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Prologue

I would like to turn your attention to the fact that we must think of how to participate in international education. We must develop here a person with a modern mindset. A person who is a creator, not a destroyer. A person with the mindset of a patriot, not a fanatic but a patriot with a tolerant mindset … with a mindset that will help him solve his problems in a creative way and help people around to be creative in decision making, not to be narrow thinking. To be the kind of person, in a sense, intended by God … and in accordance with this high ideal, the person must learn to solve huge problems. … every citizen must be a citizen not only of his country but of the planet. Wherever a person lives, he must live confidently. He must respect all people around irrespective of race, philosophy, nationality, or education. We must think of how to develop in a child what was given to him by God. We used to have a pedagogics of violence. I can say it for certain that we also have a pedagogics of violence in our institutions. We must reject it and replace it with the pedagogics of respect, of mutual understanding… we must start to develop a pedagogics of love toward the child….

Tajikistan Global Education Workshop, Opening address, December 9, 2002
Munira Inoyatova, Head of the Department of Science and Education at the President’s Office, and Former Minister of Education, Tajikistan

So this is what interests me in the approach of global education is that it’s the countries themselves doing the job while global education [IIGE] acts as facilitators. But, they are not demanding or dictating what to include and what not to include, they’re just establishing the dialogue with the local institutions on how to do better education in the respective countries. So, the output varies from country to country. There is no uniform approach or curriculum across each country. This flexibility and individuality by country has to be protected and so far as I have seen global education is managing that.

Philippe Heffinck, UNICEF CARK Area Representative,
Interview, July 8, 2002

One thing is clear … what I’ve seen in the classroom is that it is highly competitive, and we know that in the competitive learning atmosphere some people will go through but the rest just drop off. Do we want this? Do we want only one ballerina and one sculptor? Do we want only one chess player who may be the champion of the world but the economy is devastated and the people are just falling out? Or do we want to improve every citizen according to their ability and their interest and to be part of global society? That is something for curriculum and education reform.

Nurper Ulkuer, Child Development Officer, UNICEF CARK
Interview, July 8 2002
Executive Summary

Project description: This is a report on an on-going education project that began with a joint CARK workshop in Almaty in February 2002 and is intended to introduce Global Education in CARK through a pilot school approach and continuing consulting from IIGE.

Evaluation: This qualitative, utilization-focused interim evaluation report looks at all aspects of the project from inception in February 2002 until the end of December 2002 with the purpose of facilitating decision making in the formation and development of the project.

Global Education: The philosophy of Global Education (GE) is considered and found very appropriate to the educational context in CARK. The Pedagogy of GE is child friendly but maintains a teacher directed, recipe oriented style that is appropriate in the transition from traditional to progressive schools. Curricular content is social issues directed and is important and urgent. GE has had successful experience in other countries.

Educational Needs in CARK: Educational needs have been described in various existing documents and focus on a lack of materials, resources, and teacher skill, reliance on traditional methods, declining literacy levels and enrollments, and deteriorating school facilities.

Initial Project Proposal: A project proposal was written in June 2002 following the initial workshop. Although response from countries varied in February, the proposal was for a uniform approach across CARK for purposes of discussion with governments and fundraising. A flexible working proposal and plan is needed.

Initial National Workshops Three -day workshops followed by a two day orientation with the core team was held in each country. Although generally successful, especially in attitude and enthusiasm, IIGE had concern about the small number of young, active teachers on the teams, and the apparent different states of readiness in the countries.

Overall Thematic Evaluation

GE approach was reviewed and found compatible and appropriate for CARK. IIGE capacity to carry out the six year project was questioned because of some shortage of senior faculty consultants. The addition of consultants from England strengthens the resources but overall capacity remains a concern. Graduate student availability adds real strength. Demand from IIGE involvement in other projects presents some capacity concern.

IIGE mission reports have varied in detail and evaluative dimension and need greater consistency in balance of description and evaluation.

UNICEF CARK: Administration – has been efficient and reliable. Communication – has been a challenge and has been a bit spotty and needs improvement. National
participation—IIGE has felt there needs to be more involvement at the workshop level since so much depends on area project coordination. **Resourcing of IIGE by UNICEF**—responsive consulting depends on context knowledge and resourcing needed improvement in the early stages but is being addressed. **UNICEF CARK Restructuring**—is a concern to IIGE since the administration of the project will of necessity change in 2004.

**Translation:** Interpretation is crucially important in communication and needs constant vigilance. IIGE has been generally satisfied but has some concerns that might be addressed through creation of glossaries. **Materials in Russian**—are a need and ought to be created as soon as possible.

**Process:** GE espouses collaborative processes and these need to be employed in all aspects of project development and implementation at all levels.

**Core team capacity:** Activity writing is a key function and abilities seem to vary. Practicing teachers are key. Core teams are also influenced by leadership style and greater collaborative and participatory approaches are desirable.

**Project plan and proposal:** Original proposal featured uniformity across CARK. Present realities demand flexibility and origination in a true collaborative style.

**National financial capacity:** Going to scale will require financial resources and commitment. This is a concern and needs early planning and projection.

**Key Recommendations**

1. A needs assessment for curriculum development or clarification should be done immediately.
2. A plan to facilitate teacher growth from “recipe followers” to “autonomous progressive educators” should be built into the project.
3. IIGE needs to expand its complement of consultants immediately and assure UNICEF of adequate capacity to conduct the project for the duration of the plan or insist on limiting the number of countries for implementation.
4. Country specific variations in the implementation plans should be considered immediately, based on:
   a. Core team capacity
   b. Leadership strength
   c. Political will and climate
   d. Preparedness of schools and teachers
   e. Need for curriculum development
5. Key Global Education materials should be translated into Russian.
6. In the spirit of Global Education, to assure ownership and team-building, and to model participatory democracy, all crucial planning and decision-making should be thoroughly collaborative with senior consultants and not merely periodically consultative.
7. Implication for the Global Education Project of the plans to restructure UNICEF in the CARK region should be anticipated, discussed, and addressed within the next year.
8. Communication between UNICEF and IIGE problems often result from preparation timelines that are too short. All activities should be planned and scheduled a year in advance with final commitments in place four months before any event.
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Introduction

This report describes and examines in detail the context and events of an educational reform effort initiated by UNICEF in Central Asia and Kazakhstan. The International Institute for Global Education at the University of Toronto is the consulting group. This report is a utilization-focused evaluation intended for the use of the stakeholders.

