in that it divides the curriculum into a 70% core curriculum plus a 30% local option (school based curriculum – in terms of time-tabling, and to some extent in terms of content coverage); and also in that it encourages cross-curricular and interdisciplinary work. It was not and it is still unclear how the Framework can be used in classrooms with teachers (many of them unqualified) who have not been well trained in curriculum development, supplementary materials development, or reliable classroom-based assessment.

After so many years of reform (1995-2001) there is a massive need for helping schools in designing; implementing and evaluating the school based curriculum. Textbook publishers can meet this demand to some extent, but since the former '30% local option' has been dramatically reduced; there will not be an incentive for teachers to innovate. Teachers therefore need to be supported in the production of their own materials. There might be an important role for Center Education 2000+ in supporting projects aiming to solve these problems by training inspectors, head-teachers and teachers in implementing the new Curriculum Framework, in designing the school-based curriculum, in designing and using different educational materials in a proper manner. It's in this way that the Center Education 2000+ is positioned to be a major player in developing institutional capacities, human resources and policy making capacities at local level, so that reform would be a reality at the level of each single school.

In the context of ongoing national educational reform, there are not clear regulations concerning those schools promoting alternative pedagogy. Even if the present Law of Education stipulates that these schools be accepted, there is not a policy in place to support them. The existing Waldorf or Montessori schools are maintained outside the mainstream system. A notable exception is the Step by Step alternative, developed

through the OSF program as well as the highly-rated educational programs developed in the last three year by Center Education 2000+.

In this respect, Center Education 2000+ seeks to help the development and transfer of the valuable elements and experience of alternative education more effectively into the reform effort.

\* \*  
\*

OSF Romania and then, from 1999, Center Education 2000+ have provided strong support to the reform efforts. In 1997-1998, the OSF supported the development of a new model for school inspection that offered substantial support for the planned decentralization of the education system. It provided quality-assurance mechanisms and information to stakeholders at all levels in the system. In addition, it developed a network of specialized trainers for school directors. Through different programs, the OSF implemented or financed projects concerning in-service teacher training, childhood education, civics and environmental education and the improvement of educational offerings in communities with Roma populations.

At that time (1995-1999) the need and opportunity for complementary efforts of OSF with ongoing World Bank Projects was compelling. In many respects, the strategy of the OSF initiative overlapped or complemented that of the World Bank/Ministry of Education. The WB Education Reform Project funds covered areas relevant to the OSF strategy, including curriculum development, assessment services, textbook provision, and teacher training and capacity building in education management and financing. As such, OSF was co-coordinating with these activities and complemented the World Bank Project activity at the local level.

After the creation of the Soros Open Network (SON) and of Center Education 2000+, and with the implementation of the Education Development Program (EDP) (called Education 2000+), it was possible for the former OSF structures to help accelerate the reform process. Currently, the Center and the World Bank/Ministry of Education are already partners in structural reform of Romanian education as a whole. The hope is that this collaboration will lead to co-funding and coordination in future implementation processes. In addition, the Center's model of grassroots, local reform implementation was highly successful and replicable. That is a chance for further common efforts.

The Center also has contacts with the European Commission and PHARE and a number of bilateral donors who are active in education in Romania. Partnerships are and will be explored at both the national and SEE region level.

### ***1.3. Major Developments in Society since 2000***

In 2000, the major developments in society regarding education were:

### A. *Strengths*

- There is a new Law of Education in force
- The main components of a top-down/vision-driven reform are already in the system
- A new Law of Youth on way to be approved
- Romania has already closed the Chapter Education inside the Acquis **Communitaire** as part of the integration process in the European Union

### B. *Weaknesses*

- The difficulty of the system to fully integrate the change
- The difficulty of the bottom-up reform
- *Political change* after parliamentary elections and, as a result, having a new team in the Ministry of Education and Research
- The *political will to stop some of the previous reform processes*, but unclear strategy concerning the ways of doing that
- Delays in issuing new sectoral policies (e.g. teacher training)
- *Anti-liberal measures* issued this last time in order to re-centralize the system (i.e. restrictions on the free market of alternative textbooks; closing some of the private universities; reductions of school-specific curricula; less freedom for local school institutions)

### C. *Expected developments*

- Re-centralization
- Restrictions on the liberal reforms
- Less monitoring and more ruling, managing functions of the Ministry of Education and Research
- Weak SEE regional relations in education

This is basically the context in which we are undertaking the Preliminary Report and the Exit Strategies of the EDP/Education 2000+ Program.

## 2. **OVERALL STRATEGY**<sup>1</sup>

*In the new situation, the overall aims of the future strategy of Center Education 2000+ are:*

- fostering local institutional development processes (schools, local inspectorates, local school authorities)
- fostering school-based human resource development (teacher training, training of trainers, management training – all encompassing liberal types of education that meet students' real needs)

---

<sup>1</sup> See below, chapter 3.3.3.

- fostering SEE regional approaches (improving education for Roma, disadvantaged areas, educational networking – all those topics are already components of our regional projects)
- supporting local/central and sectoral/global educational policy analysis and development (training for policy analysis and development at the Ministry, and local level)
- supporting adult education in relation with individual needs and the requirements Romania has to meet in order to enter European Union.

These strategies dictate the following needs:

- To support educational projects focused on the development of school-based processes.
- To support educational projects promoting valuable elements and experience of innovative strategies in education into the reform effort.
- To promote child-centered interactive pedagogy and community involvement in education.
- To promote horizontal communication and coordination among institutions responsible for local implementation of the educational reform (such as: Local Inspectorates, Teaching Staff Centers, Universities, and Pedagogical High Schools/Colleges).
- To encourage a more productive connection between the top-down reform and the bottom-up efforts (closer links between the mentioned institutions and schools).
- To develop valuable models, in a network of key institutions (schools, kindergartens, school inspectorates, teaching staff centers, universities) that will be integrated in the system and that will provide more substantial opportunities for Roma children to succeed in education and beyond.

### ***3. EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECT: Preliminary Final Report and Exit Strategies***

This draft report is based on input and feedback from the Board of Directors of Center Education 2000+, OSF National Board for Education, as well as a group of external monitors and evaluators that specially worked on the process.

Support and guidance for the whole exercise was provided by Mr. Alexandru Crisan, Executive President of the Center Education 2000+ – Romania and Mrs. Monica Dvorski, Programs Director of the Center. Consultations were also undertaken with key institutions at the judet and school level, the Ministry of Education, councils and commissions for reform, the World Bank and other active donors. Background papers and analyses of the EDP project were assembled from the archive of the Project at central and local level.

The Preliminary final report paper was prepared by a group of independent monitors and evaluators hired by the Center.

The Preliminary report is structured into the following parts:

**3.1. INTRODUCTION: PRESENTATION OF THE PROJECT AND ITS OBJECTIVES AS PLANNED**

**3.2. PRESENTATION OF THE MAIN RESULTS**

**3.3. PRESENTATION OF THE EXIT STRATEGIES AND THE FUTURE STEPS**

**3.1. INTRODUCTION: PRESENTATION OF THE PROJECT AND ITS OBJECTIVES AS PLANNED**

This Preliminary report for the Romania *Education Development Project* (EDP/Education 2000+) summarizes the main results and issues in the project, identifies key steps in the implementation process, and outlines a clear exit strategy for the Center's further efforts in education.

The paper outlines major areas for future program development and specifies next steps. The further development of this strategy will be undertaken by Center Education 2000+ with support from Soros Open Network Romania as well as from other possible donors.

This chapter is structured into the following sections:

*3.1.1. The Strategy as response to the needs of the Romanian education system in the late 90'*

*3.1.2. Main issues identified*

*3.1.3. The Mission*

*3.1.4. Overall aim of the strategy as planned (1999-2001)*

*3.1.5. Guiding Principles*

*3.1.6. General Strategic Lines as Planned*

*3.1.7. Program Areas as Planned*

*3.1.8. Expected Outcomes*

*3.1.9. Links with World Bank-funded efforts*

*3.1.10. Integration of current education-related programs (see below)*

*3.1.11. Implementation as planned: Institutional infrastructure*

*3.1.12. Evaluation and Monitoring as planned*

*3.1.13. Sustainability and Exit Strategies.*

**3.1.1. The Strategy as Response to the Needs of the Romanian Education System in the Late 90's**

As mentioned earlier, in the period 1996-2000, with a dynamic new Minister of Education committed to change, momentum and opportunity for fundamental reform in Romanian education were greater than at any time in the previous 5 years.

During these years, reforms were hurriedly conceived and implemented in order to take advantage of the favorable political climate. In 1998 a new curriculum framework was introduced, together with other changes – a two semester instead of a trimester calendar, and different assessment tools in the first five grades of basic schooling. (Implementation

affected more than 75,000 teachers in 14,000 schools.) Teacher training for Primary for primary school education was transformed in a university type of education. Decentralization of the management and financing is envisaged as well.

There were nevertheless obstacles in the path towards reform. These came mainly from lingering conservatism in educational and political circles, the rigidity of the existing education legislation, and problematic financing of the educational sector. Reform implementation has been mostly top-down, resulting in fragmented understanding of the overall purpose and even resentment or rejection at the local and school level. Much of the reform articulation remained rhetorical (the shift is from the informative to the formative education system; reducing overload in the curriculum is seen as central to the reform) rather than specific and for educators.

Even with the steady progress in capacity building throughout the 1990s, engineering and supporting the introduction of reform was proving difficult within existing structures and human resources. Horizontal communication, strategic effort and cooperation among educational institutions were sorely lacking. Three World Bank projects targeted key reforms (general, rural and university) but have been slow to implement and disburse, due to bureaucratic, political and other obstacles.

To these, new problems were added after the elections of 2000, when – as mentioned before – the process of reform was slowed down and sometimes even stopped. Even though certain major strategy changes can be foreseen, there is not yet any evidence for that. Since 2000 the Ministry has not produced any new education policy or strategy paper, so that instead of clear (even though anti-liberal) sectoral policies one can see just certain highly specific measures (see textbooks, new format of the exams, etc.)

As a consequence of the complex situation of the Romanian education in the late 90's, the *EDP/Education 2000+ Strategy* was conceived as a response to the following needs and challenges in the system.

**A. Decentralization.** Romania's education system remains highly centralized, although there are at least three levels: the Ministry of Education; the 41 county school Inspectorates (one for each of 40 counties plus another for the special district of Bucharest); and the individual school or institution. Higher education institutions are 'autonomous', but most remain state-funded, and all must be state-accredited if they wish to issue recognized degrees and diplomas.

The Ministry of Education controls all financing and prescribes the school curricula, secondary school entry and exit examinations. The role of Inspectorates in each of 41 counties is limited to administering rather than managing funds. The Ministry of Education appoints the general inspector, his/her deputies, and the director of the regional Teachers' Centers (Casa Corpului Didactic or CCD). The other duties of the inspectorates include ensuring educational provision in the judet; opening and closing state education institutions (from kindergartens through upper secondary schools). They are responsible for staffing of teaching and non-teaching staff; for organizing in-service teacher training, mostly through the CCD; and for organization of assessment and examinations.

The general inspector of the judet is authorized to appoint head teachers. Head teachers, assisted by a School Board and a Management Board, have very limited powers, although under the new curriculum framework, approx. 30% and, after 2000, approx. 10% of the curriculum is at the option of local schools. The selection of alternative textbooks has now been given to teachers in local schools. Financial control at the school level is extremely limited, however.

The reform of the financing of education has already decentralized some aspects of educational administration from the center to Inspectorates, CCDs (Teachers' Centers), and principals of schools; modernized and diversified the source and flow of financial resources; reorganized both pre- and in-service training of teachers and principals.

*However, when the project started in 1999, there was a real need in the system to decentralize decisional mechanisms, to encourage local sustainable development and to build up ownership in schools and teachers.*

**B. National Curriculum Framework.** The introduction of a coherent National Curriculum Framework was a major step towards a needed reform in Romania. It was innovative in that it divided the curriculum into 70% core curriculum, plus a 30% local option (in terms of time-tabling, and to some extent in terms of content coverage); and also in that it encouraged cross-curricular and interdisciplinary work.

*In such a context, for the EDP a challenge was to address curriculum decentralization, to encourage school development and improvement processes and to foster teachers' capacity to innovate and not just adopt/adapt a newly created curriculum.*

**C. Educational Standards and Quality Assurance.** Evaluation of educational quality is an admitted weak point in Romanian education. There are few mechanisms for systemic quality monitoring, either in inputs (curricula, textbooks, school buildings and equipment, etc.), or processes (teaching, school and classroom organization, time-tabling, etc.), and even less of learner achievement or educational outcomes.

It is encouraging that this problem is being faced, and indeed partially addressed through the introduction of a coherent National Curriculum Framework; the piloting of a new Model for Inspection, aimed more at advice and support and less at 'inspection'; and the introduction of new, national approaches to the monitoring and measurement of educational outcomes in terms of student learning. All three of these initiatives have begun a comprehensive quality monitoring system that now seems to be in place.

*As a consequence, at the beginning of the project, there was a clear need for institutional capacity building and human resource development for institutional assessment and self-assessment of schools as well as for designing and implementing quality assurance mechanism in the system.*

**D. Teachers and Teacher Training.** Teacher salaries were and are low and falling in real terms because their annual increase cannot keep pace with inflation. At the same time, there is an over-supply of teachers, and pupil/teacher ratios are still low. A significant number of teachers were and are unqualified, especially in rural areas. The teacher education is probably the weakest component of the reform, with much of the reform-related training delayed for several years due to lack of clarity of roles and responsibilities of key players such as universities, CCDs and inspectorates; lack of clarity of the law; lack of resources; and a long delay (due to the ‘taxation question’) in the arrival of foreign technical assistance.

*So, when the project started there was a massive need for in-service teacher training at all levels. Especially urgent was training in the use of the National Curriculum Framework, but also in textbook choice, supplementary materials design and production, classroom-based assessment, and cross-curricular and interdisciplinary work. In addition, teachers and inspectors clearly needed to be trained in the use of the new Model for Inspection; training of principals of Teachers’ Centers (CCDs), of head teachers, mentors, and advisers to teachers in schools is also needed.*

**E. Access and Participation.** Educational opportunities for Roma children were and are still unacceptably low. If ‘equality’ is taken in its wider sense – of equal access to, equal survival in, equal treatment during, and equal empowerment as a result of education – then Roma children in Romania are not getting their fair share on any of these counts. *Center Education 2000+* was and is addressing some of these issues, but more is needed, especially in public awareness and in strict adherence to laws protecting children’s educational and human rights. The attitudes of people within the education system itself also needed and still need to be challenged and changed.

*Empowering Roma and Roma communities through education and the opportunities education offers was a central matter and concern for the EDP/Education 2000+ project.*

### **3.1.2. Main issues identified**

As a consequence of the above presented analysis, the following main issues have been identified, discussed and agreed in 1998 with National Education Board of OSF, Romania as being the ones to be addressed by the *EDP/Education 2000+ project*:

- In 1996 the Romanian reform in education started, but *CenterEducation 2000+* stays ahead with the grassroots movement. In 1998 and later there was a need to generate the capacity at the grassroots level.
- Key institutions (inspectorates, CCDs, schools, universities, other stakeholders) at the local level have had difficulties in making reform practical.
- The nature and quality of teacher education needed to be changed and adapted to the real needs of students.
- Community involvement and school-based approaches were needed.
- Innovations and alternatives remained outside the mainstream education system.

- One prevailing obstacle to reform implementation was a chronic under-financing of education.

### **3.1.3. The Mission**

In order to address the main issues mentioned above, OSF Romania, and later Center Education 2000+ through its mission in education conceived so as to promote *decentralization and greater local autonomy and democracy; equal opportunity in education, learner-centered education, greater involvement of the community in school life, and development of models that are replicable. Given Romania's legacy from the communist period, it was and it is still essential to develop open and global society principles and processes, from the classroom to the judet to the Ministry itself. It is for these reasons that the EDP/Education 2000+ project focused on addressing the first four points of the above-mentioned main issues and firmly stayed within the mainstream system. EDP was not entitled or able to do anything about the financial situation of the education system as such, even though its intervention gave an important support to the 8 pilot judets as well as to thousands of students and teachers.*

### **3.1.4. Overall aim of the strategy as planned (1999-2001)**

The overall aim of this Strategy was to create a model for local implementation of education reform that promotes:

- Horizontal communication and coordination among institutions responsible for local implementation of the educational reform, called *key institutions* (such as: Local Inspectorates, Teaching Staff Centers, Universities, Pedagogical High Schools – Colleges);
- Connection between the top-down reform with bottom-up efforts (closer links between the mentioned institutions and schools).

The Strategy intended to help reform implementation at three levels:

- Systemic level – undertaking institutional development and capacity building that enables Inspectorates, CCDs, Universities, Colleges to support schools;
- School level – empowering school directors, teachers, students and parents to take more responsibility in improving the quality of education;
- Community level – community development and closer involvement of community in school life.

The overall aim of the *EDP/Education 2000+* was to create a local infrastructure in which educational institutions have clear cooperative roles helping to introduce and support better management of the schools, improved teaching and learning, increased involvement of the community, and for all, equity of opportunity.

In particular, the EDP:

- created models for local implementation of education reform that helped connecting the top down reform with bottom up efforts, making the reform practical, and one that can be replicated nationwide,

- demonstrated good practice and persuaded the government to spread models and approaches system-wide,
- addressed the educational needs of the Roma population by: a) facilitating institutional change; and b) building the capacity of Roma people to participate in education and the education reform.

a. Generally speaking, the identified institutions were working in closer cooperation on common tasks such as projects, preparation of materials, training programs development etc.

b. The strategy included a focus on Roma issues, especially aiming to facilitate institutional change, which improves the education system's responsiveness to the educational needs of the Roma community, and to build the capacity of Roma people to participate in education and the education reform.

c. The EDP strategy included also public information on the importance of educational reform both at the national level and at the local level, as supported by the Center, according to the identified local needs.