Basic Initiative Description

In February 2002 an educational reform project was initiated by UNICEF for the CARK region. The International Institute for Global Education (IIGE) at the University of Toronto was engaged to provide consultation and the implementation of a Global Education Project. David Selby, Director of IIGE, and Lidra Remacka, IIGE associate, began the project with a five-fold mission between February 9-16, 2002: (1) visiting schools in Almaty and the Talgar District; (2) meeting with Philippe Heffinck, UNICEF CARK Area Representative and Nurper Ulkuer, Head of Child Development Section, UNICEF CARK; (3) conducting the regional conference “Towards the Child-friendly Classroom: Enriching the Curriculum; Enhancing Learning Quality,” (Almaty, Kazakhstan 12 February 2002); (4) facilitating a the three-day workshop (13-15 February); (5) meetings with the educational program assistants and country representatives from Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan.

In June 2002 a draft six-year project proposal was presented to UNICEF CARK by IIGE and in July initial country Global Education workshops were conducted.

The first workshop took place in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan from July 7 – 11. David Selby, Linda Cameron, IIGE faculty members, and John P. Myers, IIGE associate, conducted the three-day workshop. Lee Bartel, IIGE faculty member, attended the workshop as project evaluator. Linda Cameron and John P. Myers followed the workshop with a two-day training session with a selected National Core Team to develop understanding and skill in Global Education activity writing. The second country workshop was held in Tashkent, Uzbekistan from July 10 – 14, 2002. David Selby, and IIGE associates Fumiyo Kagawa and Neil Boland, conducted the workshop and the Core Team training sessions. Lee Bartel observed the latter part of the workshop.

Between July and September, UNICEF and IIGE negotiated and revised aspects of the draft project proposal and contract to include potential partnered involvement by faculty
members of the College of St Mark and St John, Plymouth England. No institutional contract was finalized but the project proceeded. During October and November, IIGE consultants reviewed and responded to initial activity drafts produced by the Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan Core Teams.

From December 9 – 13 an initial Global Education Workshop was held in Dushanbe, Tajikistan with Linda Cameron and IIGE associate, Hugh Brewster. David Selby participated during the first day but went on to conduct the workshop in Almaty. Lee Bartel observed the workshop. A formal consultative meeting was held with Abdulbashir Rashidov, First Deputy Minister of Education, Yukie Mokuo, UNICEF Assistant Representative for Tajikistan, and David Selby, Director of IIGE, regarding Global Education implementation plans.

David Selby, Jim Christophers, (of the College of St Mark and St John, Plymouth England) and associate Fumiyo Kagawa facilitated the initial country Global Education workshop in Almaty, Kazakhstan from December 11 – 15. Lee Bartel observed the workshop during day 2 and 3. The Core Team training sessions were facilitated by Jim Christophers since David Selby and Fumiyo Kagawa went on to Ashgabat, Turkmenistan.

From December 16 – 20 the initial country Global Education workshop was held in Turkmenistan. David Selby facilitated the first two days. Associates Lidra Remacka, Heather Reid, and Neil Boland assisted and completed the workshop and the Core Team training sessions. Fumiyo Kagawa attended the first days of the workshop as evaluator on behalf of Lee Bartel.

Follow-up workshops related to activity writing were held with Core Teams in Kyrgyzstan from December 16- 18 with Linda Cameron and Lee Bartel facilitating, and in Uzbekistan with Lidra Remacka facilitating.

A formal briefing meeting was held on December 7 with Nurper Ulkuer, Head of Child Development Section, Robert Fuderich, Senior Education Advisor, David Selby, Linda Cameron, Lee Bartel, Fumiyo Kagawa, and Hugh Brewster. A planning meeting was held on December 11 with Nurper Ulkuer, David Selby, Jim Christophers, and Fumiyo Kagawa to look at contract issues, especially around the involvement of a second institution in Plymouth England. A short information meeting took place on December 13 with Philippe Heffinck UNICEF CARK Area Representative, Nurper Ulkuer, David Selby, Jim Christophers, Lee Bartel, and three representatives of the World Bank including Chris Lovelace, newly appointed to the Bishkek office.

**Scope of this Evaluative Report:**

This report is based on the UNICEF – IIGE Project-related activities described above between February and December 2002.

**Purpose of this Report:**

This interim evaluation report is created for three basic purposes: (1) to inform participants (consultants, facilitators, and organizers) who may be connected to one part of the project or whose involvement has not been from the beginning, about the project as a whole, its genesis, and development; (2) to facilitating decision-making about the future direction of the Global Education Project in CARK. Since no project plan has been fully agreed to by
UNICEF and IIGE, and no institutional contract has been signed by either party, it is important to examine closely all possible facets of the intended project, and the actions and experiences of the past year with the purpose of re-engineering plans for ongoing or proposed activities, and; (3) to maintain accountability this evaluation report examines whether input expectations have been met by IIGE as well as by UNICEF CARK. Although evaluation reports may have a role in an institution’s communication, this report is essentially intended to be used by stakeholders to inform decision-making about future actions. In that sense it reports on an essentially utilization-focused evaluation, one that adheres to the policy of the United Nations Economic and Social Council as stated in paragraph 20 of the document, Report on the evaluation function in the context of the medium-term strategic plan (2002):

20. … Evaluation is essentially about … the provision of useful information and best alternatives to inform decision-making. Its intent is to enable learning-by-doing, thus improving results-oriented activities by re-engineering ongoing activities or improving the design of new ones. … Finally, evaluation is about accountability because it focuses on results achieved or not achieved and on explaining what has been achieved and why. It shows what decisions/actions were taken in light of what happened. Most of all, it enables the provision of information on results and learning to stakeholders and the public. (Report on the evaluation function in the context of the medium-term strategic plan. United Nations Economic and Social Council E/ICEF/2002/10, 11 April 2002. Retrieved from: http://www.unicef.org/reseval/MTSPr.html)

Evaluative Approach

This evaluation was constructed in a qualitative approach drawing on focused personal observation and journals, examination of documentary material, interviews with key country leaders, interviews with UNICEF personnel, debriefing meetings with IIGE personnel, workshop reports created by consultants, workshop participants’ thoughts written as part of activities, and many informal meetings and conversations. The Director of IIGE, David Selby and the UNICEF head of the project, Nurper Ulkuer were consulted for their utilization expectations for the evaluation. The qualitative data were examined in detail for themes and connections and for “consensus” or inconsistencies among observations or expressions. An evaluation of this sort clearly has considerable subjectivity, but as evaluator, I have attempted an interpretation with integrity and transparency to actual data.