### ***3.1.5. Guiding Principles***

The strategy was built on the following principles:

- Each activity of the *EDP/Education 2000+* had to link ultimately to a set of changed teaching and learning methods in the classroom.
- The *EDP/Education 2000+* required clear and consistent commitment to open exchange of information and analysis; the Center was seen during the process as a facilitator of open information and consultation, rather than yet another top-down communicator of centrally produced information.
- Defining or redefining quality and equity of access in Romanian education and for an open society was a central theme and conscious activity in the *EDP/Education 2000+*. Many in the education system, political sphere and broader society in Romania appear to harbor strong biases about elite education, excellence as demonstrated by Olympiads, and the belief that education needs to serve primarily or only the normal children, not those with special needs.
- The *EDP/Education 2000+* operated in support of a quality reform of education for an open society, not in support of a Minister or any political agenda or timetable. Once the political will for the reform was reduced, the Center adjusted its own effort in accordance with its mission.
- Wherever possible *EDP/Education 2000+* helped improve the effectiveness of existing institutions and programs, rather than create new ones (Romania's institutional structure in education is already extensive.)
- Each pilot key institution or school unit has developed its own unique approach, according to the needs of the area.

### ***3.1.6. General Strategic Lines as Planned.***

The strategy of the EDP was to develop the model for local implementation of education reform in a number of pilot judets. There were two waves in selecting those judets: wave 1 (Bucuresti, Galati, Iasi, Cluj) and wave 2 (Constanta, Hunedoara, Timis, Sibiu). The strategy involved the key institutions described above working in coordination with each other and with a network of pilot schools (about 100;12 in each judet). In each pilot judet, the key institutions were: a university department in education, the local inspectorates for education, the Teachers' Centers (CCDs), and pedagogical high schools (and/or colleges). Other local leaders or stakeholders in education were involved as well.

The model involved developing horizontal communication and coordination among the key institutions and, where necessary, undertaking institutional development and capacity-building that enabled them to support the reforms in teaching and learning at the classroom level. At the school level, the model helped to empower school directors, teachers and students to take more responsibility and initiative for educational reform and quality improvements. The model also stimulated greater involvement of the community in education. It also included efforts to increase public information about reform implementation through a variety of media.

A part of the strategy was the common task for partners involved in *EDP/Education 2000+* implementation on local level as a tool and/or driving force to encourage identified key institutions, schools and community to work together, and to develop horizontal communication on systemic, school and community level. Process of school development and improvement planning was highly successful, uniting all those involved.

The 8 judets in which the model was developed were representative of the conditions that exist in Romanian education. The overall selection included both urban and rural areas, schools at various levels of education, general academic and technical/vocational schools, well-resourced schools and poor schools, and areas in which various national minorities coexist.

Roma and the improvement of education for Roma was included directly in the strategy's overall aims rather than delegating this point to a separate section or within a program or two. This strategic approach reflected the belief that the support for minorities in education should be included and integrated into overall strategy and into all education programs. The focus on Roma specifically reflected their importance as a very large minority in Romania (some estimates say as much as 2,5 million), but also to the fact that this minority continues to be the most marginalized and discriminated one in Romania, and which needs extra support.

In each of the 8 pilot judets a Working Group consisting of 7 to 8 people was created. The role of the Working Groups was to help communicate the *EDP/Education 2000+* mission and strategy, to provide guidance criteria for the programs, to ensure linkages across programs and institutions, and to design and help conduct training programs. Working groups were chosen from sources such as identified key institutions, including headmasters, and informal local leaders in education.

The Working Group membership was constituted from: one school head teacher specialist (School Improvement Program), one community specialist (community development), two specialists on teacher training (for pre- and in-service teacher training), one management expert (for school development planning as a common task for all key institutions), one Roma specialist (for Roma capacity building), and one information officer (for public information). One specialist of the Working Group was responsible for development of educational materials, with a possibility to hire a new member of the WG (professional writer, specialist for educational materials) in the second year.

### ***3.1.7. Program Areas as Planned***

Program areas complemented each other. More specified program development took place during the preparatory phase, on the grounds of consultations with the representatives of the key institutions and other institutions and organizations. The higher education component has been incorporated into the EDP over the implementation period.

This chapter briefly describes the program areas as they were planned in 1999. The next chapter will present the main results registered in the framework of these areas as well as the conceptual switching that occurred during the implementation of the project.

#### ***3.1.7.1. The School Improvement Program***

##### **Objectives:**

- To generate self-motivation of schools to change.
- To foster external pressure and support for schools to change.
- To support shared leadership within the school.
- To help schools to better understand and address the needs of the students, parents and community.
- To assist schools in developing the mutual support mechanism within the schools to improve the teaching and learning process.
- To model the change process for the benefit of local institutions, policy makers, and other schools.
- To improve the culture of schools to decrease the dropout rate, lack of attendance and improve overall learning and school success for Roma children.

##### **Program description:**

The Center supported during the project the schools' interests to take more responsibility for decision making, for the educational quality and for the community involvement. The Center trained school head teacher specialists, who gradually became trainers. The program included training seminars, workshops, and study visits to different schools that offer good examples. The core teams of schools received training on need assessment, school improvement, managing the change and school development planning. The involved schools demonstrated initiative and shared leadership in developing document

such as school development plan, school profile, or set of self-evaluating criteria. The Center also played a role in helping schools to network, organize and support courses and seminars and other relevant activities. The School Improvement Program had begun with an intensive work with a limited number (10 up to 12) of schools in each pilot judet (wave 1 – first year and wave 2 – second year). In order to reach and benefit Roma children, this program targeted schools, which are in communities with a high percentage of Roma, and/or schools that Roma children are attending. Out of the total number of schools targeted in each Judet, one fifth constituted this category. Schools participating in this program also made efforts to design within their overall plan the means by which dropouts or children who have never attended school may be given the chance to return to school and to be later integrated into regular classes. The support for such a program required (see below the Second Chance Program) curriculum development, educational material development, teacher training and equipment provision.

### ***3.1.7.2. The Link between School and Community***

#### **Objectives:**

- To strengthen the link between the school as a resource for community development and the community as a potential learning environment that influences school life according to its needs.
- To get parents more involved in educational needs of their own children.
- To motivate parents and community members to support the development of school.
- To support the establishment of Parent-Teacher Associations on a local level and later on national level to become a partner and/or a pressure group for state policy makers in education.
- To promote community advocacy for the school needs and on education reform.
- To promote the involvement of broader community, such as businesses, church, NGOs etc., in school.
- To help schools with managing and raising finances.

#### **Program description:**

This program explored different possibilities and models of community involvement. It included training for school leaders and teachers, as well as workshops and round tables with community members. The program investigated successful models within Romania and from other countries, such as the Step-by-Step and Community Schools. Moreover, the outside involvement of the community for getting children who have been out of school back into school was necessary. This program was a vital link to the school improvement program for meeting the needs of children, especially Roma children, to get back into school.

### ***3.1.7.3. Teacher Training***

#### **Objectives:**

- To improve the quality of teacher training in both pre-service and in-service teacher education institutions.
- To provide professional development of top personnel of the key institutions.

- To help Universities and CCDs to better understand and assess the teaching needs.
- To help them to develop new approaches and plans for teacher training addressing these needs.
- To assist Universities and CCDs in getting better understanding of different models of teacher training delivery.
- To provide expertise and/or consultancy as needed in these institutions, specifically in order to address the identified teaching needs, especially regarding needs of Roma children, but also, addressing the majority about this particular minority.
- To facilitate professional partnerships between Romanian institutions and their international counterparts.

**Program description:**

The Center worked on building the capacity of Universities, CCDs and colleges to rethink the way they train teachers and respond to teachers' needs. The program emphasized a learner-centered approach to education. As such, during the process the Center organized institution capacity building or institution development; technical assistance and training; and cooperation among institutions on the redesign of curricula for teacher-education programs. The program built on the experience and expertise of the Step-by-Step, Reading and Critical Thinking Programs.

***3.1.7.4. Key Institution Network Development***

**Objectives:**

- To provide assistance in professional staff development in key institutions.
- To enhance capacity building within the key institutions in supporting schools.
- To involve key institutions in the process of school development planning.
- To build horizontal communication and cooperation among the key institutions.
- To facilitate the sharing and improvement of education resources.
- To organize regular common meetings on specific topics for all key institutions.
- To support joint projects for institutions to work together in researching educational needs, supporting schools, developing new modules.
- To assist in developing, piloting, and disseminating user friendly educational materials.
- To stimulate the key institutions involved in reform implementation to adapt and/or to create new policies, which will meet the educational needs of Roma students.

**Program description:**

This program will try to build up horizontal communication among Universities, CCDs, School Inspectorates, and Pedagogical High Schools in each pilot judet. Network created in each pilot judet also had the opportunity to cooperate with each other on the common task. The process of school development planning created such a 'push and pull' system. Schools have been required to develop their own school development plan, with the involvement of community, and to report this plan to Inspectorates. Inspectorates received training in assessing and monitoring schools, and many Universities and CCDs have been trained to support schools to develop such a plan. Program targeted the top personnel and core teams from all key institutions. Training has been provided for them

on international education reform, needs assessment, school improvement, managing change, and school development planning. Regarding the Roma minority, awareness training for the key institutions was also a necessary component in the project. Support was also given to other joint projects for institutions to work together in researching educational needs, supporting schools, and developing new modules. Program activities included strategic planning, joined workshops and seminars among institutions, capacity building within the institutions, study visits, twinning with foreign institutional counterparts etc. Key institutions developed, piloted and disseminated user friendly educational materials.

#### **3.1.7.5. Public Information**

##### **Objectives:**

- To raise the educators' and citizens' awareness on relevant education issues through different media, including TV, newspapers etc. Regarding Roma, to raise awareness about the difficulties this minority encounters in education.
- To provide public information on education reform in more accessible way (brochures, leaflets, newsletters etc.)
- To publicize the activities of the *EDP/Education 2000+*.
- To spread information about good educational practice.
- To enhance the documentation of the program development process.
- To provide information to Roma communities about their rights, opportunities and possibilities for receiving an education.

##### **Program description:**

This program organized forums on education, developing information materials and working with a media. The program had two main strands: a) public information on education reform, and b) publicized activities of the *EDP/Education 2000+*. Activities have been initially focused in the four first-wave institutions, but these efforts have been linked on the national level. The Center has selected different partner professional information agencies in Romania to carry out this work. The Center had an information officer(s) operating on local and/or national levels. Again, it was assured that Roma issues were covered in this program by a certain percentage of media output. Moreover, any media regarding Roma were consulted on by a representative of the Roma community to eliminate unrecognized bias or prejudice.

#### **3.1.7.6. Roma capacity building in education**

The overall portfolio of *EDP/Education 2000+* is divided into two parts. The first part, which is the local reform implementation model and which has been carried out in all 8 of the pilot judets, from the very beginning integrated Roma into each of the five areas. These are school improvement, the link between school and community, teacher training, key institution network development and public information. The second strand of the strategy, ***Roma Capacity Building in Education***, remained apart and focused only on Roma since the local model cannot address all the needs of Roma in education; a broader approach on a national level is needed in order to accomplish this.

## **Objectives**

- To help support those elements of education which are specific to this ethnicity, such as their language, culture and history, not only for this minority but for sharing with the majority society as well.
- To build capacity within the Roma community itself in education.
- To support the professional development of Roma teachers and their involvement in the education of Roma students.
- To fill the gaps in existing educational materials in Romania involving Roma, for both majority and minority pupils.
- To provide a model for older dropouts to gain an elementary education and to receive job training.

## **Program description:**

This was not one program, but rather was made up of different components, namely a) support for Roma teachers, b) educational materials development, and c) vocational training for older dropouts.

The first component, *Support for Roma teachers*, encompassed the professional development of Roma teachers first and foremost by offering scholarships to those Roma who would like to enter the teaching profession. Moreover, training was offered to help them with their entrance examinations into the pedagogical institutions.

*Educational materials development.* There are different types of books and materials, which have been developed, targeted for Roma students and for majority children. Books with a focus on developing literacy in Roma children have been developed in Romanian and Romany languages. Materials for majority students and/or mixed classes have also been developed, but with less focus on literacy. Writing workshops, support for groups of writers and illustrators, study visits and exchange programs have also been a component of this project. Awareness workshops have been given for authors and publishing houses to be aware of content in educational materials to be sensitive to Romany people. Another component of this program was the development of educational materials for remedial intensive (catching up) courses for dropouts.

*Vocational training for older dropouts.* This program, unlike the other described within the school improvement program, targeted Roma between 14 and 30. The program required new ministerial regulations, school curricula development, and teacher training. Our program aimed to ensure the generalization of vocational training and remedial teaching for older Roma dropouts.

### ***3.1.8. Expected Outcomes***

The strategy envisaged a three to four-year implementation period with the following outcomes:

**Replicable models of local educational reform implementation that:**

- have reformed pre-service and in-service teacher training through restructured institutions and programs;
- show how to improve education quality at the school level;
- have developed models of multicultural coexistence and mechanisms of school and community cooperation;
- have established networks and linkages among key institutions that redefined the process of control in education;
- have supported institutional change that improves the systems responsiveness to educational needs of Roma;
- have developed concrete, practical tools for educators, such as supplemental learning materials, teachers' guides, school development guides, video documentation etc.
- have increased the capacity of Roma teachers and students to participate in education;
- have ensured an accurate information about these models to be shared widely in Romania.

### ***3.1.9. Links with World Bank-funded efforts***

The need and opportunity for a synergy between the Center Education 2000+ effort with ongoing World Bank Projects was compelling from the very beginning. In Romania, the need was not to develop jointly a new World Bank loan but rather to help make use of substantial funds already borrowed by the Government by the World Bank and which remained unspent.

In many respects, the strategy of the Center with the EDP/Education 2000+ initiative overlapped or complemented that of the World Bank/Ministry of Education. The World Bank and Ministry of Education's Education Reform Project funds covered areas relevant to the Center's strategy, including curriculum development, assessment services, textbook provision, teacher training, and capacity building in education management and financing. The Center was coordinating with these activities and complemented the World Bank Project activity at the local level.

With an appropriate coordination, it happened that Center Education 2000+ helped to accelerate the disbursement of funds . In some cases (see analysis below) this collaboration led to co-funding and coordination in implementation of some of the WB loan components (impact study for curriculum and impact study for the Rural Education Pilot Project). In addition, the Center's model of local reform implementation is successful and replicable. As such it constitutes a good example and a starting point for the new WB Project concerning the Improvement of Education in Poor Rural Areas in Romania.

In such a context, the main areas of cooperation with the Ministry of Education (based on a formal agreement signed in 1999 and a special order issued by the Minister in 1999) were (see presentation below):

- Institutional Capacity Building (School improvement processes)

- Human Resource Development (Teacher education reform, etc.)
- Rural and poor areas development (40% of the pilot schools were from these types of areas)
- Policy Analysis and development (two overall impact studies, the most important ever carried out in Romania)
- Publicity and social marketing of the reform
- Creating a lobby in the society for the education change (see National Forums on Education).

### ***3.1.10. Integration of current education-related programs (see below)***

Some of the education-related programs run at first by the OSF and later by the Center Education 2000+ were gradually integrated in the *EDP/Education 2000+* effort. The best example in this respect includes the Critical Thinking program that involves some 40 teachers distributed in schools all over the country. The program promotes teaching strategies and techniques that could effectively be used in the frames of the program areas defined. Nevertheless, the human resources involved were of great importance in identifying further partner institutions and teacher training needs.

The best results were registered in extending the RWCT program by inserting and integrating it into the *EDP/Education 2000+* (as such the number of trainers and the number of schools involved has been raised) and an important University strand has been created.

The same happened with the Step-by-Step program. In the framework of *EDP/Education 2000+* SBS schools have received RWCT training for teachers that will take over the education of those children that have graduated Primary education against the SBS model.

### ***3.1.11. Implementation as planned: Institutional infrastructure***

The EDP strategy required from the very beginning that the Center Education 2000+ play during time different roles in its implementation. It involved building relations with the identified key institutions, forming the school network, assessing needs, designing programs, establishing policies, negotiating program resources and partnerships, coordinating and linking program activities, and monitoring and evaluating activities.

The Center created excellent institutional capacities involved in overall strategy and implementation work. As such, it guided the efforts to set overall policy where appropriate, and to take a national perspective on the model of reform implementation that is being developed.

In fact, it was agreed that the implementation of the *EDP/Education 2000+* would necessitate capacity building within the Center. The Executive President, the Program Director as well as the Education Program Coordinators have been thoroughly trained in order to take on the new role of facilitation. The new strategy implied important shifts in

how staff time is utilized and on the skills and knowledge required of an education program coordinator.

The institutional structure has been a flexible one during the process. The structure was mostly *task-oriented, ad hoc* and *flexible* to change as the needs of the program change. The central management had:

- An Executive President (the former EDP Director) seconded by a Board of Directors (4 other important personalities of Romanian education and civil society: one expert teacher, a university professor, the Director of the biggest educational publishing house in Romania and the most successful business woman in Romania.)
- A Program Director focused on the conceptual and financial administration of the program.
- A group of full-time program coordinators and assistants
- A body of independent consultants
- A body of more than 60 highly specialized trainers
- A body of 35 implementation monitors
- A huge number of external collaborators (more than 400 per year).

Each coordinator worked with a team of external collaborators. This included contracted specialists, short-term consultants, volunteer workers or student interns who supported them. Additional expert staff (foreign experts based in Romania) on a full time or part time basis have also been hired. Donor partners have been asked to sponsor positions or provide expertise.

### ***3.1.12. Evaluation and Monitoring asPlanned***

Program evaluation was a combination of self-evaluation, peer review, and ongoing external evaluation. One member of the working group in each pilot judet has been assigned for ensuring that monitoring and evaluation take place.

Each program area had its own plan and tools for self-evaluation and peer review that were developed locally during detailed planning of the program (see special Chapter below). Some elements of self-evaluation will be common across the different implementation sites. Because networking is considered an important aspect of the project, peer review of programs across institutions and geographic areas was integral to the evaluation process (e.g. managers of schools in other cities were invited to given schools to review progress there). This approach had also had benefits in terms of public information and replication of innovations under the project. Evaluation indicators and tools have been based on the objectives and outcomes defined under the strategy.

There will be an external impact study planned for the autumn of 2002 in all eight pilot judets. It will be undertaken by a team comprised of Romanian specialists influential at the national level and maybe a selected international specialist who has prior experience in Romania, in education reform elsewhere in East, Central Europe.

This team would focus on the overall effectiveness of the strategy and its relation to the broader environment of Romanian education, economy and society. It would also monitor the effectiveness and help digest the results of the self-evaluation efforts in each of the 8 models.

### ***3.1.13. Sustainability and Exit Strategy as Planned***

The OSF Romania through the *Center Education 2000+* anticipated an initial involvement of 3 to 4 years. At the beginning of the project, the OSF and from December 1999, the *Center Education 2000+* was very much the driver of program development and implementation. It also funded most of the start-up costs of the Working Group, training and initial implementation of all programs. Over time, the facilitation, leadership and management in the various programs became rooted in the school network and key institutions supported under the project.

As it has been envisaged from the beginning the Romanian trainers and other professionals developed through the project later became resources to other regions in Romania. This has been already achieved so that the replication of the model doesn't depend on expensive further foreign technical assistance.

In conceiving the project, partnerships have been explored with a variety of Romanian national institutions and other founders and implementers from abroad. This partnership functioned in an excellent way, the most important evidence being that in the framework of the project other financing bodies have been attracted:

- Austrian/Swiss Governments (Improving Education for Roma and Disadvantaged areas)
- Norwegian Government (Second Chance Project)
- Balkan Youth Fund (Guidance for Students)
- European Training Foundation of the EU (Education for Roma)
- European Commission (Open Guidance and Advising for youngsters)
- PHARE Projects in Romania (teacher training and educational policy adapted to real market place needs etc.) (See below).

A sustainable exit strategy has been developed and it is already under implementation. At the same time the Center has approached the education Sub-board with a request of some new funds for such an effort (see below).

## ***3.2. PRESENTATION OF THE MAIN STEPS AND RESULTS OF THE PROJECT***

The *Education 2000+* Programme, founded in 1999 and initially designed for a 3 year period has recently been replanned so as that, instead of ending on December 2001 – as initially planned – it extends up to June 2002. Thus, the project and the 2001 – 2002 school year shall wind up at the same time.

During all these 3 ½ years, the Programme has maintained its distinct identity. Its various programme lines aimed at developing certain educational reform implementation measures that, once proved to be functional and successful, could be replicated at a national level. Of course, the idea was not to replicate certain models without differentiation but to fully comprehend and use mechanisms that already proved to be feasible and therefore suitable for being adopted to the needs and aspirations of all institutions involved in the project (schools, school inspectorates, Teaching Staff Centers, Universities and other partner institutions).

The main target of this programme (see above) was to generate a structural impact on the Romanian education system by demultiplying certain models, processes and innovatory mechanisms in order to encourage and sustain the transit to a new educational model.

The preliminary results of the programme are listed below. The above mentioned impact study planned to begin on September 2002 shall represent a thorough analysis of the outcomes with regard to the real situation existing in all schools from the targeted counties as well as from the entire region influenced by EDP-Education 2000+.

The presentation of the main results will be done according to the following format:

3.2.1. The preparation phase and the start up of the operational phase (1999):  
short presentation

3.2.2. The main shifts in the strategy of the program (2000-2001/2002).  
Evolutions

### ***3.2.1. The preparation phase and the start up of the operational phase (1999): a brief presentation***

In 1999, the Project was divided into two phases: the *preparatory phase* (January – August) and the *operational one* (September – December). This subchapter aims at shortly reviewing the main steps of each phase. In a further chapter of the preliminary report, a special stress will be put on some of the implementation *models* that the Project started to offer to the intermediary and local institutions from its very beginning.

***A. Preparatory phase (January – August).*** The preparatory phase of the *EDP/Education 2000+* project had three main objectives:

- ❑ Create the institutional and managerial infrastructure of the project;
- ❑ Establish the working methodology for this infrastructure;
- ❑ Stimulate training and various other activities in the judets' key institutions (inspectorates, teaching training centers, faculties, pedagogical colleges, etc.) as well as in the pilot schools in the six program areas initially designed: School Improvement, Teacher Training, School and Community, Key Institutions Network, Roma Capacity Building and Public Information.

The following concrete steps have been taken:

- (a) Signing a formal agreement with the Ministry of Education in 1999, and encouraging the issue of a special order of the Ministry for the implementation of the project (see *Annexes*)
- (b) Institutional capacity and human resource analysis in those counties that had, at that moment, higher institutions of primary and secondary teacher education; questionnaires were used and the results were presented in a synthetic report.
- (c) Roma students' and teachers' need analysis as well as the analysis of other human resources involved in educational projects for Roma students.
- (d) Bolstering infrastructure of the *EDP/Education 2000+* project implementation at the local level by:
  - Selecting, on a competitive basis, the pilot counties (called implementation centers – Bucharest, Cluj, Galati, and Iasi)
  - Establishing contacts and formal commitments with the key institutions at the level of those counties;
  - Selecting *Working Groups*, made up of representatives of these institutions and trained to offer educational advice and professional support for the implementing actions at the local level;
  - Training the working group members in view of accomplishing the local implementation plans; training activities for the key staff in pilot institutions (inspectors, experts from the teacher training centers, headmasters, heads of departments etc.)
  - Making needs analysis in the pilot counties;
  - Drawing up a list of criteria to select 10 to 12 pilot schools in each county;
  - Selecting a pilot schools network, on the basis of a school development projects competition;
  - Building up teams of headmasters and project coordinators from the pilot schools for local advisory activity (understand the OSF mission and strategy, as they are defined in the *EDP/Education 2000+* project; project management; team building; school development/improvement; management of change);
  - Accomplishing strategies and local implementation plans for each county for the years 1999-2000;
  - Developing terms of reference for the pilot schools in the network;
  - Developing working instruments for pilot schools: *The Guide of the Pilot Schools, Initial evaluation sheets of pilot schools, Instruments concerning the monitoring of the project quality in pilot schools* (see annexes to the report: Annex no2, Annexe no 3, Annex no 4, Annex no 5, Annex no 8)
  - Providing equipment to each school or other kind of pilot institution;
  - Developing the necessary planning materials to draw up the next phases of the project;
  - Improving everyday classroom activities.

### ***B. The operational phase (September – December 1999)***

The operational phase has been characterized, first of all, by the project decentralization. The activities in the framework of this project – coordinated, in the preliminary phase,

from the central headquarters of the OSF and then the Center Education 2000+ – have emphasized the level of the pilot judet. As a result, the activity of the key institutions and pilot schools has been more dynamic.

### ***B.1. Types of activities***

The activities of the operational phase in 1999 aimed at developing institutional capacity and building human resources. These two aspects had in view to improve the instructional and institutional management process, as well as the learning environment in schools.

**a.** From the point of view of their ***location***, these activities have been developed at three levels:

- ❑ Classroom level
- ❑ Pilot school level
- ❑ County level, i.e. in the above mentioned key institutions.

**b.** From the point of view of their ***coverage*** they can be clustered as:

- ❑ Activities that exclusively involved the teams of certain pilot schools or key institutions
- ❑ Inter-institutional activities that encouraged projects developed in partnership.

**c.** As for the categories of ***target population*** involved in training, we are referring to:

- ❑ School inspectors
- ❑ experts from teacher training centers
- ❑ Managerial teams in schools (headmasters, members of the school boards, heads of departments, etc.)
- ❑ Pre-university and university teachers
- ❑ Parents, community members, local leaders.

### ***3.2.2. The main shifts in the strategy of the program (2000-2001/2002). Evolutions***

As from 2000, a second “wave” of pilot counties was selected, in compliance with the above mentioned procedure used for the first “wave”. At the same time, the project suffered a series of essential strategic shifts.

The main strategic directions shaped during the development of the project are presented below. Mainly, the shifts occurring after the beginning of 2000 can be accounted for as follows:

- As expected, the program lines - initially grouped on six categories - evolved, focusing on a lower number of priorities;
- This process defined and promoted certain “main action lines” that regrouped the initial six lines by integrating them into a vision that is not only coherent but also logical.

Consequently, *the initial program lines* were integrated in several *strategic directions* with a high sustainability potential. These directions shall encompass all the lines of the initial project, now regrouped from another prospective.

These strategic lines shall regulate, on one hand, the long – term vision of the Center and, on the other hand, its immediate and future development strategy, namely:

- a. *Building institutional capacities* (with regard to the school and institution improvement and development processes – and, in this framework, participatory management; school team structuring and professional development; relations between school – community – parents – other parties involved; cross-institution communication development; involvement of the Roma population in the educational process; attracting additional funds; advertising the reform process and creating a favourable public opinion, etc. This also includes the conversion of other educational institutions into learning organisations.
- b. *Developing human resources*: extending the training offer to fields less approached during the reform process (“classroom practice” - top-of-the-line teaching methods; co-operative learning; active learning; multiple intelligence, etc. – everything a teacher should do for the “extracurricular” life of the pupils). Education for democracy, education for personal life, unconventional methods for informal education are going to constitute as many action fields for our human resource development projects, only this time they are going to be destined for pupils. In fact, the Centre has created and continuously perfected its own trainers and, in the near future, we are going to place on the market a comprehensive training offer for fields complementary to those usually covered by the Romanian training organisations.
- c. *Sustain local and national analysis and development of sectorial and global policies*, ranging from general fields of interest to the development of school or other type of institutional strategies;
- d. Developing and implementing an interactive and innovative curriculum (primary education curriculum, school-tailored curriculum, training for the implementation of the new curriculum, curriculum adapted for remedial teaching, for young school dropouts – “Second Chance”, academic and adult education curriculum);
- e. Supporting the EU accession process through education (approaching topical education fields: adult education, e-education, senior counselling);
- f. Sustaining SEE regional programs with a view to gradually create a regional network of organisations that could provide educational counselling for the comprehensive education reform processes.

**3.2.3. Project result categories.** The main project result categories are presented below, in accordance with the strategic areas that aggregated during 2000 - 2001 – 2002.

**3.2.3.1.** The following activity categories **shaped in the field of institutional capacity building (key institutions and schools)**:

- Supporting the development of pilot school local strategies and strategic planning capacity (A);
- Creating an appropriate learning climate and environment (B);
- Developing partnerships between pilot schools and other schools or institutions (C);

- Initiating school networks based on the local needs and interests (C);
- Specific training for school development in *Center Education 2000+* Resource Centers from Pucioasa and other regions (D);
- Institutional development of children from disadvantaged regions (“Second Chance” Program – Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs from Norway; school rehabilitation – Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs; school-tailored curriculum / pre-vocational programs for disadvantaged rural regions – co-financed by KulturKontakt Austria and Center Education 2000+) (E).

#### ***A. Supporting the development of pilot school local strategies and strategic planning capacity***

Supporting the development of pilot school local strategies and strategic planning capacity was one of the most important features of the project as a whole. The essential elements of this veritable “program line” are presented below:

***A.1. Sources for data*** – the Center’s policies, documents on planning strategy and practice, projects of the pilot educational units (schools, inspectorates, universities departments, Teaching Staff Centers).

#### ***A.2. Planning mechanism***

##### ***a. Framework and approach***

According to the principles of the institutional capacity building, the educational units (schools, inspectorates, university departments, teaching staff centres) had to produce and to present planning documents (strategy, implementation plan, narrative plan) for each year of the project related to the overall project strategy and the regional and local specificity and needs.

In this respect, the pilot units’ strategies had to take into consideration:

- key elements of the Center’s policies and its priorities and goals for each year
- planning technical requirements and rules
- regional and local specific aspects.

To provide a clear and coherent framework for the planning process at the institutional level, there were agreed some general principles and criteria:

- keeping the coherence and the continuity in planning
- taking into consideration the EDP/Education 2000+ project’s specific features
- assuming the diversity and the innovation
- building on clear analyses and setting the priorities
- observing the rules of an efficient planning
- applying the agreed planning tools
- valuing the opportunities and the strengths of the pilot units
- encouraging the partnership in planning.

From the strategic point of view, a particular emphasis was put on the: internal coherence of each institutional strategy, continuity in a long range approach, connections between different pilot institutions, consistency between all the strategies at the local level (in the framework of each judet).

### ***b. Operational aspects. Planning teams***

To encourage the pilot institutions to learn and to practice the planning – as a condition of capacity building – the Center efficiently managed during three years a planning process, extended to all pilot units.

This process had as main stages:

- working seminars with local experts
- development of planning tools
- dissemination of strategic demands and operational tools
- working sessions at local level
- development of the strategies and operational plans
- analyses of the strategies and plans
- provision of the information on suggested correctives
- elaboration of the final version

For the strategies and plans analyses and adjustment, various methods were used by the Centers' managers and experts: documentary analyses, comparative analyses, SWOT analyses, interviews with experts, interactive seminars.

To support the development of the strategies at the level of the educational units, the Center constantly provided training courses and counseling activities for the local planning teams. The analyses of the pilot units strategies and plans revealed a continuous improvement of the planning products in terms of: internal coherence, ways and methods of planning, missions definition, objectives, results, target groups, types of activity, identification of strong points, approach on partnership and sustainability, approach on human resources, openness to change, fields of interest.

The relevant progress registered (the approach on continuity, the types of main objectives, the focus on human resources) demonstrated that the pilot units became more and more interested in identifying and improving the elements able to contribute to the school empowerment in terms of capacity building.

In the same respect, the training courses focused on planning, the dissemination of the planning good practices, and the institutional cooperation in the planning field really contributed to the development of the institutional capacity at the level of the pilot units.

### ***A.3. Planning tools***

To provide a coherent planning, all the educational pilot units used the same tools: strategy, narrative plan, implementation plan.

***a. The strategy***, as an overall approach included: the presentation of the institution, SWOT results, vision, mission, principles, values, objectives, target groups, program

lines, types of activities, types of resources, managerial tasks, partners, connections with other projects, expected results, self- monitoring, self- evaluation.

**b. The narrative plan** – yearly derived from the strategy- included a detailed presentation of each planned activity: data, location, coordinator, objectives, target group, program line, needed resources, partners, expected results, self- monitoring, and self- evaluation.

**c. The implementation plan** – as an operational tool- included for each activity of a planning year: data, location, participants, and financial resources.( see Annex no 1)

Due to the coherence in the field of planning approach and tools, actually there was an active planning network acting in the framework of the EDP/Education 2000+ project.

#### **A.4. Focuses**

In order to fully contribute to the desirable educational change, mainly in the field of capacity building, the planning teams had to focus on:

- innovative activities and their impact on schools
- professional development of schools' human resources
- team building at the level of the educational institutions
- concrete institutional needs and priorities
- motivation and involvement of schools' actors
- active participation of the school children
- increase of parents interest
- training based on needs analyses
- awareness raising of the community
- enlargement of institutional financial and material resources
- encouragement of various partnerships
- providing condition for institutional development and change.

To contribute to the growth of institutional capacity, the Center constantly encouraged the local planning teams to value (through their strategies and plans) organizational opportunities, success and strong points. According to its policies as refers to the professional empowerment of human resources of the educational organizations, the Center had a particular focus on training and counseling the planning working groups at the level of the pilots units.

#### **A.5. Main Results and Facts**

##### **a. The planning process contribution to the capacity building**

Due to the Center's policies as concerns the planning process, the educational units included into the project (particularly the pilot schools) presently have concrete bodies of trained human resources who are already used to plan together for the growth of their institutional capacity.

From the point of view of capacity building, the analyses of the strategies and plans developed by the pilots units revealed that – due to their planning efforts – human resources gradually learned to:

- focus on particular objectives related to capacity building
- use the strong points of the institution for developing its capacity
- value the external opportunities for the achievement of the institutional goals.

The training, the counseling and the practice of planning generated **changes relevant to** the organizational culture. By learning to plan, preparing for planning, working together, getting new attitudes and behaviors – in the framework of the planning process- the people of the pilot units contributed to a cultural change at the level of the organizations.

Taking into account this cultural change and the human resources new competencies, the planning process made a relevant contribution in the field of institutional capacity building.

***b. Success in capacity building (according to the SWOT analyses)***

The analyses of the pilot units strategies (particularly of their SWOT studies) revealed that the major part of these units got (through the implementation process) relevant elements in the field of capacity building:

- practices of planning, implementing, monitoring, evaluating organizational changes and institutional partnerships
- relevant professional competencies of the human resources
- new attitudinal and behavioral patterns
- use of innovation and change
- strong institutional groups used to work together
- experience in resources management and growth
- increase of the institutional social prestige
- various relationships with the external environment

As a main consequence of their strategic planning and implementation exercise, people of the pilot units: understood the importance of capacity building, learned to identify and value its key points, involved themselves in actions with a relevant impact on institutional capacity development.

***c. Needs for the future***

According to the results of the institutional SWOT studies, the pilot institutions got (through their strategies' implementation) relevant strong points and a real understanding of the change and of the opportunities. On the other hand, the SWOT studies reveal that from the point of view of capacity building, the educational institutions have to face internal weak points and external constraints.

To value success and opportunities and to overcome risks, constraints and weak points of their capacity building, the educational units (particularly the schools) need to be supported and encouraged by a follow-up process, as a continuation of the Center's EDP project (see Exit strategies).

***B. Creating an appropriate learning climate and environment***

According to the project philosophy, a climate conducive to learning has been considered one important characteristic of an effective school. It means that:

- Morale is due to active involvement and responsibility on the part of the students
- Recognition and fairness influence students' behavior
- The learning environment is attractive, with work display
- Communication and relationships with parents and members of the community are good and they are involved in school life.

The most successful schools in the project have taken initiatives and have been supported in setting the right climate in their schools, addressing such issues as:

***B.1. Improvements to the physical environment:***

- classrooms in pilot schools have been equipped with modern furniture
- each pilot school and key institution got computers, photocopiers, printers etc.
- as a Resource Center, School 4 (Pucioasa) has provided examples of good practices in turning schools into friendly places (see below)

***B.2. Establishment of communication lines and decision-making procedures within the institution:***

- set up Student Councils and PTAs (parent-teacher associations)
- publish school magazines and newsletters etc
- develop new systems of recognition and incentives
- developing team work in the school and carrying out team building activities.

***B.3. Developing a positive image for the school and building closer links with parents and the community*** by initiating a wide range of partnership activities in and out of schools.