Contributors and Data Sources:

This evaluation has drawn on the following:

IIGE Reports:
- February 6-16 Almaty Mission Report — Lidra Remacka
- February 13-15 Almaty Global Education Workshop Report — Lidra Remacka
- July 7-11 Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan Workshop Report — John P Myers
- July 10 – 14 Tashkent, Uzbekistan Workshop Report — Fumiyo Kagawa
- December 9 – 13 Dushanbe, Tajikistan Workshop Report — Hugh Brewster
- December 11 – 17 Almaty, Kazakhstan Workshop Report — Fumiyo Kagawa
- December 16 – 20 Ashgabat, Turkmenistan Workshop Report — Neil Bolland
- December 11-13 Uzbekistan Follow-up Workshop — Lidra Remacka
- December 16-18 Kyrgyzstan Follow-up Workshop — Linda Cameron

IIIE-UNICEF Draft Contract
- July 2002 – initial draft
- August 2002 — Revised draft

IIIE Planning and Debriefing Meetings
- June 13 10:00 – 12:00
- July 2 2:30 – 4:00
- November 20 2:00 – 4:30
- January 13 4:00-6:45

IIIE Team and UNICEF Joint Meetings
- July 7 12:30 – 1:30
- December 7, 4:00 – 7:00

IIIE Kazakhstan Team, UNICEF, and World Bank
- December 13, 10:45 – 11:15

Email Correspondence within IIIE and between IIIE and UNICEF
- Approximately 370 individual messages between June 2002 and December 2002

Formal Tape-Recorded Interviews
- Philippe Heffinck, UNICEF CARK Area Representative
- Nurper Ulkuer, Child Development Officer, UNICEF CARK;
- Tatiana Aderikhina, Education Programme Assistant, UNICEF CARK
- Marina Zhukova, Tajikistan UNICEF Workshop coordinator
- Gulsana Turusbekova, UNICEF Kyrgyzstan
- Yulia Narolskaya, UNICEF assistant, Uzbekistan
- Bahara Shihkuliyeva, UNICEF Assistant Project Officer, Child Enrichment, Turkmenistan
- Larisa Miroshnichenko, Ministry of Education and Culture, Kyrgyz Republic
- Munira Inoyatova, Head of the Department of Science and Education at the President’s Office, and Former Minister of Education, Tajikistan
- Helen Ruzieva, Head of School 74, Dushanbe, Tajikistan
- Sergei Vasilyevich Uryvayev, Assistant Director on Extracurricular Work, Gymnasium, Kazakhstan
- Natalya Ivanovna Bakhmutova, Director of public/social association “Association of Young Leaders,” Kazakhstan
- Almagulle Mukhamedkhanova, Dean of the Humanities Dept, Semei State University (teacher training Faculty)
- Matluba Alimnazarova, Core Team Member, Uzbekistan
- Eleanara Sadiroya, Core Team Member, Uzbekistan
- Mr. Sarykhanov, Minister of Education/ Director of National Institute of Education, Turkmenistan
- Ms. Soltanova, Research Secretary of National Institute of Education, Turkmenistan
• Chariyeva Aygul, history teacher, Turkmenistan
• Gulshedov Atamurat, Principal, Turkmenistan

Opening Addresses – Taped
• Tajikistan Workshop - December 9
• Turkmenistan Workshop – December 16

Evaluator Personal Observations:
• Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan Workshop July 7-10
• Tashkent, Uzbekistan Workshop July 11 – 14
• Dushanbe, Tajikistan Workshop December 9 – 11
• Almaty, Kazakhstan Workshop December 12 – 14
• Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan Follow-up Workshop, December 16-18,

Workshop Participant-Generated Material
• Uzbekistan Workshop – final activity on perceived strengths and weaknesses
• Kyrgyzstan Follow-up Workshop – opening review activity “Graffiti”
• Uzbekistan Follow-up Workshop – participant final personal reflections

Assistant Evaluator Observations
• Tashkent, Uzbekistan Follow-up Workshop – December 11-13, Lidra Remacka
• Ashgabat, Turkmenistan Workshop — December 16-17, Fumiyo Kagawa

Photo Record
• Digital Photographs – 250 photos from Kyrgyzstan in July and December, Uzbekistan in July, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan in December

Significant Informal Meetings
• Robert Fuderich, UNICEF Geneva
• Yulia Narolskaya, UNICEF Uzbekistan
• Richard Young, UNICEF Kyrgyzstan
• Yuki Mokuo, UNICEF Tajikistan
Project Overview

What is Global Education?

Global education is an approach to education directed towards rendering education a more relevant preparation for life in an increasingly complex, fast-changing and interdependent world, while also recognizing the importance of educating the whole person by addressing the intellectual, emotional, physical, moral, and spiritual dimensions of the learner in a holistic way. While such a conception of learning has whole-school implications, impacting upon teacher-student relations, school-community relations, decision-making processes, and school climate and ethos, the process of change begins by focusing upon curriculum, learning and teaching. Curriculum content and learning/teaching methods and processes are modified so that the child more effectively develops the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values necessary for constructive participation in society and for lifelong learning. Concretely, the process of change involves the simultaneous yet gradual implementation of two complimentary strands. First, a range of agreed cross-curricular dimensions are woven into the curriculum in age-appropriate ways. These dimensions include: understanding of interdependence and interconnectedness (local, regional, global, ecological), education for citizenship, education for development, education for human rights and responsibilities (including the rights of the child), education for peace and conflict resolution, environmental education, health and safety education, anti-discriminatory education, education for international and inter-community/inter-cultural understanding, and futures-oriented education (personal, local, national, regional, global futures). The dimensions are of universal significance and application but, within the process of change, are necessarily refracted through a national and cultural lens. Second, interactive learning methods that encourage co-operation, discussion, and active participation are introduced. The diverse range of learning approaches employed are designed to practice and reinforce basic skills as well as building the higher order skills required for constructive and effective engagement in contemporary society such as creative, divergent and lateral thinking, conflict resolution, consensus building, negotiation, and problem solving. The learning approaches are also oriented towards building self-esteem and respectful and responsive attitudes and behaviors within any group of learners.

Global education may appear to be like Life-skills Education and in many ways it is. The general goal of Life-skills Education is to develop “a group of psychosocial competencies and interpersonal skills that help people make informed decisions, solve problems, think critically and creatively, communicate effectively, build healthy relationships, empathise with others, and cope with and manage their lives in a healthy and productive manner” (UNICEF/WHO: Skills-based Health Education, including Life skills, Draft-October 2002, p.8). Global Education pursues the same goal. Life-skills
Education and Global Education also share a similar focus on issues. “Life skills education may focus on peace education, human rights, or citizenship education, and other social issues as well as health issues” (UNICEF/WHO draft, p. 9). Global Education and Life-skills Education also both “address real life applications of essential knowledge, attitudes and skills, and use interactive teaching and learning methods” (UNICEF/WHO draft, p. 9). The difference between Global Education and Life-skills Education resides importantly in its orientation to the broader school curriculum. While Life-skills Education is sometimes “a core subject placed in the broader school curriculum” and sometimes “offered as an extra-curricular program,” it tends to organized as a distinct “course” of studies with hopes for reinforcement in others subjects by teachers. Global Education in contrast, is an infusion, a thorough integration, of the issues content and the teaching methodology into all subjects of the curriculum. The result is no need for a separate “Global Education course” and the accomplishment of Life-skills goals at the same time. But, the most important gain is the degree to which children absorb both the explicit and implicit learnings because of the pervasiveness of integration of the methodology and philosophy into all of schooling.