***C. Developing partnerships between pilot schools and other schools or institutions. Initiating school networks based on the local needs and interests***

While, during the first year of the project, the Education 2000+ pilot and resource schools built up strategies and implementation plans based on the six program lines (intra – and interinstitutional communication; school development; school and community; initial and continuous training; building the Roma's capacity to join in the educational process; raising public awareness), in 2001 these implementing units aligned their institutional strategy with the specific destination of each school, identifying dominant development guidelines and partnerships with other schools or institutions with the same interests and needs.

By elaborating strategies and implementing plans for 2001 in all Education 2000+ pilot and resource schools, we aimed at developing partnerships with other schools from the 8 counties in order to create networks of schools with common interests and needs. In

view of these partnerships we applied questionnaires to all partner schools in order to identify common goals and possible partnership agreements that have enabled these institutions to run joint projects.

### ***Rationale***

The *EDP/Education 2000+* project has initiated, developed and promoted an approach in which the schools should reach out to others beyond its walls in order to increase students' learning.

Schools have been considered central social agencies in their communities, able to create partnerships with individuals, groups, organizations and institutions which share responsibility for the growth and development of pupils, parents, community groups, students, other schools, local educational authorities, local businesses etc.

Within the project, partnership has come out as a main condition for success in school improvement. It promotes participation and encourages learning in all people involved, contributing to the process of institutional capacity building of schools.

### ***Directions***

The pilot schools and key institutions have had initiatives in the following directions according to the project policy:

a. ***Education for life in the community*** – fostering the students' skills and attitudes of good citizens and the community spirit. Schools and other institutions in the project have taken initiatives in order to make their institutions function themselves as 'small communities' which use democratic practices:

- Develop participative management strategies
- Improve internal communication
- Produce changes in teachers' attitudes in order to promote dialogue and cooperation with students
- Use a variety of active teaching methods to encourage critical thinking, discussions and debates
- Set up mechanisms to involve students in decision-making process

b. ***Develop activities in order to bring benefits to local communities:***

- Run small scale projects to improve life in local communities in areas like ecology, traditions, charity etc.
- Develop school based curricula according to community needs and resources

c. ***Involve parents, local groups, institutions, authorities and business in school life and develop efficient partnerships:***

- Manage the school as a provider of community services
- Develop projects in partnership

- Re-organize the meetings with parents

***Types of activities developed within the project***

In order to develop partnerships at local/regional levels between different groups, within the project Education 2000+ have been organized/ developed:

- A large range of activities initiated by the pilot schools/key institutions in order to improve the relationships with parents and other groups in local communities like: training workshops, meetings for needs analysis and common planning, publication of parents guides and newsletters, celebrations, open doors days, community service actions, study tours, etc.-
- 6 day training courses addressed to teachers in the pilot schools on the issue of 'School and the community' run at national level by foreign and Romanian experts. The courses were an excellent opportunity for participants to share experience developed within the project and network for future activities.
- Local events on school and the community organized in 4 counties (Iasi, Cluj, Galati and Bucharest), by local resource people involved in the project as follow-ups of the national training courses. The most important part of the events were the exhibitions where schools, local school inspectorates, teacher training centers and universities involved in the project enjoyed the opportunity to be known by their community members, to promote their institutions in the region and sign interinstitutional cooperation agreements.
- Visits to pilot schools by independent consultants in order to develop local expertise in initiating and managing community partnerships.
- School-based trainings on how to involve students in decision making process, how to contact donors and find partners for joint projects, etc.
- Local networks of schools created by the pilot schools/key institutions with schools and institutions in the judets with the same needs and interests. The interschool partnership has been an opportunity to promote the expertise developed in the project, disseminate materials and develop local institutional capacities.
- Publication of a guide for teachers and community groups on how to better link schools to their local communities.
- The organization of the forum 'Education for success' in order to identify guidelines for a national policy to link education to the world of business.

The project experience has pointed out the fact that partnerships are a necessary condition for capacity building. In order to adapt to a continuously changing world and be able to manage change, schools require togetherness with various stakeholders to continue to develop as organizations.

By creating these school networks based on mutual interests and local needs, we prepare the 3<sup>rd</sup> stage of the project, namely the classification of schools according to institutional capacity building and successful experience dissemination directions.

***D. Specific training for school development in the Resource Centers of Education 2000+ (RCEDU 200+) and the “Resource Center for School Development” founded by the Center in Pucioasa.***

In order to better influence the capacity building process, Resource Centers Education 2000+ (RCEDU 2000+) have been set up to implement and disseminate the Center Education 2000+ strategies at local and regional level. These are:

- Cluj RCEDU (created at the Pedagogical High School in Cluj)
- Bucharest RCEDU (created at the Mihai Viteazul College in Bucharest)
- Galati RCEDU (created at the CCD – Galati)
- Pucioasa RCEDU (created as a school-based teacher training center in School no. 4: 'Elena Donici Cantacuzino', Pucioasa).

In accordance with its own vision and institutional capacity and the Center's priorities, the last RCEDU is running training, consultancy, implementation, documentation and information activities in school improvement. The School 4 offer has been tailored according to pilot school training needs and it includes lesson observations, workshops, training sessions, meetings with the teaching staff and the Student Council. More than 1,500 teachers, head teachers, university professors, inspectors or students have attended activities at School 4 Pucioasa since January 2001.

***E. Institutional Development of Schools from Disadvantaged Regions***

***E.1. “Second Chance” Program for Roma Children***

***Background***

“Second Chance” is an experimental project of Education 2000+ Program designed for school integration of youngsters (not exclusively Roma) from disadvantaged regions, who, due to social reasons, dropped out of school before having completed their compulsory education. The project is implemented in 11 pilot schools from 6 counties and from Bucharest. The program aims at fighting social and professional marginalization and exclusion of young people who haven't completed their compulsory education and have not acquired the basic skills necessary in order to obtain a job.

***Goal***

The project aims at sustaining these young people in completing their compulsory education so as to be able to obtain a graduation certificate and to pass the 8<sup>th</sup> class graduation exam. At the same time, they are vocationally trained in a skill that will allow them to obtain vocational qualification certificates.

***Target Group***

The group targeted by this project consists of young people from disadvantaged communities, aged between 16 and 24, who, due to social reasons, dropped out of school before having completed their compulsory education. At present, 350 students in their 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> year of study are included in the 18 classes covered by the project.

### ***Duration***

The project has been initiated in 1999 as a component of the Education 2000+ Program. The first generation of students is going to graduate on June 2002 (general knowledge) and February 2003 (vocational training) respectively. The night school lasts for 3 ½ years and they combine theoretical teaching with vocational training in compliance with the *Order* issued by the Ministry of Education on August 18<sup>th</sup> 1999.

### ***Activities***

The most important activities developed within the project were: developing an adapted curriculum; elaborating teaching materials for students and teachers; training seminars for teachers, school monitors and mediators; providing financial support for schools and students; monitoring pilot schools; mediating school-family-community relations; exchanging experience; visiting pilot schools (students and teachers); organizing an international conference; informational activities.

### ***Sponsors***

The project started as a component of Education 2000+ Program, being initiated by the Department of Education from the Foundation for an Open Society – Romania together with the Ministry of Education and Research. Since 2000, the project has been taken over by Center Education 2000+ and it is co-financed by the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs from Norway within the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe.

### ***E.2. Improvement of education in disadvantaged regions: piloting “Hauptschule” and “Berufschule” models (Austria)***

#### **Context**

As a component of Education 2000+ Program, the project is co-financed by *Kulturkontakt Austria* and *Center Education 2000+* and aims at experimenting and implementing “*Hauptschule*” and “*Berufschule*” (Austria) models in pilot schools from Romania. The first model deals with the organisation of skill-oriented secondary school and the second one is focused on vocational training.

#### **Goal**

The goal of the project is to provide support for youngsters who, after completing their compulsory education, chose a predominantly vocational educational system. The support is concretized in adapting the curriculum and modifying the ratio between theoretical and vocational training.

#### **Target Group**

The project was designed for pupils and teachers from 4 schools from Romania and the respective local community members. The four pilot schools are located in Bucharest (School no. 147 and “Anghel Saligny” Industrial School) and Constanta (“Adamclisi” School and “Poarta Alba” Agricultural School).

The program has developed over a two-year period (2000 – 2002) and, if the two above-mentioned organizations chose to co-finance the project for a longer period, it could be extended.

## Activities

The activities include: need identification and assesment mission realised by Austrian experts; meetings with Romanian experts with a view to curriculum adaptation and material translation; training sessions for Romanina teachers in Austria; a seminar for founding an implementation group formed by representatives of the co-financing organisations; a seminar for curriculum and teaching material elaboration.

The Program assessment activity shall take into account: the teachers' increased capacity of realizing teaching materials adapted to the specific needs of the pupils and applying new teaching methods and techniques; the enhanced role of remedial education or children that come from disadvantaged families, have special educational needs and present a high risk of school abandonment.

### ***E.3. Improving Education for Roma – Focus on Romania***

#### ***Context***

As a component of Education 2000+ Program, the project is co-financed by *the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, DEZA Agency from Switzerland and Center Education 2000+* within the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe. The program aims at developing teaching models adapted for Roma children by resorting to the experience accumulated by the NGOs active in the field of educational projects in South-Eastern Europe.

**Goal:** improving educational processes by providing continuous trainig for teachers, developing and implementing personal projects, elaborating teaching materials, improving the learning climate and environment and by disseminating the outcomes throughout the entire South-Eastern Europe.

**Target group :** teachers and pupils from five schools from Romania as well as the local community members and local and national NGO representatives. The project is run in 5 pilot schools, namely: Dolhasca (Suceava), Crisan Criscior (Hunedoara), Chiliseni (Suceava), Tecuci (Galati), Brahasesti (Galati).

**Duration:** the program lasts for two years, out of which 2001 – financed by *Stability Pact and Center Education 2000+* and 2002 – entirely financed by *Center Education 2000+*.

**The program activities** are organised at school and central level. The schools elaborated their own projects and received equipment from donations. The teachers attended training seminars and the pupils had the opportunity to meet their colleagues from the neighbour countries by participating to an international summer camp. Here are the most important points of the project:

- **Start-Up Meeting (March 29<sup>th</sup> –31<sup>st</sup>, 2001):** attended by NGOs active in the Roma field, representatives of Roma minority and State authorities, headmasters and teachers from pilot schools.
- **Workshop 1 (May 7<sup>th</sup> –11<sup>th</sup>, 2001):** attended by 30 teachers from pilot schools and two trainers. The main fields of interest were: theories and models of human thinking and learning, learning through co-operation, questioning techniques, group form and structure, etc.
- **Summer Camp - "Together for a better school"(July 22<sup>nd</sup> –28<sup>th</sup>, 2001):** teachers, pupils and Roma NGO representatives issued school development projects that are going to be implemented in their respective schools.
- **Workshop 2 (November 12<sup>th</sup> –15<sup>th</sup>, 2001):** attended by 30 teachers from the 5 pilot schools and 3 trainers. The main subjects covered during the seminar were:: interactive teaching methods, school intergration in the local community, efficient teaching communication, etc.

The funds provided by the **Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs** also sufficed for improving the pilot school infrastructure according to the existing needs. The **DEZA Agency** provided funds for school supplies and internet related expenses. **Center Education 2000+** donated the necessary equipment for each pilot school.

**3.2.3.2.** The following categories of activities took place with regard to the **human resource development (trainers and teachers)**:

- Elaborating a coherent training strategy and creating a *Center Education 2000+* permanent team of trainers;
- Pilot school training;
- Training sessions during competitive seminars focused on topical subjects of widespread interest: school and community, school tailored curriculum, school performance assessment;
- Summer schools and corresponding follow-ups organized by CE+
- “Teaching Through Critical Thinking” Innovative Teaching Program
- Sustaining initial and continuous training for Roma teachers;
- Specific training for pupils and college students (especially through Master and Internship programs).

These results were obtained through a laborious evolution. The stages of this evolution and its main outcomes are illustrated below.

#### ***A. Overall Evolution in the Human Resources Development***

The development of human resources, first called “Initial and continuous training of teachers”, is one of the six lines of EDP/Education 2000+ program, implemented for a 3 year period in 86 pilot and resource schools and in 32 key institutions from all 8 pilot counties: Galati, Iasi, Timisoara, Hunedoara, Sibiu, Cluj and Constanta.

The 3-year evolution synthesis of “Initial and continuous training for teachers” with regard to its implementation and development is presented below<sup>2</sup>:

<b>Project Year</b>	<b>Training Activity Levels</b>	<b>Subjects</b>	<b>Target Groups</b>
<b>Year I</b>	WG/KI level	The subjects complied with the 6 program lines	Members of the working groups and PS/RS/KI representatives
<b>Year II</b>	PS/RS/KI level County and inter-county level National level	Extended subjects focusing on school performance improvement and human resources development	PS/RS teachers, WG/KI representatives, pupils, parents and community members
<b>Year III</b>	PS/RS/partner school level National level	Comprehensive subjects focusing on institutional capacity building and human resources development	PS/RS/KI/partner and other school teachers, pupils, parents, community members

<sup>2</sup> WG = Working Group; PS = Pilot School; RS = Resource School; KI = Key Institution.

A.1. **During the first project year**, the main goal was to improve the initial and continuous teacher training quality. The program focused on a pupil-centered approach of the educational process, on institutional development, technical assistance, preparation and co-operation of institutions involved in the teacher training modernization programs.

In order to reach the above-mentioned goal, the project mainly gave heed to PS/RS/KY/WG team building activities with a view to sustaining strategic planning, negotiation and team outcome assessment.

According to the local strategies issued by the pilot units, the third program line, namely “Initial and Continuous Teacher Training”, was structured according to the following levels:

- **Working group level;**
- **Pilot/resource school level;**
- **Key institution level** (inspectorates, teaching staff centers, DPPD, pedagogical high schools).

The first stage fostered training activities destined for **working group members** from each pilot county in order to identify and set up various information demultiplication methods with regard to the implementation of the project in pilot/resource schools and key institutions.

The working methodology focused on interactive methods, co-operation, and team negotiations in order to prepare the training strategy materials for teachers from pilot counties.

The training activities organized at **pilot/resource school level** targeted the school department heads that benefited from methodological and technical support necessary in order to initiate and carry out curricular and extracurricular activities in their respective schools.

These training activities were intended for:

- acquiring teaching and learning interactive methodologies in order for teachers to master new working procedures;
- initiating teachers in elaboration methods for pupil educational need identification;
- generating developing capacities for new curricula in order to create and implement school-tailored curricula;
- identifying pupil and teacher needs in order to conceive the mission of each school;
- correlating the managerial development plan to the respective school mission;
- increasing the information and training levels for teachers from pilot schools.

At **key institution level**, the **training activities** centered on subjects included in the pilot and resource school implementation plans approached the following issues:

- project management;
- community school;
- interactive methods;
- inter/intra-institutional communication;
- team building

These training activities were attended by a team of teachers for each pilot or resource school. The training courses organized at this level were led by consultants of CE+. At KI training level, the participants were in charge of disseminating and implementing the newly acquired information in their respective schools in order to strengthen the teaching capacities of their colleagues. Another method used at KI training level consists of resorting to joint target groups (inspectors – headmasters – teachers, all members of the respective institutions).

**A.2.** During **the second project year**, based on the evaluation of PS/RS narrative reports and monitor and evaluation reports issued by the trainers, the PS/RS training needs were identified. These needs were included in the strategies and implementation plans issued by PS and RS that also emphasised the specific needs for teacher training. While the first project year represented a training stage necessary in order to induce and acknowledge the training needs, during the second project year PS and RS requested various training activities - according to the mission of their respective schools – which were intended to include the entire teaching staff.

The PS/RS training needs included a wide variety of themes and this led to the creation of a *team of trainers* (see below) in order to cover the entire training activity scope at school level (see below). The wide variety of training subjects was obtained by analysing the questionnaires applied to the pilot and resource school headmasters/key institution representative/working group members/consultants that provided the training activity during the first project year.

At **national level** “competitive” activities were organised on specific themes that were in accordance with the respective project development stages. Also, the already well-known *Summer Schools of Center Education 2000+* were held (see detail presentation below).

**A.3.** During the **3<sup>rd</sup> project year** we furthered and developed the above-mentioned structural training activities, on one hand, and, on the other hand we identified dominant issues necessary for the institutional capacity building and human resources development activities of PS/RS/KI.

The year 2001 saw the completion of a training policy, the extension and the continuous qualification of our trainers and consultants, a coherent training strategy for schools and key institutions as well as the emergence of specific training packages differentiated for individuals, professional groups, institutions and communities (see point B below).

While during the first project year it was one of the six project lines, during the 3<sup>rd</sup> project year the “Initial and Continuous Training of Pre-University and University Teachers” line has become one of the strategic development strategies of *Center Education 2000+* for a

sustained development based on the following results generated by the implementation of the Education 2000+ Project:

**a. National Training Models**, namely:

- training at school level;
- training at Education 2000+ resource center level;
- training upon request;
- competitive training
- caravan training
- summer school for teachers;
- trainer training model;
- school network training model.

**b. Training Methodologies:**

- active learning methods: team work, debate groups, problem-solving activities, role play, simulation, practical experiments;
- project writing
- experimental learning.

**c. Theme packages:**

- project management;
- efficient communication at classromm/team/teaching staff room level;
- change management
- modern theories for the educational process;
- learning process personalisation strategies;
- resource manegement;
- team and partnership forming;
- conflict negotiation;
- educational and vocational counseling;
- critical thinking and active learning.

***E. Institutional Development of Schools from Disadvantaged Regions***

***E.1. "Second Chance" Program for Roma Children***

***Background***

"Second Chance" is an experimental project of Education 2000+ Program designed for school integration of youngsters (not exclusively Roma) from disadvantaged regions, who, due to social reasons, dropped out of school before having completed their compulsory education. The project is implemented in 11 pilot schools from 6 counties and from Bucharest. The program aims at fighting social and professional marginalization and exclusion of young people who haven't completed their compulsory education and have not acquired the basic skills necessary in order to obtain a job.

***Goal***

The project aims at sustaining these young people in completing their compulsory education so as to be able to obtain a graduation certificate and to pass the 8<sup>th</sup> class graduation exam. At the same time, they are vocationally trained in a skill that will allow them to obtain vocational qualification certificates.

### ***Target Group***

The group targeted by this project consists of young people from disadvantaged communities, aged between 16 and 24, who, due to social reasons, dropped out of school before having completed their compulsory education. At present, 350 students in their 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> year of study are included in the 18 classes covered by the project.