An important issue addressed through Global Education activities and topics of discussion is that of gender identities, rights, roles, relationships, and responsibilities. More importantly, especially for girls’ education, is the creation of a gender sensitive learning environment through equitable and participatory classroom procedures.

The global education approach is being implemented in many parts of the world, in both developing and developed countries. In the Middle East and North Africa it has been implemented in Jordan and Lebanon since 1993 and has provided the framework for reform of the national curriculum within the basic learning cycle. The approach has also been adopted by the Ministries of Education of Syria and Palestine since 1995/6, and by Iran’s Ministry of Education and Science since 2000. Evaluation of the national projects in their successive phases has revealed substantial gains in students’ affective development and cognitive attainment, as well as positive improvements in students’ attitudes to school, to teachers, and to the discipline of learning. These successes are documented in Pike, G. & Selby, D., Global Education: Making Basic Learning a Child-Friendly Experience, UNICEF MENA, 1999, and in Sultana, R.G., The Global Education Initiative: Syria’s Flying Carpet, UNICEF MENA, 2000.

(This description of Global Education is adapted from the draft Project proposal for CARK)
GLOBAL EDUCATION IS . . .

. . . education in the interests of children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutual respect</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>Peaceableness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educating environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up with the time</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Mutua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>A teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Step by step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of choice</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity of the educational process</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Personalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-realization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amicability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Careful attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial, temporal, internal, referring to sources</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Responsibilities of the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td>inquiring component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interrelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-subject relation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child’s rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This is a translation of a flipchart sheet created during the “Graffiti” activity on the question: What is Global Education? During the Kyrgyzstan follow-up workshop in December 2002)
Evaluative Observations

Global Education is essentially a focused educational philosophy with a practical application in pedagogy and content.

**Philosophy:** The philosophy of Global Education with its focus on the whole child and the whole planet is very appropriate to needs of the world. The fundamental approach of Global Education could be described substantively as an integration of “social studies” into the whole curriculum. Although this may be questioned by advocates of a discipline-oriented education, it is an urgent need in the world as a whole and especially in countries where social issues dominate citizens’ consciousness and should dominate the political agenda. Consequently, the Global Education reform agenda for schools is highly appropriate for Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

**Pedagogy:** The pedagogy advocated by Global Education can be interpreted as “child friendly.” It is described as featuring “interactive learning methods that encourage co-operation, discussion, and active participation.” As manifested in training workshops, Global Education pedagogy is that. However, it still exists in a general teacher-directed approach to education. Activities are predefined, initiated by the teacher, carried out under the permission and supervision of the teacher, with the specific resources prepared for the activity, and learning is debriefed under the guidance of the teacher. Although more progressive in theory, practical implementation of the pedagogy in a very traditional context does not hand much decision-making or initiative to the child outside the bounds of the activity, the curriculum is not negotiated with the students, and most activities do not feature or allow authentic context-situated learning. As well, the general approach advocated for CARK does not assume, or even allow, for the “educated” teacher, who will design or change activities for situational or contextual needs. It is a “teachers manual” approach where externally prepared activities are presented to teachers for “use” in the classroom. How this will affect pedagogy in the spaces between activities remains to be seen. This may appear to be a negative criticism but it is not. This approach of Global Education is in fact a positive and helpful one for the current transitional educational system in CARK. Teachers have been “trained” and personally educated in a system that does not encourage autonomous pedagogical decision making, that places the “teacher manual” in a controlling position, that assumes supervision of teachers by “experts,” and that makes teacher control central to schooling. The “scripted approach to freedom” advocated by Global Education will make it possible for teachers in the CARK system to move forward confidently into progressive education. This development toward a more “educated” teacher, greater expectation of initiative for students in learning, and greater teacher responsiveness to learning contexts, probably needs specific planning and facilitation. UNICEF and the IIGE could address this need with specifically planned interventions during the course of the whole project.
**Content:** There are two facets to the content of Global Education – the covert and the overt. The covert, or hidden curriculum consists in the deep learnings from the very act of collaboration, cooperation, having voice, being able to express opinions, being able to express criticism, and so on. This is of utmost importance in the transition from a restricted society to one featuring participatory democracy. It is essential for the evolution of the understanding of the potential meaning of democracy. The overt content consists of the issues to be addressed through planned activities: an understanding of interdependence and interconnectedness (local, regional, global, ecological), citizenship, social, political, cultural and economic development, human rights and responsibilities (including the rights of the child), peace and conflict resolution, environmental issues and concerns, safety and security, gender issues, anti-discriminatory education, international and inter-community/inter-cultural understanding, and futures-oriented education (personal, local, national, regional, global futures). All of these issues are important and urgent for the educational context. Although not explicitly stated, it is assumed that values will be developed in relation to these issues. Economic issues are included in the global education list under economic development but seem to be of such great importance in CARK that they should become a specific focus in the planned activities.

**Global Education Experience:** It must be noted as a positive and encouraging sign that Global Education has been successful in many countries – particularly those who have had very traditional pedagogy and academically-oriented curriculum.

**Clarification of concepts:** One minor point in the language of Global Education could be clarified for greater consistency and therefore better communication. That point is the differentiation between the terms “activity,” “lesson,” and “unit,” “educational plan” and “curriculum.” Inconsistency among IIGE facilitators was noted and that may be a greater problem since the whole concept of curriculum is a confusing one for educators in CARK.
What is the International Institute for Global Education (IIGE)?

NOTE: This section on IIGE is adapted from the IIGE website.

The International Institute for Global Education, a cross-departmental centre at the University of Toronto, with a principal attachment to department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, was established in 1992 to contribute to the growth of global education in Canada and internationally through teaching programs, consultancy, curriculum development and research. In addition to offering courses at preservice and graduate level, IIGE faculty provide professional development services for elementary and secondary schools through partnerships with school boards, other universities, national and international non-governmental organizations, U.N. bodies and ministries of education. Research and development projects include the support of global education and national curriculum renewal initiatives in countries in Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Middle East and North Africa.

The Institute promotes dialogue between global educators worldwide and welcomes visiting scholars. Faculty interests include anti-discriminatory education; basic and life skills education; citizenship education; education for development; environmental education, futures education; health education; humane education; human rights education; intercultural and multicultural education; education for peace and social justice; education for international understanding; inclusive, interactive and participatory pedagogies. David Selby is the Director of the Institute.

IIGE Faculty

Lee Bartel
Linda Cameron
Mark Evans
Tara Goldstein
Dick Holland
Edmund O'Sullivan
David Selby

Student Associates:

Lee Bensted
Neil Bolland
Hugh Brewster
James Gray-Donald
Fumiyo Kagawa
Yoko Motani
John P. Myers
Heather Reid
Lidra Remacka

More information about the IIGE including a list of Faculty and Associates can be found on the website: http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/depts/ctl/

Evaluative Observations

Director: Dr. David Selby, Director of IIGE is without question, an outstanding leader in social education and educational reform in the world. As is immediately evident from his extensive list of publications, presentations, and consultancies, he contributes both theoretically and practically to the field. The way he has defined the work of IIGE situates it as the world leader in practical, strategic educational intervention in highly challenging places. As a superb workshop facilitator, he animates the Global Education vision.

Faculty: IIGE lists an impressive seven faculty members on its website. All have and are contributing to the mission of IIGE.
– through teaching Global Education courses, publishing related to Global Education, or working on Global Education projects. The number available for on-site participation in international projects is limited to 3 Faculty Members and of these one is primarily focused on evaluation leaving only 2 international facilitators. These do have broad international experience and expertise.

**Graduate Students:** There is a considerable number of graduate students studying Global Education and many of these are available for involvement in workshop facilitation, more than listed on the website. This is a real strength of IIGE and the possibilities for students being more involved in projects like CARK exists. This might extend to students focusing their research on projects or spending time in country locations as interns.

**Educational Needs And Contexts In CARK**

**Kyrgyzstan**

Note: The following section is based on an interview with Larisa Miroshnichenko — Deputy Minister of Education and Culture

Educational reform in Kyrgyzstan essentially began in earnest in 2001. The new education law establishes the foundational goals of the education system: to make the system of education democratic, the curriculum humanistic, the curriculum community oriented, to decentralize management in education, to make the financial system transparent. Some of the objectives related to diversity, e.g., in language, are being pursued and decentralization is in process. However, finance is a large barrier to this process and to reform in general. Inequality among schools is rapidly developing as some schools attract special funding from international organizations and some especially rural schools do not. The process of revising National standards has also begun. With this there is also an effort to revise the system of educational testing – both the graduation from school testing as well as the entrance to university testing. The Kyrgyzstan government has engaged Educational Testing Services from the United States to design and conduct some of this testing with a grant from the U.S. government (informal conversation with ETS consultant in Bishkek, December 2002). There is general government support for the reform efforts and for free education up to grade nine, but not all specific reforms are supported by everyone, particularly when it comes to financing the reform initiatives.

The school system in Kyrgyzstan has 2020 schools, about 8000 teachers, and several million students. In the past there were special schools for gifted students, students with disabilities, and residential orphan schools. Recently there has been a trend toward including these students in regular schools. There were some efforts to introduce progressive, child-centered educational ideas in the 1980’s in the primary schools and it was very well received by teachers and parents. The country has also adopted an “education for all” policy. A recent national study found that mathematics, science, and languages scores at the secondary level were acceptable but that students’ “life skills” scores were not acceptable. Educational leaders would like to raise life-skills scores to the level of the mathematics and science but without deteriorating those
scores. To achieve this there will need to be some general curriculum revision. Also, to make learning more relevant. For example, aspects of theoretical mathematics may need to be replaced with more globally practical understandings of economics.

One of the political-educational realities in Kyrgyzstan is the influence of international organizations through the power of donor money to pay for projects. For example, testing through a grant by the U.S. government, textbooks paid with a loan from the Asian Development Bank, educational information management system through a UNICEF grant, teaching materials through UNESCO, and so on. The local educational leaders are eager to activate their reform agenda and therefore welcome financial assistance, but also may not have the discriminatory ability to differentiate one “democratic” or “western” approach from another.

The biggest concern in educational reform is the “provincial level” — the middle level administration system. The government has recently tried to involve people from that level in reform discussions. Another concern is the university level – the government may attempt changes through in-service training but pre-service does not change. A further problem has been decreasing enrollment in pre-service education. The average age of teachers in the schools is around 50. There will soon be a large teacher shortage. The biggest problem is the low salary of teachers.

At the February Global Education Workshop in Almaty the Kyrgyzstan group described government policy to reconstruct curricula in two phases. Phase one, (2002-2004) is to implement a new program of study in 41 schools in rural areas. Phase two (2004-2006) will do the same in 62 schools. Representatives of Ministry of Education expressed their ‘open policy’ to collaborate with UNICEF and the Global Education project. Kyrgyzstan has already started to reform preschool system of education. They considered that Global Education approach fits with national objectives of education.

**Tajikistan**

**Note:** The following section is based on an interview with Munira Inoyatova, Head of the Department of Science and Education at the President’s Office, and Former Minister of Education, Tajikistan

During the Soviet era there was just one standard for education. The first step following independence was to change the standard, the main goals, to make them more responsive to the needs of Tajikistan. Two main goals were adopted: to educate the citizen of Tajikistan – as a citizen of the planet, to educate a tolerant democratic, secular person, sensitive to human rights. To this end a new education law was passed. New standards of education were developed to be more in line with international standards. Some programs and teaching plans have been created. As well, some new subjects have been introduced. New courses have also been introduced in the university and others have been discontinued. There have not been new standards for each subject, but there are some new textbooks for primary schools and currently new texts are currently being prepared for secondary schools. Private schools are now being created although the legislative foundation for these is not yet in place, but
During the past 10 years, the country paid little attention to education. Consequently there is now a real shortage of quality educational leaders in methodology or pedagogy. One of the efforts of the government is now to improve the quality of university pre-service teacher education. Now the focus seems to be on quantity rather than quality of teacher preparation. One of the problems with introducing change is that motivation in teachers at all levels is very low. Salaries are only around 11 or 12 Somonies (4 dollars) a month and so there is no economical motivation. There is some motivation through recognition and through societal valuing or respect for teachers, although that is now also less than it used to be. In the rural areas teachers are given some extra benefits – they are given land, help with seeds, with firewood, or electricity cost reductions.

Tajikistan has a committee of statistics responsible for general national data – including schools. But, it only tracks numbers of students but not quality of learning. A huge problem is the management of education at all levels. During the Soviet era everything was centralized and controlled and the quality of education was perceived to be excellent. The situation for Tajikistan, however, has changed and education needs to change but the educational administrators are basically resistant. Progressive leaders tend not to be officially supported.

Note: The following information is adapted from the Background Review and Analysis of Key Issues Hindering the Process of Educational Reform in Tajikistan prepared by the Khorog Joint Research Team, in close collaboration and under the leadership of the Head of Education Department, GBAO. Tajikistan, November, 2001.

Prior to independence, the education system of Tajikistan was considered as one of the best in the Central Asia with well functioning schools. Schools catered for students of all abilities received teaching resources, textbooks and materials from the central government on a regular basis. Education was free at all levels, medical treatment was free and there was a high level of employment.

Independence from the Soviet Union resulted in the cessation of resources and funding for the educational system. The economic situation in the country deteriorated further as a result of the civil war from 1992 to 1997. Poverty is widespread, there is not enough food and many students lack proper clothes and shoes.