### ***Duration***

The project has been initiated in 1999 as a component of the Education 2000+ Program. The first generation of students is going to graduate on June 2002 (general knowledge) and February 2003 (vocational training) respectively. The night school lasts for 3 ½ years and they combine theoretical teaching with vocational training in compliance with the *Order* issued by the Ministry of Education on August 18<sup>th</sup> 1999.

### ***Activities***

The most important activities developed within the project were: developing an adapted curriculum; elaborating teaching materials for students and teachers; training seminars for teachers, school monitors and mediators; providing financial support for schools and students; monitoring pilot schools; mediating school-family-community relations; exchanging experience; visiting pilot schools (students and teachers); organizing an international conference; informational activities.

### ***Sponsors***

The project started as a component of Education 2000+ Program, being initiated by the Department of Education from the Foundation for an Open Society – Romania together with the Ministry of Education and Research. Since 2000, the project has been taken over by Center Education 2000+ and it is co-financed by the Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs from Norway within the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe.

### **E.2. Improvement of education in disadvantaged regions: piloting “Hauptschule” and “Berufsschule” models (Austria)**

#### **Context**

As a component of Education 2000+ Program, the project is co-financed by *KulturKontakt Austria* and *Center Education 2000+* and aims at experimenting and implementing “Hauptschule” and “Berufsschule” (Austria) models in pilot schools from Romania. The first model deals with the organisation of skill-oriented secondary school and the second one is focused on vocational training.

#### **Goal**

The goal of the project is to provide support for youngsters who, after completing their compulsory education, chose a predominantly vocational educational system. The support is concretized in adapting the curriculum and modifying the ratio between theoretical and vocational training.

#### **Target Group**

The project was designed for pupils and teachers from 4 schools from Romania and the respective local community members. The four pilot schools are located in Bucharest (School no. 147 and “Anghel Saligny” Industrial School) and Constanta (“Adamclisi” School and “Poarta Alba” Agricultural School). The program has developed over a two-year period (2000 – 2002) and, if the two above-mentioned organizations chose to co-finance the project for a longer period, it could be extended.

## Activities

The activities include: need identification and assessment mission realised by Austrian experts; meetings with Romanian experts with a view to curriculum adaptation and material translation; training sessions for Romanina teachers in Austria; a seminar for founding an implementation group formed by representatives of the co-financing organisations; a seminar for curriculum and teaching material elaboration.

The Program assessment activity shall take into account: the teachers' increased capacity of realizing teaching materials adapted to the specific needs of the pupils and applying new teaching methods and techniques; the enhanced role of remedial education or children that come from disadvantaged families, have special educational needs and present a high risk of school abandonment.

### *E.3. Improving Education for Roma – Focus on Romania*

#### *Context*

As a component of Education 2000+ Program, the project is co-financed by *the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, DEZA Agency from Switzerland and Center Education 2000+* within the Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe. The program aims at developing teaching models adapted for Roma children by resorting to the experience accumulated by the NGOs active in the field of educational projects in South-Eastern Europe.

**Goal:** improving educational processes by providing continuous training for teachers, developing and implementing personal projects, elaborating teaching materials, improving the learning climate and environment and by disseminating the outcomes throughout the entire South-Eastern Europe.

**Target group :** teachers and pupils from five schools from Romania as well as the local community members and local and national NGO representatives. The project is run in 5 pilot schools, namely: Dolhasca (Suceava), Crisan Criscior (Hunedoara), Chiliseni (Suceava), Tecuci (Galati), Brahasesti (Galati).

**Duration:** the program lasts for two years, out of which 2001 – financed by *Stability Pact* and *Center Education 2000+* and 2002 – entirely financed by *Center Education 2000+*.

**The program activities** are organised at school and central level. The schools elaborated their own projects and received equipment from donations. The teachers attended training seminars and the pupils had the opportunity to meet their colleagues from the neighbour countries by participating to an international summer camp. Here are the most important points of the project:

- **Start-Up Meeting (March 29<sup>th</sup> –31<sup>st</sup>, 2001):** attended by NGOs active in the Roma field, representatives of Roma minority and State authorities, headmasters and teachers from pilot schools.
- **Workshop 1 (May 7<sup>th</sup> –11<sup>th</sup>, 2001):** attended by 30 teachers from pilot schools and two trainers. The main fields of interest were: theories and models of human thinking and learning, learning through co-operation, questioning techniques, group form and structure, etc.
- **Summer Camp - "Together for a better school"(July 22<sup>nd</sup> –28<sup>th</sup>, 2001):** teachers, pupils and Roma NGO representatives issued school development projects that are going to be implemented in their respective schools.
- **Workshop 2 (November 12<sup>th</sup> –15<sup>th</sup>, 2001):** attended by 30 teachers from the 5 pilot schools and 3 trainers. The main subjects covered during the seminar were:: interactive teaching methods, school intergration in the local community, efficient teaching communication, etc.

The funds provided by the **Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs** also sufficed for improving the pilot school infrastructure according to the existing needs. The **DEZA Agency** provided funds for school supplies and internet related expenses. **Center Education 2000+** donated the necessary equipment for each pilot school.

**3.2.3.2.** The following categories of activities took place with regard to the **human resource development (trainers and teachers):**

- Elaborating a coherent training strategy and creating a *Center Education 2000+* permanent team of trainers;

- Pilot school training;
- Training sessions during competitive seminars focused on topical subjects of widespread interest: school and community, school tailored curriculum, school performance assessment;
- Summer schools and corresponding follow-ups organized by CE+
- “Teaching Through Critical Thinking” Innovative Teaching Program
- Sustaining initial and continuous training for Roma teachers;
- Specific training for pupils and college students (especially through Master and Internship programs).

These results were obtained through a laborious evolution. The stages of this evolution and its main outcomes are illustrated below.

### ***A. Overall Evolution in the Human Resources Development***

The development of human resources, first called “Initial and continuous training of teachers”, is one of the six lines of EDP/Education 2000+ program, implemented for a 3 year period in 86 pilot and resource schools and in 32 key institutions from all 8 pilot counties: Galati, Iasi, Timisoara, Hunedoara, Sibiu, Cluj and Constanta.

The 3-year evolution synthesis of “Initial and continuous training for teachers” with regard to its implementation and development is presented below<sup>3</sup>:

<b>Project Year</b>	<b>Training Activity Levels</b>	<b>Subjects</b>	<b>Target Groups</b>
<b>Year I</b>	WG/KI level	The subjects complied with the 6 program lines	Members of the working groups and PS/RS/KI representatives
<b>Year II</b>	PS/RS/KI level County and inter-county level National level	Extended subjects focusing on school performance improvement and human resources development	PS/RS teachers, WG/KI representatives, pupils, parents and community members
<b>Year III</b>	PS/RS/partner school level National level	Comprehensive subjects focusing on institutional capacity building and human resources development	PS/RS/KI/partner and other school teachers, pupils, parents, community members

**A.1. During the first project year**, the main goal was to improve the initial and continuous teacher training quality. The program focused on a pupil-centered approach of the educational process, on institutional development, technical assistance, preparation and co-operation of institutions involved in the teacher training modernization programs.

In order to reach the above-mentioned goal, the project mainly gave heed to PS/RS/KY/WG team building activities with a view to sustaining strategic planning, negotiation and team outcome assessment.

<sup>3</sup> WG = Working Group; PS = Pilot School; RS = Resource School; KI = Key Institution.

According to the local strategies issued by the pilot units, the third program line, namely “Initial and Continuous Teacher Training”, was structured according to the following levels:

- **Working group level;**
- **Pilot/resource school level;**
- **Key institution level** (inspectorates, teaching staff centers, DPPD, pedagogical high schools).

The first stage fostered training activities destined for **working group members** from each pilot county in order to identify and set up various information demultiplication methods with regard to the implementation of the project in pilot/resource schools and key institutions.

The working methodology focused on interactive methods, co-operation, and team negotiations in order to prepare the training strategy materials for teachers from pilot counties.

The training activities organized at **pilot/resource school level** targeted the school department heads that benefited from methodological and technical support necessary in order to initiate and carry out curricular and extracurricular activities in their respective schools.

These training activities were intended for:

- acquiring teaching and learning interactive methodologies in order for teachers to master new working procedures;
- initiating teachers in elaboration methods for pupil educational need identification;
- generating developing capacities for new curricula in order to create and implement school-tailored curricula;
- identifying pupil and teacher needs in order to conceive the mission of each school;
- correlating the managerial development plan to the respective school mission;
- increasing the information and training levels for teachers from pilot schools.

At **key institution level**, the **training activities** centered on subjects included in the pilot and resource school implementation plans approached the following issues:

- project management;
- community school;
- interactive methods;
- inter/intra-institutional communication;
- team building

These training activities were attended by a team of teachers for each pilot or resource school. The training courses organized at this level were led by consultants of CE+. At KI training level, the participants were in charge of disseminating and implementing the newly acquired information in their respective schools in order to strengthen the teaching

capacities of their colleagues. Another method used at KI training level consists of resorting to joint target groups (inspectors – headmasters – teachers, all members of the respective institutions).

**A.2.** During **the second project year**, based on the evaluation of PS/RS narrative reports and monitor and evaluation reports issued by the trainers, the PS/RS training needs were identified. These needs were included in the strategies and implementation plans issued by PS and RS that also emphasised the specific needs for teacher training. While the first project year represented a training stage necessary in order to induce and acknowledge the training needs, during the second project year PS and RS requested various training activities - according to the mission of their respective schools – which were intended to include the entire teaching staff.

The PS/RS training needs included a wide variety of themes and this led to the creation of a *team of trainers* (see below) in order to cover the entire training activity scope at school level (see below). The wide variety of training subjects was obtained by analysing the questionnaires applied to the pilot and resource school headmasters/key institution representative/working group members/consultants that provided the training activity during the first project year.

At **national level** “competitive” activities were organised on specific themes that were in accordance with the respective project development stages. Also, the already well-known *Summer Schools of Center Education 2000+* were held (see detail presentation below).

**A.3.** During the **3<sup>rd</sup> project year** we furthered and developed the above-mentioned structural training activities, on one hand, and, on the other hand we identified dominant issues necessary for the institutional capacity building and human resources development activities of PS/RS/KI.

The year 2001 saw the completion of a training policy, the extension and the continuous qualification of our trainers and consultants, a coherent training strategy for schools and key institutions as well as the emergence of specific training packages differentiated for individuals, professional groups, institutions and communities (see point B below).

While during the first project year it was one of the six project lines, during the 3<sup>rd</sup> project year the “Initial and Continuous Training of Pre-University and University Teachers” line has become one of the strategic development strategies of *Center Education 2000+* for a sustained development based on the following results generated by the implementation of the Education 2000+ Project:

**a. National Training Models**, namely:

- training at school level;
- training at Education 2000+ resource center level;
- training upon request;
- competitive training
- caravan training
- summer school for teachers;
- trainer training model;
- school network training model.

**b. Training Methodologies:**

- active learning methods: team work, debate groups, problem-solving activities, role play, simulation, practical experiments;
- project writing
- experimental learning.

**c. Theme packages:**

- project management;
- efficient communication at classroom/team/teaching staff room level;
- change management
- modern theories for the educational process;
- learning process personalisation strategies;
- resource management;
- team and partnership forming;
- conflict negotiation;
- educational and vocational counseling;
- critical thinking and active learning.

***B. Issuing a Coherent Training Policy and Constituting a Center Education 2000+ Permanent Team of Trainers***

As stated before, 2001 saw the completion of a training policy of Center Education 2000+ (see above). This policy aimed at selecting and training a team of trainers in compliance with the Center Education 2000+ quality standards, elaborating a coherent training strategy for all schools and key institutions involved in the Education 2000+ Project as well as elaborating theme training packages that are differentiated for individuals, professional groups, institutions and communities.

The training policy was defined in accordance with the values of the open society and it is based on a strategy that encourages honest and open competition, co-operation and personal initiatives. In 2001, the selection and training of a team of trainers constituted the most important strategic course of action. The selection process took place in several stages and was performed by a commission of training experts – independent consultants of *Center Education 2000+*.

By repeatedly analysing the project training needs, we concluded that ***a team of specialised trainers*** was necessary in order to cover the various needs, at least for the following fields: class management, conflict management, organisational management, general assessment principles for pre-university education process, assessment methods and instruments, grade awarding in current assessment, topical information of curriculum reform, school tailored curriculum, active learning methods, teaching strategies that include the new curriculum reform, counseling and guidance, efficient communication, cross-cultural education, communication and information technology.

The selection criteria for the respective team of trainers considered the following issues:

- presentation skills;

- organizational capabilities;
- training guidance and evaluation skills.

The evaluation criteria for these trainers were based on their behavioural patterns with regard to the following abilities:

- identifying real training needs;
- setting appropriate goals and objectives for meeting the training needs
- providing for training objectives that are coherent with the targets of the training program
- efficient appropriation and use of material and human resources
- focusing one's activity on positive outcomes for the participants;
- issuing easy-to-use and attractive additional materials;
- proper use of the working environment;
- promoting active group working methods;
- providing incentives for the participants;
- efficient presentation;
- adapting the training pattern to the concrete reality of the respective group.

Thus, we formed a team of 50 trainers specialised in adult education for the fields requested by PS and RS. This team of trainers went through 4 training stages in order to acquire the knowledge envisaged by the program strategy. These four training stages focused on: trainer's contribution to institutional capacity building and to adult education; efficient presentation of school training activity content; modern training techniques and methods; acquiring a portfolio compliant with school activities; assessment methods for training programs and stages.

The trainers provided training activities for approximately 100 school from our 8 pilot counties. In each school, these activities included all teaching staff members. The wide range of requested themes and target groups led to a differentiation of the training activity at school level (for each school from the pilot counties) but also at county and national level, given that all initial program lines started to develop through these training programs. Thus, we have cross-county trainers for subjects like school – community; cross-institutional co-operation; institutional evaluation and self-evaluation, and all these were attended by WG members and the PS/RS headmasters.

### ***C. Pilot School Training***

The pilot and resource school training activities targeted the teaching staff, pupils, parents, local community members, school managing staff and partner-school teaching staff. The subjects approached by these training activities were chosen in compliance with the dominant mission and strategy lines of each school. The training activities took place in the respective schools and were led by trainers certified by *Center Education 2000+*. The training activities focused on the following themes: school counseling and guidance; school-tailored curriculum; evaluation; school – community relation; fundraising; class management; interactive methods; new teaching techniques from a disciplinary point of view, etc.

***D. “Competitive Seminar” Training*** organized on topical themes of widespread interest: school and community; school-tailored curriculum; school performance assessment.

The competitive training seminars were destined for teachers from Center Education 2000+ pilot counties and were conceived as qualification modules for the school human resources development in order to optimize the reform process for the pilot schools. The human resources training in the new fields established by the educational system reform proved to be a necessity for the above-mentioned educational fields.

The selection of the participants was based on a process that assessed their professional skills as well as their institutional capabilities of disseminating the newly acquired knowledge both in their respective schools and in the partner-schools, if such partnerships were set up through the implementation plans. Each of the chosen themes had its own modular training packages covering the specific needs for each such pilot school, a training and participatory methodology and operational purposes. The curriculum of these training packages was approved by the Ministry of Education and Research. Thus, each participant was awarded a training certificate endorsed by the corresponding Ministry.

#### ***E. Center Education 2000+ Summer Schools and Follow-Ups***

With regard to the reform implementation at classroom level, an important role was played by the **Education 2000+ Summer Schools** destined for PS/RS and partner-school teachers that aimed at integrating the new subject teaching methods into their teaching activity.

These summer schools aim at pragmatically approaching the top-of-the-line teaching methods used for various subjects or cluster of subjects that are essential for the educational process: Romanian Language and Literature; History; Mathematics; Sciences (Physics, Chemistry, Biology), from a subject, cross-subject and cross-curricular point of view.

Elaborated for a 3-year period, the “Summer Schools” Project is destined for Romanian teachers who wish to qualify in specific teaching methods, during the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> year, and to attend an assisted self-training program during the 3<sup>rd</sup> year. The teachers that go to the entire three-year process are qualified in general, specific and cross-curricular teaching methods and shall become Center Education 2000+ independent consultants on teaching methods problems.

The mission of these summer schools is to facilitate reflection on teaching methods from the point of view of those who bring reform into classrooms and of the new teaching and training theories. At the same time, the summer schools create the framework necessary for combining theory with practice by resorting to a national and international team of trainers.

The selection process is open for all teachers from Romania and is based on criteria that allow the educational qualification of those who shall be selected. It comes as a complement to the efforts made by the Ministry of Education and Research in order to improve the quality of the Romanian education system. The curricula of these summer schools is approved and endorsed by the Ministry of Education and Research.

## ***F. “Teaching Through Critical Thinking” Innovative Teaching Methods***

### ***Goals***

- to further the dissemination of the RWCT program within pilot or other schools and highschools;
- to extend the RWCT Program to university level;
- to support publications that facilitate the dissemination of this program.

### ***Activities:***

#### ***F.1. Training the trainers***

*RWCT training for our selected trainers* constitutes a priority in what regards the investment policy of the Center Education 2000+ for 2001. The first meeting took place in May and the second one in December. These training sessions were led by volunteer work-shop leaders (Janet Richards for May and James Wile for December) that co-operated with Romanian trainers (Monica Onojescu and Anca Tirca respectively).

#### ***F.2. Teacher Training***

As during 2001 there was no financing from OSI NY, the RWCT program was financed by *Center Education 2000+* as part of the CEDU training program offer. The program is highly popular among teachers from all over the country (from regions where the Education 2000+ Project was implemented as well as from counties/localities where RWCT trainers started to disseminate the program after having received numerous requests formulated by the management of the respective schools, for instance from Bistrita Nasaud, Suceava and Bihor).

During the first half of 2001, (from January to July 2001) the 60 trainers certified first by the volunteers mandated by the *International Reading Association (IRA)*, and then by the 5 Romanian certifiers, continued the RWCT training of teachers from pilot/resource or other schools.