The educational system in Tajikistan is currently facing extensive problems in infrastructure such as: deteriorating school buildings, lack of fuel for heating, lack of textbooks and other learning materials, poor professional development of teachers, curriculum and educational legislation, inappropriate financing mechanisms for the educational system, etc.

In 1997 only 62 percent of school age children were enrolled in school and there is a widening gap of opportunities for girls and boys. Enrolment in secondary and tertiary educational institutions has also sharply decreased. This can have serious long-term consequences for the country, since 46% of the population of Tajikistan is below the age of 16 years old.
The mismatch of subject curriculum, course plans and textbooks is one of the main factors affecting the quality of the teaching in Tajikistan. For example, in the 1992-1993 academic year Grades 10-11 ‘Social Science’ subject was changed to ‘People and Society’; however, there is no corresponding material for teaching this subject. The same situation exists with the teaching of ‘Basis of world culture.’ At the primary level the main problem is that some of the textbooks (e.g., Math and Tajik language) were published recently, but the curricula were produced in 1994, and are outdated.

At the December 7th briefing meeting, Nurper Ulkuer, UNICEF CARK Child Development Officer pointed out that problems in Tajikistan are many and include a “brain drain” of educational leaders, no inservice education for teachers, and a severe lack of resources resulting in schools without desks or even windows. However, the government is very receptive to assistance and the Asian Development Bank, Islamic Development Bank, World Bank, Aga Khan Foundation, the Soros Foundation are all offering assistance. A world food program has been offering meals in schools. UNICEF has already done some work on peace education as well as classroom management.

At the February Global Education Workshop in Almaty, the Tajikistan’s group presented problems in their education system as being lack of teacher’s capacity, lack of motivation for students and teachers, and lack of adequate education for teachers, especially in rural areas. They emphasized the need to implement Global Education in Tajikistan as soon as possible.

Turkmenistan

The Following information is adapted from TURKMENISTAN: A Country Study Edited by Glenn E. Curtis. Federal Research Division, Library of Congress, March 1996. And from the Baskurt Website:
http://baskurt.homestead.com/index2.html

In 1991 literacy in Turkmenistan was nearly universal. According to the 1989 census, 65.1 percent of the population aged fifteen and older had completed secondary school, compared with 45.6 percent in 1979. In the same period, the percentage of citizens who had completed a higher education rose from 6.4 percent to 8.3 percent.

Education is free of charge, although introduction of fees is being considered by selected institutions. Formal schooling begins with kindergarten (bagcha) and primary school (mekdep). School attendance is compulsory through the eighth grade. At this point, students are tested and directed into technical, continuing, and discontinuing tracks. Some students graduate to the workforce after completing the tenth grade, while others leave in the ninth grade to enter a trade or technical school.

Although the education system in Turkmenistan retains the centralized structural framework of the Soviet system, significant modifications are underway, partly as a response to national redefinition, but mainly as a result of the government's attempts to produce a highly skilled work force to promote Turkmenistan's participation in international commercial activities. Reforms also include cultural goals such
as the writing of a new history of Turkmenistan, the training of multilingual cadres able to function in Turkmen, English, and Russian, and the implementation of alphabet reform in schools.

Turkmenistan's educational establishment is funded and administered by the state. The Ministry of Education is responsible for secondary education and oversees about 1,800 schools offering some or all of the secondary grades. Of that number, 43.5 percent are operated on one shift and 56.5 percent on two shifts (primarily in cities). Secondary schools have 66,192 teachers who serve 831,000 students. Thirty-six secondary schools specialize in topics relevant to their ministerial affiliation. The primary and secondary systems are being restructured according to Western models, including shorter curricula, more vocational training, and human resource development.

The curriculum followed by schools is standardized, allowing little variation among the country's school districts. The prescribed humanities curriculum for the ninth and tenth grades places the heaviest emphasis on native language and literature, history, physics, mathematics, Turkmen or Russian language, chemistry, foreign language, world cultures, and physical education. A few elective subjects are available.

Although teaching continues to enjoy respect as a vocation, Turkmenistan's school system suffers from a shortage of qualified teachers. Many obstacles confront a teacher: heavy teaching loads and long hours, including Saturdays and double shifts; wholly inadequate textbooks and instructional materials; serious shortages of paper, supplies, and equipment; low salaries; and, at times, even failure to be paid. An estimated 13 percent of schools have such serious structural defects in their physical plants that they are too dangerous to use for classes.

Instruction in 77 percent of primary and general schools is in Turkmen, although the 16 percent of schools that use Russian as their primary language generally are regarded as providing a better education. Some schools also instruct in the languages of the nation’s Uzbek and Kazak minorities. Especially since the adoption of Turkmen as the "state language" and English as the "second state language," the study of these two languages has gained importance in the curriculum, and adults feel pressure to learn Turkmen in special courses offered at schools or at their workplaces.

At the December 7th briefing meeting, Nurper Ulkuer, UNICEF CARK Child Development Officer, described Turkmenistan as “not in as much need” as most of the other Central Asian countries. However, schools are in bad condition with many not even having water. The Minister of Education is supportive of UNICEF efforts and of the Global Education initiative. He was formerly the Head of the Academy of Education. There is less activity from aid agencies in Turkmenistan: World Bank is not involved, SOROS is not there, USAid and UNICEF are somewhat involved. Rob Fuderich, UNICEF Senior Education Advisor, expressed his opinion that Turkmenistan at this point is not ready for curriculum reform.
Uzbekistan

Note: The following information on Uzbekistan is adapted from Societies in Transition: A Situation Analysis of the Status of Children and Women in the Central Asian Republics and Kazakhstan, 2000. UNICEF 2001

Uzbekistan has been implementing a major reform of its education system. The key aspect of the reform is transition from nine to 12 years of compulsory education. After graduation from grade 9, students must either enroll in a professional college or academic lyceum. Professional colleges are to be established from the current specialized secondary and vocational/technical schools. Academic lyceums (specializing in general sciences rather than skills training) are to be attached to universities. Enrolment in the academic lyceums is to be limited to 10 per cent of grade 9 graduates. Government education reform priorities are outlined in the National Programs for Personnel Training. This framework identifies major areas of change and improvement, which are addressed through the issuance of decrees.

Another of the government's goals is to maintain the high standards of access and equity in education left from the Soviet system. Provision of schooling in the seven languages of instruction - Uzbek (the state language), Russian, Kazakh, Tajik, Karakalpak, Turkmen and Kyrgyz - remains a priority. Other important priorities include improvement of basic economics education, provision of learning support materials for different types of schools, and upgrading of training in foreign languages and computer skills.

The pre-school system faces serious problems besides declining enrolment, such as a lack of learning materials and toys, inadequate water and sanitation, low teacher pay and, as a result, insufficiently trained teachers. Of the more than 70,000 pre-school teachers, only 15 per cent have higher education. Most are graduates of secondary or special secondary schools. Due to low pay, university graduates simply are not interested.