#### ***F.3. Expansion of RWCT Program towards High-Education System***

*The expansion of RWCT Program towards the high-education system* constituted another field of development. In February 2001, the Center Education 2000+ organized in Sinaia a meeting for high-education institution Directors and Deans in order to provide training for teachers from 7 pilot counties (except for Hunedoara) and the county of Brasov. In March 2001, in Sinaia, we initiated training workshops for a group of 32 teachers from

the high-education system. Center Education 2000+ asked the management of these institutions to nominate the participants to these work-shops (initially, we envisaged a series of 40 training hours that was subsequently extended to 80 hours), hoping that, once returned to their respective departments, these teachers would promote the program within their institutions with the support of the institution management team. As the funds provided by Center Education 2000+ for two modules (summing up a 40 hour period) were completely exhausted, OSI NY decided to continue the financing of this high-education expansion program. The workshop developed in November 2001 and the one envisaged for February/March 2002 are financed by OSI NY that also covers the travel expenses of workshop leaders.

#### ***F.4. RWCT for schools with primary Step-by-Step grades***

The RWCT Project for schools with primary Step-by-Step grades started during the fourth quarter of the year. The beneficiaries of this project are the teachers from secondary education level from 26 schools that implement the Step-by-Step project at the primary education level. This is an on-going project that shall be completed in February 2002.

The RWCT Program from Romania was invited to provide for the certification process for the certifiers from the Republic of Moldavia. Thus, during December, the Program co-ordinator went to Chisinau in order to monitor the activity of some RWCT training workshops with a view to authorize a first team of RWCT trainers from the Republic of Moldavia.

#### ***F.5. The 2<sup>nd</sup> RWCT National Meeting***

At the end of August 2001 (August 29<sup>th</sup> – September 2<sup>nd</sup>), the ***2<sup>nd</sup> RWCT National Meeting*** took place in Sinaia. The meeting was attended by the RWCT authorized trainers, guests representing various university departments and representatives of World Bank and Peace Corp.

***F.6. Publications:*** As for the publishing activity, it concretized in the **RWCT promotional booklets** issued at the beginning of the year as well as in the **RWCT guides** re-published in two volumes. At the same time, the book signed by Ion Dumitru, Ph.D. from Universitatea de Vest, Timisoara (**Critical Thinking and Active Learning**) was published at the beginning of the year.

#### ***F.7. Didactic Dialogues Magazine***

In January 2001, the Editor-in-Chief of “*Didactic Dialogues*” Magazine attended the RWCT workshop (newspaper editing) organized by OSI NY in Vilnius, Lithuania. The workshop aimed at initiating and sustaining national RWCT publications in all countries involved in the project. Consequently, in April 2001, the RWCT program started to publish the quarterly called “*Didactic Dialogues*”, based on funds granted by *Center Education 2000+*. The second issue was published in August and the third one in December. IRA is expected to grant funds (USD 5,000) for the next year’s activity and

the magazine is to be distributed mainly to teachers that attended the RWCT training courses.

#### ***F.8. The Fifth RWCT International Conference***

The RWCT Program developed by Center Education 2000+ was the co-organized of the *Fifth RWCT International Conference* that took place in Brasov, during June 9<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup>, 2001. The Conference was a real success; it was attended by approximately 190 representatives from the 28 countries involved in the program and by volunteers from USA, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia. It was for the first time in the history of RWCT program that a country involved in the program was also the co-ordinator of such a conference.

***G. The initial and continuous training of Roma teachers*** concretized in two program lines: (G1) – Scholarships granted to young Roma for completing distance learning courses in order to become Institutors; (G2) – Support for Roma Teachers Association Khetanes (Together).

#### ***G1. CREDIS Scholarships: 3 year courses for “Institutors – Rromani Language” (double specialisation) Open Distance Learning Department – CREDIS from Bucharest University***

##### **Context**

Within the Education 2000+ project, *the development of Roma representatives’ capacity to join the educational process* is stimulated mainly through initial and continuous training of teachers who are active in the Roma communities. The launching of the 3-year training program for “*Institutors – Rromani Language*” in September 2000 was initiated and financially supported by *Center Education 2000+* in co-operation with the Department of Education for National Minorities (from the Ministry of Education and Research) and the Bucharest University (Department of Open Distance Learning – CREDIS).

In the educational field, the professional training program conceived for 30 young Roma and consisting on distance learning courses comes as a support for the Strategy for Roma developed by the Ministry of Education and Research and other organizations in order to implement affirmative measure for the promotion of young Roma in faculties and universities with a view to generate a core of intellectual young Roma.

##### *Center Education 2000+:*

(a) *grants semestrial scholarships* (according to grade average) to 30 young students in Institutor – Rromani Language, based on an *individual contract*. These scholarships are granted *exclusively* to those students that actually teach Rromani language in schools. The scholarships cover: (1) tuition fees (USD 300 per student x 30); (2) transport fees for student participation to tutorial meetings organized on a monthly basis (10 tutorial meetings per year) (USD 180 per year/student); (3) lodging related expenses for the exam session period (USD 750).

(b) Covers the salaries of the University Professors who issue materials necessary for specializations in Rromani language. Out of the 11 titles proposed in the editorial plan, the following have already been published:

- *Ancient Indian Civilization, part I and II;*
- *Learn Rromani – common language segment;*
- *History of Contemporary Rromani Language;*
- *Roma Anthropology and Folklore;*
- *Learn Rromani – Texts.*
- *Learn Rromani – common language segment.*

The budget for 2001 – 2002 integrally covered by funds provided by Education 2000+ Project amounts to USD 17,000, out of which the amount of USD 13,679 was spent during 2001.

### ***G.2. Support for Roma Teachers – Support Granted to KETHANES Association***

The program “Support for Roma Teachers” developed within the Education 2000+ project has been developing now for two years. The program sustains the professional development of Roma teachers and educators that work with Roma children. In this regard, *Center Education 2000+* financed the founding of the **Association for Roma Education** (2000).

The Association is encouraged to initiate professional training programs and to attract the resources necessary for the development of the envisaged activities (through the “conditional grant” system). The **KHETANES** Association (50 members and numerous followers al over the country) aims at protecting the Roma cultural identity and promoting an active civic co-operation between Roma and non-Roma citizens through:

- Encouraging Rromani language education;
- Promoting intercultural education;
- Identifying, acknowledging and preventing discrimination in its various forms;
- Sustaining Roma children and youngsters with special talents;
- Encouraging inovations that meet the educational needs of Roma children.

Activities developed during 2001:

- Raising public awareness (through ISJ network and local media);
- Training sessions for teachers and other professionals that are active in Roma communities;
- Attending conferences and training courses initiated by *Center Education 2000+*;
- Exchange of experience between teachers from various counties;
- Project writing (MEDE – Partnership Fund, OSI Roma Culture Initiative, Link Diversity,etc.)

## ***H. “I Want a Career” Project***

### ***Context***

In Romania, the labor market is continuously changing, evolving together with the country's economic development. Both the employers and the official bodies in charge with monitoring the social integration of young people noted that highschool graduates are not properly train in order to find a job and are not aware of their possibilities and limits. Sometimes, this makes them fail in their attempt to find a job.

### ***Project Goals:***

- to prepare teenagers from pilot highschools for choosing a career;
- to generate personal, social and technical skills in all teenagers;
- to promote the market economy values;
- to prevent and mitigate unemployment among highschool graduates;
- to experiment an optional subject of study called “Career counseling”.

***Target group:*** The project involves 575 teenagers (11<sup>th</sup> grade students) from 21 highschools from Romania. These highschools were pilot schools within the Education 2000+ Project developed by our Center. The students shall acquire skills in personal marketing, namely they shall gain the ability to build an optimum self-image, to value their person, to draw up a Résumé and a cover letter, to develop social and decision-making skills.

***Duration:*** 2001-2002 school year.

### ***Activities***

- ◆ analyzing teenager training needs for building a career;
- ◆ seminar on project conception debate;
- ◆ realizing promotional and informational materials: student guide, folders, posters;
- ◆ peer-counseling training courses for 11<sup>th</sup> grade students from pilot highschools;
- ◆ creating a debate panel on Internet;
- ◆ teenager training sessions led by teenagers who attended the above mentioned peer-counseling training courses;
- ◆ establishing contacts with representatives of media, local companies and similar projects;
- ◆ job fair for teenagers organized within each highschool from the project;
- ◆ project assessment summer camp for teenagers.

### ***Financing Organizations***

Balkan Children and Youth Foundation (USA – European headquarters in Skopje, Macedonia)  
*Center Education 2000+*

**3.2.3.3. In the field of global and sectorial educational policy development and analysis,** the project fostered a series of activities mainly based on institutional contracts closed with the Ministry of Education and Research or with other

organizations. These activities generated, on one hand, an increased political analysis capacity of our institution, thus leading to the augmentation of its prestige in Romania, and, on the other hand, a concrete impact on any future options of the Ministry of Education and Research with regard to the educational policy. From this point of view, the political analysis approaches perfectly fit the central goals of Education 2000+ Project. These activities are briefly illustrated below.

#### ***A. Impact Study: “New Curriculum in Compulsory Education”***

##### **Background. Goals. Activities**

The study – the first one of such magnitude in our country – was realised upon request from the “National Curriculum Council” and the Ministry of Education and Research, within the Project for the Reform of the Romanian Educational System co-financed by the Romanian Government and the World Bank. Following a public tender, *Center Education 2000+* was chosen as its executor organisation. The study was co-financed by the Curriculum Component of the respective project and by *Center Education 2000+*.

The study aims at shaping a more accurate image with regard to what really happens in the implementation process of the new “National Curriculum”, after a 10-year period of successive changes brought to the national education system. It tried to identify parents, pupils, teachers and headmasters’ points of view on the present curriculum and to establish the strengths and the weaknesses of the new curriculum with a view to proposing all necessary amendments.

The research was focused on the following objectives:

- To determine whether the component parts of the pivotal curriculum are equally represented, namely to see if the curriculum enables the pupils to build enough skills and to acquire proper knowledge both from the point of view of the allotted period of time and of the targeted educational level;
- To identify any possible gaps between primary and secondary education both from content and methodology perspective;
- To identify the concepts from each subject that present a high degree of difficulty for pupils;
- To determine the teaching methods, specific for each subject of study, that are predominant in the teaching process;
- To determine the impact of the new textbooks on the teaching methodology;
- To ascertain parents’ viewpoints with regard to the national curriculum;
- To identify the changes triggered by the implementation of the new curriculum in teaching methodologies and to assess the extent to which this new curriculum stimulates the use of active methods for teaching and learning;
- To establish the extent to which the school-tailored curriculum is appropriate for the skills and the interests of the pupils.

Given the complexity of the themes, the research activity focused on quantitative as well as on qualitative aspects.

- *The quantitative data* were collected by means of questionnaires applied to pupils, teachers and headmasters. The questionnaires were filled in by 5,778 teachers and 350 headmasters from 352 schools as well as by 8,647 pupils from the 4<sup>th</sup> grade and 6,556 pupils from the 8<sup>th</sup> grade. The questionnaires were applied by 150 field operators who are students of Universities from Bucharest, Cluj, Iasi and Timisoara.
- *The qualitative research* focused on two directions:

(1) The content analysis for curricula and all alternative textbooks used for secondary education generated reports for each subject of study. Also, cross-subject reports were drawn on the following themes:

- Explicit and implicit manifestations in school curricula and textbooks;
- Training pupils for a personal life from a privacy prospective;
- Remarks regarding public health on 1<sup>st</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade pupils;
- Basic educational system for 1999 – 2000;
- Curricula and textbook analysis from the school performance assessment perspective;
- Relations established between primary and secondary education subjects of study with a focus on switching from primary to secondary and then to high school;
- Forms of *hidden curriculum* (implicit and explicit school ideologies).

(2) Realizing institutional analyses in 17 schools; data collected through questionnaires or focus group activities realised with: a) teachers with experience in reform targeted subjects; b) young teachers and teacher substitutes; c) parents; d) 4<sup>th</sup> grade pupils; e) 8<sup>th</sup> grade pupils.

## **Outcomes**

The outcomes of this research activity are included in the report called “Change and Continuity in Compulsory Education” which was presented for public debate during a Debate Forum organized in Sinaia during November 22<sup>nd</sup> – 24<sup>th</sup> 2001. This event was attended by the Ministry of Education and Research, Mrs. Ecaterina Andronescu, members of the National Curriculum Council, representatives of the County School Inspectorates and members of the research team. The research report is available both in full and as a synthesis at the *Center Education 2000+* Romania and, as from October 20<sup>th</sup> 2001 on the Internet site [www.cedu.ro](http://www.cedu.ro).

## **B. Impact Study on the Development of the Rural Education**

### **Background. Goals. Activities.**

Like the previous one, this study was realised upon request from the Ministry of Education and Research, within the Project for the Reform of the Romanian Educational System co-financed by the Romanian Government and the World Bank and *Center Education 2000+* was chosen as its executor organisation.

This study aims at evaluating the “Program for the Re-Launch of the Rural Education” developed by the World Bank’s Department of Reform programs in rural schools from the counties of Botosani, Buzau, Constanta, Harghita, Gorj, Maramures, Olt and Sibiu. The program aimed at endowing the schools with new teaching materials and equipment, helping the teachers to develop new resource materials in compliance with the new curriculum as well as actively involving the parents, local authorities and other decision-making factors from the community in school life.

The two-stage impact study was run on a sample of 460 schools from 8 pilot counties. The first stage aimed at diagnosing the rural school status before the initiation of the project and the second on-going stage evaluates the changes induced by the implementation of the project in these schools. The following aspects were considered:

- analyzing the changes occurred in pilot schools;
- difficulties faced during the distribution of teaching materials and equipment; creating resource materials for teaching and learning processes; organizing training sessions; involving the community in the school development process;
- the success obtained in distributing teaching materials and equipment at county level, changing the teaching methods and classroom management, developing new teaching and learning materials;
- recommendations regarding the development and the use of teaching and learning materials, distribution of teaching materials and equipment, training the teachers and headmasters from rural school; active community involvement in school activity.

### **Outcomes**

During both stages, quantitative and qualitative data were collected:

- Quantitative data were obtained through questionnaires applied to 460 headmasters and 3,800 teachers from target schools;
- Quantitative data were obtained through focus-group debates attended by pupils, parents and representatives of local authorities from 24 rural localities. Based on these data, a case study shall be drawn for each of the 8 counties.

### ***C. Elaborating a document for educational policies in the following fields: (a) prospective research in education and (b) initial and continuous training of teachers.***

This program line aimed at generating a national consensus with regard to the above mentioned fields.

The book called “Education – 2015 Horizon” (co-ordinator: Alexandru Crisan) appears after long debates with alternative groups for reflection with regard to the creation of possible scripts for the evolution of the Romanian educational system.

The initial and continuous training of teachers – a key problem of the present reform of the educational system, represent the second theme approached in the field of political analysis. The following activities were considered:

- Approaching a high number of university professors from partner or other program-associated universities;

- Organizing national debates on this theme;
- Providing for a permanent lobby with the Ministry of Education and Reform;
- Publishing a volume on this theme (authors: Romita Iucu, Otilia Pacurari), which, subsequently, became the basis for the decision made by the new Governmental team with regard to the debated theme.

***D. Shaping a possible networking policy in the business and educational environment – Center Education 2000+ Forum for 2001 “Education for Success”***

The “*Education for Success*” Forum was organized during November 29<sup>th</sup> – December 1<sup>st</sup> 2001 and aimed at identifying the problems and solutions shared by the educational system and the business environment from Romania.

The workshops allowed the participants to decide on a National Fund to be created in 2002. The Fund would allow all interested financing entities to offer support to the Romanian education reform. Afterwards, meetings shall be organized between representatives of interested NGOs and the initiative group in order to set up the details related to the administration of this funds and the efficiency of the newly created body. At the same time, the participants launched the idea of founding the “Businessmen for Education” Club, thought as a debate space for promoting initiatives in the education field.

At the same time, *Center Education 2000+* aimed at finding real solutions for aligning the educational process to the demands of the contemporary world, to the labor market and the needs of the present society. According to the organizers of “Education for Success” Forum, the most important problem is to train the young graduate for finding a job, for making it or not as well as for the coherent building of a career.

In this respect, the businessmen made accurate suggestions with regard to school curricula, the balance between practical and theoretical knowledge as well as to the duty of the school environment to build rather attitudes than abilities. Team spirit, the ability to make rapid decisions under stress, dynamicity and flexibility are some of the qualities of a future employee appreciated and desired by employers. The headmasters and the teachers that attended the Forum adopted the declaration made by Mrs. Monica Tatoi, General Manager Oriflame Romania and member of the *Center Education 2000+* Board of Administration: “We hire people for their attitudes and we train them for becoming competitive”.

***3.2.3.4. Interactive and Innovative Curriculum Development and Implementation***

The development and implementation of interactive and innovative curriculum aimed at realising curriculum materials for primary education (see the work mentioned in the chapter focused on public relations and publications), school-tailored curriculum, training for the implementation of the new curriculum, curriculum adapted for remedial education, for young dropouts – “Second Chance”, university and adult education

curriculum (see the new “Open Guidance and Advising Services” programs and those from the Phare Programs recently gained by our Centre).

### **3.2.3.5. *Sustaining the European integration through education***

It is possible to sustain the European integration process through education (approaching modern education fields: adult education; e-education; peer counselling) by applying a series of programs mentioned in sub-chapter 3.3.3. (see below)

### **3.2.3.6. *Sustaining Regional Programs in South-Eastern Europe***

Sustaining regional programs in South-Eastern Europe so as to gradually create a regional network of organizations that could offer educational counseling for complex processes developed in the education reform.

### **3.2.3.7 PUBLIC INFO !!!**

### **3.2.3.8. *The Monitoring of the Project***

**A. Sources of data** –The Center’s policies; documents on monitoring strategy and practice; and monitors’ reports on schools projects implementation.

#### ***B. Monitoring Mechanisms Framework and approach***

According to the Centers’ approach, projects implementation has to be accompanied by a monitoring process, defined as an objective, but friendly supervision of the implementation.

In this respect, it was a particular strategy of the Center in the monitoring field and each pilot school had a monitor selected, trained and supervised by the Center.

Focused on the appropriate implementation of the pilot schools projects (content and assumptions), the monitoring process:

- used specific methods and tools
- was based on the continuing collection of the relevant data
- had an objective, positive and supportive profile.

Generated by the Centers’ overall strategy, the monitoring – as a key process – was related to the other strategic process and dimensions of the project. It had strong connections with the planning, decision making, evaluation, training, guidance, and counseling functions.

In the framework of this approach, the monitoring activities:

- used the schools’ strategies and implementation plans as basic tools
- accompanied continually the implementation of schools projects
- provided data for the school evaluation

From this point of view the monitoring process had a relevant impact on increasing the institutional capacity at the schools level.

### ***Operational aspects – the monitoring team***

To really support the achievement of the monitoring goals (particularly the institutional capacity building), the monitors had specific and clear attributions and professional tasks:

- understanding and applying the general useful information and the monitoring tools
- elaborating an action plan and a time table for each monitoring year
- doing the monthly visits into the schools
- registering monthly observations
- writing the monthly report.

The selection of monitors took into consideration:

- knowledge, skills, abilities in the monitoring field
- competencies in communication and interpersonal relationships
- personal profile (self-control, emotional features, objectiveness, positive thinking, clear values, behavioral flexibility, loyalty, tact and creativity)

To successfully perform its function and to provide relevant and clear information, the monitoring team was supposed to assume and to respect the:

- educational reform's priorities and the CEDU strategic demands
- principles, criteria and rules of efficient monitoring
- monitors institutional status
- monitoring methods and tools

To really understand the implementation and to produce a relevant report on building capacity, monitors had direct contacts with: project's coordinator, activities' coordinators, and school's working group.

According to the Centers' strategies there were professional rights as a part of the monitors' institutional status: free access to the useful information and materials, rewards for good practices and performances, specific training programs and counseling.

### ***Monitoring tools***

As a guaranty of continuity and coherence of the monitoring process, the monitors of the Center used a set of particular tools: action plans, monitoring grids and monthly reports.

**a. The action plan**, as a guiding tool of each monitor, included: monitoring objectives, needed resources, monitoring activities, time limits, contact persons, estimated risks, expected opportunities and self- evaluation methods.

**b. Monitor's timetable**, for a monitoring year, included the monitor's activities and the date, the location and the contact person of each activity.

**c. The monitoring grid** included the main dimensions to focus on: resources allocation, activities implementation, activities impact (according to the project's objectives),

implementation's dysfunction, corrective measures, project's coordinator efficiency, project's team efficiency, impact of training programs, communication with the school's actors, impact on school change and development, contributions to the institutional capacity building.

In this respect, the monitors were supposed to monthly register the relevant information concerning the implementation of the project and to make professional comments on the relevant aspects.

The monthly monitors' reports provided relevant information as concerns the dimensions included in the monitoring grid, with a particular emphasis on school progress in the capacity building field.

### ***C. Focuses***

To support the achievements of schools in terms of aims, goals and objectives, the monitoring process followed as basic rule the respect for:

- the Center's policies, key points and priorities of each year
- the projects' particular features and program lines
- particular features of each educational unit and demands of educational partnership

In this respect, the first responsibility of each monitor was to know and to understand the strategies of the Center and the school's project (objectives, target groups, actions, coordinators, partnerships, connections with other projects, expected results, self monitoring, self-evaluation)

To contribute to the increase of the institutional capacity, the monitors had a particular focus on the:

- activity of the project's team (managerial attributes, interpersonal communication, resources administration, innovation and creativity, openness to change and development, level of maturity and growth)
- school team's profile, team's efficiency
- program lines chosen by the school (the elements considered as crucial points for the institutional capacity building)
- degree of motivation, participation, involvement of schools actors
- respect for the school's particular characteristics
- added values (unclear what this means)
- advantages taken from the partnerships.

### ***D. Results and Facts***

#### ***a. The monitoring process contribution to the capacity building***

The analysis of the monitoring activities proves that they contributed to the empowerment of the educational units and the enlargement of Center's experience. From the point of view of capacity building, the monitoring activities:

- supported the implementation of the projects objectives (related to the growth of institutional capacity)
- provided information on the success in the field of capacity building
- facilitated the understanding of the present needs and demands as refers to the institutional capacity.

***b. Success in capacity building (according to the monitors reports)***

The monitoring reports revealed relevant progress as concerns the capacity building at the level of the pilot schools:

***In the field of school development***, the pilot schools got experience and expertise in: elaborating institutional development strategies and setting up organizational priorities, managing resources, changing the organizational culture, involving and motivating human resources, getting partners, implementing and monitoring innovations, and evaluating the results.

***In the field of school and community***, the pilot schools got: openness to the community, increase of community's interest, new partners and experience in managing the relationships with the community.

***In the field of human resources training***, the pilot schools got real benefits from the central and local training programs (particularly from the school-based training).

As a consequence, human resources of the pilot schools got particular skills and abilities that enable them to initiate and to support specific strategies related to the growth of institutional capacity.

The analyses of the monitoring reports revealed that the implementation of the school projects generated immediate effects with a strong impact on the institutional capacity mainly as refers to the organizational culture and the human resources competencies.

***E. Needs for the future***

Based on the monitoring reports, the present conclusions concerning the implementation results clearly demonstrate that the capacity-building process has to be continued.

To value the strong points attained through the EDP/Education 2000+ project and the new social and educational opportunities, the pilot schools have to be included into a new coherent strategy focused on the capacity building process and its continual valorization.

***3.2.3.9. Evaluation of the Project***

***A. Institutional capacity of evaluation and self-evaluation***

During the first year of the project (1999), the development of the basic institutional competencies for planning/organizing the units/pilot schools included in the project constituted a priority. For this reason, the evaluation concerns were integrated in this process.

Beginning with the second year of the project (2000), when the pilot schools already had real planning/organizing capacities, it became possible, at school level, to separate the issues concerning the development of institutional capacities from project results evaluation activity. During the third year (2001) the basis was already in place for a gradual transfer to institutional self-evaluation.

<b>Project year:</b>	<b>Level where the institutional evaluation capacity is built</b>	<b>Target group (where the capacity is built)</b>	<b>Existing documents Concrete course of actions</b>
Year I.	At Mega-project level and in projects for first wave counties.	-project team of CEDU -project team from the implementing counties	<b>-evaluation report (developed, applied and processed tools)</b> -evaluation seminar -evaluation report presented in Budapest
Year II.	In implementing units level – first wave pilot and resource schools ; second wave project teams.	-project teams of first wave schools.	-CARAVANE Seminars -Training seminar on evaluation for pilot schools -elaboration of self-evaluation guide
Year III.	In first and second wave pilot and resource schools,.	-project teams in schools, the entire school staff members	- self-evaluation guide based on performance indicators, piloted and amended - Guide for Elaboration of Performance Indicators at school level.

**During the first year** of the project a centralized approach of the evaluation issue was necessary for two reasons:

- The project management required a centralized approach;
- In the implementation structures, the specific capacities for an autonomous/local approach were not developed at that time.

The evaluation action carried out during the respective year was completed with a training seminar focused on evaluation, its purpose being to assure a high involvement level of the participants and their motivation for project continuation.

The documents of this seminar were:

- **Evaluation tools**, developed for different target groups representative for the project (interview guide, questionnaires, guide for document analysis, etc)
- **Evaluation Report** – representing a feed-back for the managerial team in view of improvement interventions in project development and in quality assurance, but also a starting point for planning the next stages of the project.

One of the strategic principles for **the second project year** was the ‘de-centralization’, expressed also in the evaluation field. **De-centralization** became, on one hand, **necessary**, also due to the project’s expansion to second wave schools. On the other hand, it was also **possible**, since the basic evaluation competencies were already developed in the work teams from counties and schools.

Together with the evaluation specific purposes, we have also observed the responsibility level developed in the participants to the project in order to perform an effective and efficient evaluation at county level, a progress evaluation, which implied also a promotion of the registered results.

The methods used for these purposes were:

- “Caravan-type Seminars”, organized in every implementing county.
- Training seminars for trainers and monitors focused on program evaluation issues and on efficient evaluation
- Impact study organized in key-institutions

**The documentary evidences** of these activities are:

- The portofolios that exist with Center Education 2000+, namely for the respective counties (written documents, reports, films, pictures, exhibited products) .

These seminars represented a first exercise for the project “outlet” counties in the respective community.

For the specific training of human resources in the evaluation field, we organized: a training seminar for trainers and a workshop for monitors on issues such as project and institutional evaluation.

In 2000 was developed, in the initial stage, an institutional self-evaluation tool, based on performance indicators. This tool prepared the third de-centralization level for the evaluation process. Passing evaluation responsibilities at school level was a necessary measure in our intention, since it prepared the school units for self-support in their actions after the conclusion of project financing.

During the third year of the project, the quantitative accumulations and the qualitative increase called for a situational/contextual approach, able to adjust to the high variety of results/models existing within the project.

The appropriate tool for these needs is the **Self-Evaluation Guide, based on performance indicators**.

The existing guide form is the result of the following contributions:

- Schools that expressed the desire of piloting it;

- Project teams (headmasters and persons in charge with the program lines) that participated in the evaluation seminar for amending the documents that were drawn up;
- CEDU consultants who made proposals/recommendations concerning the form and the content.

In order to become an operational tool, it also has to be edited (published), together with an auxiliary document for schools, in view of setting the specific performance indicators.

### **The Self-Evaluation Guide**

- Is structured on eight self-evaluation fields, set in accordance with the goals of the Mega-Project; (*I. Curriculum; II. Teaching and Learning Process; III. Support for Pupils for Personal Development; IV. Human Resources Development V. Material and Financial Resources; VI. School Climate; VII. School Mission and Vision; VIII. Management, Leadership; IX. Institutional Partnership*)
- 38 performance indicators are formulated; they cover the evaluation fields, in order for these fields to be relevant for the schools involved in the project;
- A number of concrete aspects, noticeable in schools, are formulated for each indicator, and this list is to be amended by each school, according to its specificity.
- The schools using this tool also draw up the set of descriptors for the performance levels (levels 1-4), according to their own performance and to the formulated vision/mission;
- The school must be assisted during the process of aspect formulation and performance levels description, until they develop their own capacity of using the tool.

In the current stage of the project, a distinction must be made between:

- Evaluation performed at Mega-Project level (a program evaluation), and
- Evaluation of the progress/results obtained in the implementation units.

In the first case (Mega-Project evaluation), the reference elements are the very objectives stipulated in the strategic documents (Initial Strategy, amended by the annual strategies).

For the evaluation activity performed in schools, the reference elements must take into consideration the specific conditions existing in the respective school, as well as the concrete objectives of the project.

The two actions are complementary, since the program requires the elaboration of specific mechanism for analysis and interpretation of data collected during the evaluation performed in schools. The interpretation of the results obtained in the implementing units shall identify the “clusters” according to a number of reform implementation models, that can be replicated at system level.

The description of these models as processes shall be the starting point for securing a systemic impact of the project, possible through the assistance given to schools in their

efforts to transfer and use the successful experiences gained during the implementation of the project.

In order to identify these possible models, one of the reference sources is represented by the CEDU trainers/consultants/experts reports, drawn up after the visits/activities in these schools.

### ***B. Vindicating documents/documentary evidence***

- Preliminary stage evaluation:
  - Conceptual structure;
  - Developed, applied and processed documents;
  - Written report;
  - Evaluation Seminar portofolio;
  - Report presented at OSI Budapest.
  
- Documents from the Training Seminar for trainers on/for evaluation;
- Documents of the workshop for monitors focused on evaluation;
- “Caravan” Seminars portofolios from the counties Galati, Iasi, Cluj and Bucuresti, Center Education 2000+ and local portofolios (county level)
- Initial form of the Self-evaluation Guide based on performance indicators
- Documents from the seminars amending the Self-Evaluation Guide
- Present form of the Guide.

## ***3.3. PRESENTATION OF THE EXIT STRATEGIES AND THE FUTURE STEPS***

### ***3.3.1. Developing and Exit and Sustainability Strategy for 2003-2005***

As mentioned before, the Education 2000+/EDP implemented between 1999 and 2001 is intended to continue in 2002 and to have a clear exit and sustainability strategy for 2003-2005. The reasons are as follow:

a. The Board of Directors of *Center Education 2000+* has decided to extend the EDP up to June 2002. Such a decision has been taken, on the one hand, in order to adjust EDP to the real duration of the school fall 2001/2002 (that in Romania ends in June). On the other hand, the Board’s decision was based on a large number of requests coming from our pilot schools to find out ways to continue the project. Of course, the decision does not affect the initial strategy of the project. On the contrary, it allows the generation of some clear ‘exit strategies’ that will assure the sustainability of the outcomes even more than before.

b. The Education 2000+/EDP has attracted during these years a number of new projects, generating an important **SEE regional component**. Reference is made here first of all to the projects run by the Center in the framework of the Stability Pact with different partner

countries of the SEE region. These projects are co-financed by other international donors (the Austrian Government, DEZA, Norway, and Balkan Youth Foundation) and some of them will be concluded in 2002. All of them have their starting point in the EDP, and their continuation and successful implementation would need further support of OSI and its Education Sub-Board. In fact many of the good examples and success stories of the EDP have been replicated in different partner countries (see below).

c. *Center Education 2000+* has developed a clear exit strategy from Education 2000+/EDP. It is already prepared and it is a basic component of the present strategy for 2003. This exit strategy will basically encompass a continuation of the EDP with a possible OSI financial support, as well as with contributions from other donors. Such a continuation will comprise: (1) a school networking program in which pilot schools of the project will be encouraged to create sustainable school networks in accordance with their areas of interest and competence developed during the project (Education 2000+/EDP); (2) a human resource development program that intends to foster the human capacities created during the project (trainers, local training centers, successful training models etc.); (3) a policy analysis and development program that aims at supporting national and local educational policy development in order to foster sustainable development in education; (4) a SEE regional program that intends to promote and replicate successful models developed in certain counties of the region in other countries. All these show the systemic impact of EDP in Romania, a strand that can be further developed and channeled by creating and encouraging a sustainable SEE education model, starting from current good practices in the region. Based on its national and international experience and expertise, *Center Education 2000+* can act as a component of a think tank network of expert organizations in the region that would offer educational advice and consultancy in different areas of the education reforms of the region.

d. The *Center* intends to start – immediately after June 2002 (so when the project is really concluded) – an extended impact study concerning EDP. The design of such an impact study is under preparation and it will use as instruments: analyses of the documents issued during the program, questionnaires, focus groups, institutional analyses of the pilot schools, field visits, interviews etc. The impact study will start in September and in December 2002 the first results will be issued. The lessons learned through this process will have an important role in promoting further programs of this type.

### **3.3.2. Key characteristics of the Strategy for 2002**

The key characteristics of the Strategy for 2002 are:

#### **1. Monitoring and assessing the quality of activities developed by the institutional structures established in the framework of the project such as :**

- *The implementation centers* (counties) for the educational programs promoted by OSF Romania;

- *The key institutions* (County School Inspectors Office, Teaching Staff Centers, Universities/Departments of Teacher Education and Colleges, School-based training centers) that become strategic partners in the programs;
- *The working groups* made up by representatives of the above mentioned institutions and other local informal leaders in the educational field;
- *The network of pilot schools* selected on open competition basis against their development plans. Among pilot schools, during the year 2000, *resource schools* (institutions able to offer expertise in school improvement and development and in educational staff development) and *magnet schools* (institutions that have vision and organizational coherence and can attract other schools around them due to their capacity to present practices that are valuable and easy to replicate even nationwide);
- *Task forces on different program areas* – involving experts that play an important part in developing the Center sector policies (school improvement, initial and in-service teacher training, Roma education etc.);
- *The team of trainers and project monitors* – selected against an open competition, able to offer training modules and technical assistance to the institutions involved in different programs and to monitor the effects of different interventions at school/institutional level;
- *The training centers and resource centers based in schools* and a number of key institutions that have excellent results and as such offer their expertise to others.

## **2.Fostering school development/improvement and institutional capacity building that is based on:**

- *School improvement* – as a complex process that implies a thorough change at the level of the working and learning environment in schools (participatory management, active tasks for curricular or problem areas, stimulating the learning process etc.).
- *Institutional Capacity Building* – the development of high quality management mechanisms, fostering the planning, developing, monitoring and evaluation of activities in schools etc.
- *Inter-institutional Development Plan* – specifying the mission of the school, long term and short term objectives, predictable outcomes, as well as the actions that a group of institutions at local level has in view, as a result of their common aims and interests.
- *Teacher training focused on school* – the school-centered, team-centered training proved to have many advantages: building the sense of a common mission, creating a common organizational culture as well as assuming a set of common values.
- *Formal structuring of the relation school-parents-community* – the local authorities, the church, other individuals or organizations interested in school life established an open collaboration with the schools involved in Education 2000+ projects.
- *Second Chance – remedial educational programs and processes* addressed mainly to the young Roma who dropped out of school at different ages and who are over school age.

## **3.Fostering and monitoring the models created in the framework of the project and mentoring their dissemination.**

Successful school based development and improvement practices implemented during the process have been replicated in 2000 – 2001. That happened by means of a series of concrete processes:

- *Fostering the improvement of quality control* at the level of the existing network (specific strategies for monitoring and evaluating processes at school/institutional level were developed and implemented);
- *Extending partnership and networking* with other interested parties and active donors; *encouraging the development of local institutional framework* for the school-to-school, school-to-parents and school-community partnership;
- *Developing a higher education component* focused on pre-service teacher training and master degree in educational policy in the Departments of Education of some selected universities etc.

**4. Encouraging ownership of the institutions and individuals involved, partnership, networking, creating capacities for financial and conceptual autonomy** by introducing motivational mechanisms to finance the institutions involved in EDP/Education 2000+ programs. Schools and key institutions were financed according to their capacity to get funds from third parties. *Center Education 2000+* has been encouraging and financially supporting the creation of local capacities that can support the process of change at the school level. Various and dynamic selection mechanisms to encourage and support the most challenging innovations at the local level were implemented.