After an initial drop in the early 1990s, enrolments in basic education stabilized (Table 1). Girl and boy students are almost equally represented. Statistics on drop-out are hard to obtain, but it does not yet appear to be a major problem. Education attainment in Uzbekistan remains high. The mean level of schooling in 1994 was 11.4 years; in 1995, 25.7 per cent of workers had higher or secondary specialized training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Basic education in Uzbekistan, 1990/91-1995/96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/teacher ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: Uzbek MMES (1999) and Uzbek MoE (1999).*
The number of schools for children with disabilities remained stable during the 1990s (between 82 and 85 schools), but enrolment decreased from a high of 21,900 students in 1992/93 to 19,000 in 1996/97.

Teachers are generally well trained. Uzbekistan has in fact been more successful than the other Central Asian republics in maintaining the pre-transition standard of teacher in-service training every five years. However, teachers need special in-service training in the content of newly produced textbooks, especially those using Latin characters for the Uzbek language, which is an important element of the reform process. Teachers also need training in new methodologies, particularly learner-based and active-learning approaches, to help them overcome the more didactic approaches of the past. In addition, they need better training in foreign languages and computer skills, which is high on the list of the government's priorities.

Regional disparities in the quality of education are wide. The populations in the Autonomous Republic of Karakalpakstan, living in the area surrounding the Aral Sea, remain among the most disadvantaged in the country. Schools lack paper, teaching aids and school supplies. School maintenance is poor, and many schools are renovated schools' that were not originally built as schools and are not fit for educational purposes. Lighting and ventilation are bad, and there are shortages of coal for heating. Latrines are in very bad condition, sanitation is poor, there is no running water, and children are not encouraged to wash their hands. Often there is only one basin, and it is for the teachers. Fuel is usually used for heating rather than boiling water, so there may be no safe water for children to drink.

Teaching methods are traditional with rote learning the norm. There are few teaching aids and, even if parents could afford them, school supplies are difficult to find in the markets. These conditions are causing teachers to leave to find better jobs. Those left behind must struggle for survival with few incentives and low salaries that often are late in coming.

**Kazakhstan**

Note: The following information on Kazakhstan is adapted from *Societies in Transition: A Situation Analysis of the Status of Children and Women in the Central Asian Republics and Kazakhstan, 2000.* UNICEF 2001

The President signed a new Law on Education in June 1999, and a working group has been established to develop more detailed legislation and programs. While this law has given more responsibility to regions to raise funds locally and to schools to maintain their own bank accounts for extra-budgetary revenues, in other ways the government has tended to exert more central control:

A number of recent changes has strengthened central control after a period of more devolved power. Amendments to the Law on Education have given central authorities power to approve local directors of education and have introduced new budget reporting mechanisms. Municipalities have little freedom to move funds among specific categories of expenditure. The central government has the right to establish working hours for teachers and may define the terms of activities of general schools', a power which implies the possibility of intervention from the centre at any stage (UNICEF, 1998a, p.75).
One important provision of the new law is contained in Article 23, which calls for mandatory, free kindergarten education for one year prior to entering grade 1. A draft strategic plan prepared by the Agency for Strategic Planning for the period 2001-2005 calls for all children to have received one year of pre-school education by the year 2005. The plan also emphasizes improvement of basic education, especially in rural areas.

At independence, Kazakhstan had the best pre-school education coverage of the entire region. Over 50 per cent of the age group were enrolled in pre-schools. Since then, enrolment has dropped by nearly 80 per cent (93 per cent in rural areas). In 1999, only about 10 per cent of the age group were enrolled in pre-schools.

In 1997, the World Bank and the Ministry of Finance with Benchmark International conducted a pilot project of social support for children in the cities of Kantal and Shimkent, which included community-based pre-school education. Education officials, however, consider the project unsuccessful. The pilot kindergartens were 20 per cent more expensive than regular kindergartens. Another project sponsored by the Soros Foundation (also in Kyrgyzstan) called Step-by-Step is encountering more success and is considered very promising by education officials. The program concentrates on training teachers in more active, child-centred learning methodologies.

As mentioned earlier, the new Law on Education provides for one year of mandatory, free pre-school education. The target is to have 50 per cent of the age group, or 220,000 pupils, in one-year pre-school programs in the 1999/2000 school year and all by the year 2005. (The 1999/2000 target was nearly achieved, with a reported 200,000 pupils enrolled in some type of program.) For the future, a problem will be to attract sufficient teachers. Salaries of pre-school teachers are the lowest in the country at KZT 4,500 per month (about $34). Some 82 per cent of pre-school teachers have left the profession and are unemployed. Unless they live in rural areas (where KZT 4,500 is a reasonable amount), they are unlikely to come back at such a low salary level. In addition, they must be recertified since only currently qualified teachers will be allowed to teach in kindergartens. Plans have been made to establish new centres for the upgrading of teacher skills and the development of preschool programs, but no one knows how to pay for all of this.

While letting the pre-school system decline, government policy has called for continued free access to basic education as guaranteed by the Constitution. About 3.7 per cent of the state budget went to education in 1997; nearly 60 per cent of this amount was allocated to basic education. Yet, compulsory school enrolment is not always free. Fees are increasingly being charged for entry, especially in some of the more prestigious government schools. The number of private basic schools is also growing, doubling between 1997 and 1998 to 124. In 1997, there were also 29 international secondary schools, 28 of which were Kazakh-Turkish Lyceums.

Although enrolment in compulsory education has generally been maintained, the number of schools has decreased. This is especially true in rural areas. In the region of Kyzylorda, it was reported that five secondary schools, 28 boarding schools and 87 pre-school and out-of-school facilities had to be closed between
1994 and 1996 due to lack of heating (Bauer et al., 1998).

Gender discrimination does not seem to be a problem, as girls represent about 60 per cent of the graduates from secondary education. Student-teacher ratios in Kazakhstan are low, especially in rural areas. This may indicate that although schools are being closed as a cost-savings measure (419 schools in rural areas between 1997 and 1998), the number of teachers is not being reduced to the same extent.

Government policy also calls for access of ethnic minorities to education in their mother tongue. As a result, there are 2,412 Russian schools, 2,153 mixed Russian/Kazakh, 78 Uzbek, 13 Uighur, and Tajik, Ukrainian, Turkish and German language schools. Providing textbooks for these schools has understandably proved to be a major difficulty.

Non-attendance is becoming an issue. It was estimated that 14 per cent of children aged 6 to 13 did not attend school regularly in 1994/95, and 34,471 students did not complete grade 11 compared with 30,461 in 1993/94 (Bauer et al., 1998). The current estimate of the Committee on Education is 25,000 drop-outs from the system.