**5. Extending the intervention of Education 2000+ by means of new projects and third party funding for Romania and SEE region.** In 2001-2002, new program areas were developed, based on the results of the EDP implementation and on a set of prerequisites generated by the analysis of the ongoing education reform process in Romania. The following **projects** have been developed based on the Romanian EDP: *Improving education in disadvantaged areas* (project developed in partnership with KulturKontakt – Austria: 83.880USD); *Improving Roma Education – Focus on Romania* (project financed by the Austrian Government and Swiss DEZA in the framework of the Stability Pact – 164.965USD), *Second chance for older drop-outs* (project financed by the Norwegian Government in the framework of the Stability Pact – 95.000US; *Equal Opportunities for Roma Children through School Development, Plans and Parents' Involvement* (project financed by MATRA, the Netherlands – 420.000USD for the next three years); *Impact Study concerning the Rural Education Development Project of Ministry of Education Romania* (project financed by the Ministry of Education and Research Romania – 30.000USD); *Impact Study concerning the Curriculum Reform in Romania* (project financed by the Ministry of Education Romania – 48.250USD); *Implementing the PISA+ Project* on behalf of the National Assessment and Evaluation Service of Romania (NAES) (project financed by the Ministry of Education and Research Romania – 38.664USD); *Open Guidance and Advising Services* (project financed by the European Commission; the Center is the coordinator of the project and the partners are from Italy, Finland, Portugal, Cyprus and Bulgaria – 227.273USD); *Together for a better community* (project financed by UNICEF – 49.900USD); *A Career Dream* (project financed by The Balkan Children and Youth Foundation – 18.746USD); *Mentors*

*Evaluation* on behalf of NAES Romania (project financed by the Ministry of Education and Research – 20.568USD; *Human Resource Development in the Highschools from the North-West Region to adapt the School offer to the Labor Market Requirements*(project financed by Phare Programs Romania – 116.424 Euro) and *The development and implementation mechanism as a systemic instrument to encourage employment.Active measures to adept professional training to the requirements of the labor market* project financed by Phare Programs Romania –164.860 Euro)

### **3.3.3. Exit and Sustainability Strategy for 2003-2005**

The strategy for 2003-2005 has as its starting points the current situation and challenges of the Romanian education system as compared to those of 1997-2000 (see also Chapter 1). The following processes constitute the dominant factors of the current *political change* after the parliamentary elections in 2000:

- The *political decision to stop some of the previous systemic reform processes*, without any clear strategy concerning the ways for such a critical change;
- *Serious delays in developing clear educational policies and exit strategies* for different sectors of education that have concluded an important 5-year World Bank Project in 2002 (curriculum development, textbooks, assessment, teacher training, management);
- A number of *anti-liberal measures* issued in 2001 and 2002 in order to re-centralize the system. Reference is made to processes such as the critical restrictions on the free market of alternative textbooks; closing some of the private universities; reductions of the percentage of the school-based curriculum in the framework of the new National Curriculum; less freedom for local school institutions). In addition, generally speaking there are clear restrictions on the liberal reforms, and the Ministry of Education seems to prefer ruling and managing the system than monitoring it as happened between 1997-2000.

In addition, there is still a real need of regional vision and approaches that can support and replicate good models developed throughout different country-based projects in the **SEE region**. As such, a set of regional models for institutional capacity building, human resource development, policy analysis and development should be encouraged by all means.

#### ***Priorities***

In such a situation, the *Center Education 2000+* has the following priorities for the next years:

- Fostering local institutional development processes (schools, local school authorities);
- Fostering school-based human resource development (teacher training, training of trainers and school managers – all encompassing liberal type of education that meet students' real needs);
- Supporting local/central and sector-based/global educational policy analysis and development (training for policy analysis and development at the Ministry, and local level);

- Fostering SEE regional approaches (improving education for Roma, disadvantaged areas, educational networking – all those topics are already components of our regional projects).

As a consequence of the above-mentioned priorities, *Center Education 2000+* intends to continue the former EDP (1999/2001) with a new one for a period of three years (2003-2005).

### ***Strategic Directions***

In this framework, the *strategy for 2003-2005* would focus on four main directions. On the one hand, all of them continue the previous EDP (1999/2001), opening on the other hand directions for further sustainable development of the results and outcomes of this project.

- ***Institutional capacity building*** (comprising school development and school improvement processes, school and community relationship, parental involvement, education in disadvantaged areas and in multicultural settings, education for Roma);
- ***Human resource development*** (training of trainers and teacher training in different areas: active learning, school-based curriculum, student guidance, educational management and reform implementation processes, teachers' support in implementing innovation);
- ***Policy development and implementation*** (advice for policy analysis and development, training for policy development and implementation, think-tanking in the development of policies for education in disadvantaged areas)
- **SEE region-based approaches based on the added value of regional networking and more and more globalized society** (education for disadvantaged areas, education for Roma, human resource development for policy making etc.).

### ***Areas of activity***

According to the strategic dimensions presented in the previous chapter, the actions for a new EDP (2003) aim at covering three main areas:

- A School Networking Program
- A Professional Development Program
- A Policy Analysis and Development Program
- A SEE regional Program component

#### ***3.3.3.1. The School Networking Program***

The global reform process of the Romanian educational system – generated by the Reform Project co financed by the Romanian Government and the World Bank – has been mainly focused on general changes at a central level. Therefore, it only partially and discontinuously targeted the class and the school and as such it did not produce a sustainable institutional capacity development. At the same time, the human resource development process mainly followed the cascade type of mechanism. As such, it was not entirely connected to the specific needs of the individuals and their ongoing

professional development and it did not offer a valid monitoring and evaluation system for the professional performances of the teachers.

In this context it was identified the need to train resource persons skilled in local and sectorial educational policies to create and implement sustainable models in education.

The project Education 2000+ run by Center Education 2000+ intervened in the reform implementation and it centered its effort on a series of school-based processes. Complementarily with the initiatives of the Ministry of Education, the Center Education 2000+ encouraged school-based training and implementation activities, intra and inter-institutional communication developing, replicating models in the reform process.

In the first years of its implementation process, the pilot and resource schools developed strategies and implementation plans that followed the 6 program directions promoted through the initial EDP strategy: school improvement, in-service and pre-service training, school and community relationship, intra- and inter-institutional development, Roma capacity building in education and awareness-raising for education reform.

In the final year of the project these implementation units targeted their institutional strategies on the specific mission of the schools identifying dominant directions and partnerships and creating networks with schools and institutions with the same needs and interests.

As a consequence of the Center's initiatives, the following systemic needs were identified to sustain and develop schools as autonomous entities:

- To create professional development opportunities for teachers in schools and in the networks;
- To improve quality in education through network cooperation;
- To sustain schools/networks for institutional capacity development;
- To continue the training activities in accordance with already-identified needs;
- To identify the roles of the institutions involved in the networks.

After the thorough analyses of the monitoring and evaluation process in the project Education 2000+ (EDP), it can be stated that many of the long-term strategies of the pilot schools can be grouped into **a series of school-clusters based on common interests and skills developed.**

As a result, it is a necessity to set up **networks of schools** with specific tasks and areas of interest that in the long run can function as sustainable school-based support for other institutions interested in educational change implementation.

### **17 *General Objectives***

- Clustering the pilot schools developed during the Education 2000+/EDP project (1999/2001) according to the areas of interests/competencies developed in this project;
- Encouraging the development of functional school networks on the bases of these clusters;
- Creating proper mechanisms to make the networks self-sustainable and to attract other institutions interested in their own development;
  - Extending the networks on the basis of long term strategies;
  - Creating the idea of sustainable school networks as bases for further development and systemic impact on Romanian education.

### ***Specific Objectives for the School Networks***

- To identify and promote the expertise developed in the Project Education 2000+;
- To create a space of knowledge in and around the networks;
- To sustain communication in /outside the networks;
- To facilitate, create and promote databases with local experts competent in areas of interest in the region;
- To produce and disseminate materials produced within the networks;
- To develop common projects intra- and inter-networks;
- To offer consultancy and counseling for other institutions interested in the results of the piloting activities;
- To produce new methodologies at local level for school and network usage;
- To develop abilities in participative strategic planning;
- To produce network evaluation and self-evaluation instruments;
- To facilitate exchange of piloted materials and updated information;
- To facilitate debates and discussion forums on topics of common interest.

### **18 *Duration of the Project***

The project is designed for a period of 3 years and it has the following implementation phases:

- Preparation phase;
- Operational phase;
- Dissemination and self-sustainability phase.

### **19 *Strategic Approach***

The creation of the school networks on bases of common interest areas is important for the future development of the institutional capacities in schools and key institutions. The development of the networks is determined by the results of the needs assessment processes, characteristics of program design, policy analyses data, resource negotiations

programs, types of partnerships, and the database from the monitoring and evaluation system.

The network models promote the horizontal coordination and communication among schools and the vertical data collection (bottom up, top down) in order to correlate the needs of the schools with the offers already existing in the system.

To develop the institutional capacities within the network, the strategic of this new project targets two levels:

- The intra-institutional one – through school-centered activities (the production of experimental organizational graphs, production of new job descriptions, creation of quality management instruments and crisis-management tools as well as the production of cooperation instruments with the extra educational environment);
- Inter-institutional – through network-centered activities; the network is energized through the cooperation and communication among schools and institutions within the networks.

At this level the human resource development activities take place on three levels:

- At individual level;
- At school level;
- At network level.

The development of policy programs within each network is the obvious outcome of this three dimensional approach on the two levels.

## 20 *Description*

The process of school identification is not region-oriented but rather in accordance with a set of selection criteria. These will be:

- Narrative reports of the pilot and resource schools made between 1999/2001
- Monitoring reports written along the project development;
- Questionnaires applied to pilot and resource schools;
- New projects written in schools;
- The capacity of schools to raise funds;
- Partnerships established with other schools or institutions;
- Number of innovative teachers in the schools involved in the project ;
- The active presence of schools in community life;
- The way and level at which the school equipment is properly used in schools;

After the identification phase of those schools that have had outstanding outcomes during the project **Education 2000+ (EDP: 1999/2001)**, it follows the **clustering phase** (on groups and categories of schools). As a result of the monitoring and evaluation processes in the Project Education 2000+, the following strategic clusters or school networks can be anticipated:

- **School and community:** schools with successful experiences in managing/developing the school-community relationship. The cluster is made of schools in which parents were actively involved in the life of the schools, built up partnerships with the representatives of the community and successfully raised funds (i.e. **Community School Model**).
- **Interculturality** – schools that successfully identified the needs of students of different ethnic groups and developed activities that encourage anti-bias attitudes and ran support activities for students in difficulty, activities to reduce stereotypes and prejudices, that motivate students to take part in the educational act – **Intercultural School Model**.
- **Human Resource Development** – is a direction that covers:
  - **The Participative/partnership oriented schools** – cluster of schools that centered their mission on activities and projects organized in schools by students, extracurricular activities, schools with counseling and guidance for students, schools where the Students' Council is active.
  - **Professional Development School** – schools where teachers trained in the Project Education 2000+ apply the new methodologies in the teaching-learning-evaluation process, develop interdisciplinary projects and disseminate the successful experiences.
  - **Communication, Promotion and Awareness Raising** – schools with successful experiences in promoting the school offer, communication of the inter/intra institutional type, teaching aids and material development and dissemination, activities that promote the achievements of the students and of the teachers (through exhibitions, educational job fairs, the days of the open gates , a good promotion of the project at local level) –**The Open School Model**

Each group of schools will become a network of about 5-6 schools with the same interests and competence areas. In this context, as an exit strategy from the project Education2000+ we could set up at least 5 school networks that would develop common strategies for long-term self-sustainability at both school and network level.

The above presented models function as learning organizations. Each network develops a strategy and implements:

- common activities
- exchange of experience
- develop common projects
- analyze aspects that have to be improved for institutional capacity development in each school and of the network itself.

The identified network models function as magnet units to attract other schools with the innovative and easily explorable character of the practices they promote. The development and functioning strategies of the networks envision the building up of new networks on the bases of the piloted mechanisms .Each network will pilot the proposed

model in accordance with a specific mission, strategic objectives and an implementation plan.

## 21 *Types of Activities*

To attain the objectives of the School Networking Program, the following set of activities are considered:

- workshops for the school clusters;
- exchange of experience within the network of schools;
- training courses centered on schools: critical thinking and active learning, differentiated instruction, strategic planning, information technology, quality management, knowledge and resource management, project management, conflict management.
- training courses centered on networks:

*General topics:* inter/intra institutional communication, knowledge and information management, conflict management, fund raising, public image promotion.

*Specific topics* related to the dominant strand of the network: interculturality, school and community, the psychology of students and adults, new theories of learning.

- monitoring and consultancy for the networks;
- chain exhibitions and training events
- publication and informative material production;
- press conferences and a web page for each network;
- new project development on the dominant feature of each network;
- dissemination activities through the Educational Policy Colloquia of the Center Education 2000+ and the Annual Forum of Center Education 2000+.

## 22 *Expected Results*

- effective development models of complex institutional capacity building;
- mechanisms for network development;
- replicable networking models on varied competence and interest patterns;
- network models as support networks for school improvement and school development;
- models of self-sustainable and autonomous institutions within the networks;
- development and implementation of sectorial educational policies ;
- resource persons, consultants, trainers as agents of change for other schools and institutions as well;
- a great number of schools to benefit from the results of the project Education 2000+;
- informative materials of interest produced by each network on specific network issues.
- a web page for each network;
- active partnerships with schools in the country and abroad on grounds of common good practices ;

### ***3.3.3.2. The Professional Development Program***

The human resource development is an essential component of the general strategy of Center Education 2000+, an institution that sustains an educational system based on open and honest competition, cooperation, encouragement of individual innovation and initiatives. The present strategy gives a detailed presentation of the main steps and specific professional development activities that are part of the implementation plan of Center Education 2000+ for the year 2003.

The present strategy is based on: (a) the results obtained in the previous years through the implementation program of the project Education 2000+ and of the critical thinking program; (b) the training needs that were identified through the analyses of the reform process in Romania; (c) the current situation in the process of institutional capacity development in Romania; (d) the analyses of the educational market in Romania.

#### ***A. Objectives***

The main strategic objectives for the year 2003 are:

- The continuation and extension of the successful experiences and good practices from the project Education 2000+;
- The immediate reply directed to the training needs that occur in a society that undergoes the process of change;
- Contribution to the process of educational market-development in Romania;
- Opening up the training offer to other sectors of education than the school/university ones;

In this context, the restructuring of the training system and of the human resource development should continue in the directions set by the premises of quality education as requested by the process of change in education. Therefore, in the year 2003 the training programs should:

- Sustain the development of an open, flexible school that can adapt to the world in continuous change, a school open to the individual needs of the members of the community.
- Be developed from the perspective of the continuous training needs of the adults;
- Contribute to the decentralization of the educational system;
- Contribute to the development of a free educational market ;
- Sustain the improvement of the teaching-learning process at grassroots level ;
- Contribute to the implementation of the curricular objectives at local level;
- Bring the changes in education to the grassroots level ;
- Focus on the humanistic dimension of education both through the training topics and through the working methodology;
- Develop the critical and creative thinking of the participants;
- Promote innovation and the novelty in the young adult and adult learning;
- Evaluate the impact of the professional development programs at individual and institutional level.

## **23 Professional Development Strategy Approach**

The professional development strategy is based on the following premises:

- To attain the quality standards set for the professional development programs implemented through the projects of the *Center Education 2000+* ;
- To continue the training activities started in the Project Education 2000+ (EDP);
- To develop and extend the professional development activities that generated good practices;
- To continue the successful training events and open them up to country level: the critical thinking program, school-based training activities, summer school training events, training packages on request.

### **17 Types of activities for professional development 2003**

- Trainer training programs.
- Professional development programs in pilot schools (integrated training activities).
- In-service training events:
  - At central level on topics of general interest;
  - At network level on topics of specific interest;
  - At school level on needs-tailored training programs;
  - On request, for other target groups than educationalists;
  - Summer Schools for training teachers to implement changes in subject curriculum;
  - Training modules for critical thinking development.
- Training activities for human resource development in the projects developed and implemented by Center Education 2000+.
- Training programs for clusters of schools on specific targets.
- Training and consultancy material publication for national and international events;
- Training and consultancy for network development.

### **18 Expected Outcomes**

- A body of trainers and consultants, experts on international standards;
- Educationalists skilled in the implementation of the curricular reform;
- Complex training packages for professional development at local level;
- Promotion materials published (newsletter, leaflet , catalogue, guidebook );
- Resource persons specialized at school level in different areas for institutional capacity building ;
- Web page and corresponding links with updated information about all the professional development and training events of the Center;
- On-line communication with the beneficiaries of the programs delivered.

#### **3.3.3.3 The Policy Analysis and Development Program**

*This program will follow two main lines of action:*

**A. Impact Study** – the first one of this extent in the Soros Open Network – concerning the Education 2000+/EDP results.

The research will follow the below mentioned objectives:

- To determine the impact of the project at program development directions: intra/interinstitutional communication, school development, school and community, pre-service and in-service training, Roma community capacity development to take part in the educational act, public information.
- To examine the way in which the change was produced at pilot school level in the project.
- To analyze the significant changes produced by the project development at the level of institutional capacity building, human resource development, and sectorial, local and national policy programs.
- To identify the potential disfunctions produced at the level of the diverse program components;
- To evaluate the quality and the effectiveness of the data obtained in the monitoring and internal evaluation of the entire process.
- To identify the models with the highest rate of demultiplication in the educational system.
- To identify the opinion of the local community members (parents, local authorities) who became active in the project.
- To give recommendations concerning the new program directions that could be approached further on.

Because of the complexity of the issues under analyses the research will consider both quantity and quality indicators.

**B. Opening up the Colloquia of Center Education 2000+**

Starting with the year 2002 the Colloquia of Center Education 2000+ will be institutionalized. They will be organized as panel discussions, seminars on educational problems of interest for Romania, with the consequent publishing of materials. There will be invited Romanian as well as foreign specialists. The potential topics for this year are:

- School improvement in the rural area in Romania
- Management and school development
- Educational policy in the domain of curriculum
- Educational policy in the field of evaluation
- Policy for remedial education in risk areas
- Educational policy promoted by NGOs.

These activities are seen as a means to raise public awareness and build public opinion on the education change process in Romania, making it sustainable and irreversible.

#### ***3.3.3.4. The SEE regional program component***

This program area would encompass:

- a. the continuation of the SEE regional project already developed
- b. the opening of our projects towards new partners and funders
- c. the organization of a Summer University for Young Educational Policy Makers from different SEE countries (funds will be further identified).