Access of children with disabilities to education is problematic. In early 1996, Kazakhstan reported a total of 120,000 children with disabilities under the age of 16, half classified as mentally ill (about 5 per cent of all children) (ibid). The number of children with disabilities in boarding schools decreased by 38 per cent between 1991 and 1995, and the number of schools declined by about 36 per cent (1,540 to 982). In rural areas, there were only 22 facilities for children with mental or psychological disabilities. In 1999, it was estimated that only 12 per cent of the children with serious disabilities were attending school.

"In the 1997/98 academic year 498 functioning children's homes and boarding schools cared for some 50,617 children. The breakdown of educational provision is as follows: 40 children's homes, 43 children's homes of family type, 22 boarding schools for orphans, 48 boarding schools of general type, 11 schools of 'sanatorium' type and 84 special corrective establishments, one boarding school for children with behavioural problems and 249 boarding schools attached to general educational establishments.

However, in the conditions of economic crisis the system of special education establishments satisfied only 30 per cent of needs. Especially alarming is the condition of those boarding schools where children from low-income families and families with many children were brought up: children's nutrition is deteriorating and there is a shortage of clothes, footwear and furniture. Compared with 1991, the number of these establishments has decreased to 1,042 units and enrolment to 50,500 persons. (In 1997 alone, 270 boarding schools were closed.) The largest number of boarding schools to be closed was in Aktobe (102), Almaty (105), North Kazakhstan (114) and Kostanai (105) Oblasts. All boarding schools of the general and sanatorium type and two auxiliary boarding schools were closed in the
former Semipalatinsk Oblast. In East Kazakhstan Oblast, there remained only 9 boarding schools attached to rural schools during the last academic year. Source: UNDP, 1998, p.45.

Education quality in Kazakhstan, as in the other Central Asian republics, is compromised by the lack of textbooks, learning support materials and skilled teachers. Perhaps the most serious deficiency in Kazakhstan is in the area of textbooks and facilities. New curricula and textbooks have been introduced through grade 3.

Introduction of grade-4 textbooks began in the year 2000. This effort has been costly in terms of both financial and human resources (AsDB loans have helped), and textbooks for grades 5-11 must still be prepared. The percentage of schools in bad condition and in need of repair has increased sharply. It is estimated that one in ten schools requires a complete renovation, and one in three schools is housed in buildings that were not designed as schools (UNDP, 1998). In the 1996/97 school year, 1,479 urban schools and 3,123 rural schools were double-shifting; 67 schools were triple-shifting. Sanitary conditions are worsening, and there is a shortage of potable water in schools. This is especially the case in Kyzylorda and other poor regions such as South Kazakhstan and West Kazakhstan.

The proliferation of multigrade classrooms in rural schools has become an issue. With the migration of the rural population to cities, rural teachers find themselves having to form classes with perhaps two grade-1, five grade-2, and three grade-3 students. Rural teachers are unfamiliar with how to manage multigrade classes.

The Ministry of Education and Science is now developing a program on how to teach the sciences in multigrade classes.

School management is also a concern. Directors of schools have not been taught management skills, especially in the new economic environment. Enhancing the competence of school directors in management skills is considered a priority.

A majority of teachers (66.6 per cent in 1996/97) have higher education degrees, with an additional 3.6 per cent having incomplete higher education. Still a number of teachers are underqualified, especially those who were transferred from pre-school programs to teach in grades 1-4 of primary schools. Teachers are also poorly paid, with salaries only 70 per cent of the average wage, and two to three times lower than wages of workers in the production sectors. Although student/teacher ratios are low, there is a shortage of teachers primarily in the rural areas. Low wages clearly contribute to this situation.

**Main Issues in Education in Kazakhstan**

**Pre-schools:**
- large drop in pre-school enrolments, especially in rural areas
- lack of low-cost community and home-based alternatives
- poverty leading to poor nutrition among pre-school-age children, especially in rural areas
- pre-school teachers lack training in more active, child-centred teaching methods
- inadequate incentive programs to attract and retain qualified pre-school teachers

**Basic education:**
- decreasing basic education enrolments
in rural schools
• quality of rural schools needs improvement
• teachers require training in multigrade teaching
• lack of textbooks and learning support materials
• deteriorating school facilities, furniture and equipment
• need for school directors to develop management skills for new economic environment
• outdated teaching methods in use where more modern methods may be appropriate
• increasing non-attendance and drop-out rates
• teachers require training in early detection of children in danger of drop-out and in measures to counter drop-out

Special Education:
• deteriorating conditions in boarding schools for orphans and for children with disabilities
• alternative non-institutional methods of serving children needed

Kazakhstan does not believe it generally needs help in education, especially primary education. The Ministry of Education suggests that a Global Education project could be done in the poorest area in southern Kazakhstan. Step by Step has not been implemented in that area. Another factor in education in Kazakhstan is the “Self-Esteem Program” based on the philosophies of Si Baba with a curriculum from preschool to university written by the President’s wife. She essentially runs the program with a team of assistants. It is now being pilot tested in schools across the country.

The year 2003 has been designated “The Year of the Village” in Kazakhstan. This may be an opportunity to promote global education in rural villages. One of the schooling problems of rural areas is the large number (about 20,000) of small schools.

At the December 7th briefing meeting, Nurper Ulkuer, UNICEF CARK Child Development Officer pointed out that
Initial Project Expectations and Concerns

February 2002 Almaty Global Education Mission.

The February 9-16 conference and workshop in Almaty was the strategic beginning of the CARK Global Education project. It provided an opportunity for IIGE consultants to study the context through observation of schools, meet with leaders, and gauge the response to Global Education ideas and approaches. The conference and workshop allowed UNICEF leaders and country representatives to assess the potential and suitability of Global Education for the educational needs in the CARK region and for country participants to express their expectations and reactions.

IIGE Observations: The IIGE consultants visited four schools and observed both traditional classes and Step by Step classes. The purpose was to provide some understanding of school culture in Kazakhstan as an example of a post-soviet school system and to observe Step by Step and traditional classroom side by side in the same school. The consultants described the traditional classes: “The teacher with a long stick in her hand, taught in an extremely traditional approach. Total silence predominated while student worked individually in their notebooks. The teacher’s authoritarian approach didn’t allow them to talk or discuss with each other.” By contrast the Step by Step classes were described as follows: “The atmosphere was lively and positive. Desks were in groups of four according to four centers of learning; science, art, Russian, reading. The teacher was the center of the classroom and the teaching approach was individualistic and result oriented.” However, the consultants reported that in Step by Step classes: “equipment and physical environment are more enriched than traditional class. The physical setting of chairs and tables allowed students to work in group but they actually still learned in an individualistic way.”

The IIGE consultants concluded that the traditional approach to education was not “child-friendly,” participatory, or democratic and that students would benefit from the implementation of a more progressive approach. They further concluded that, although Step by Step has improved the educational process, it is not as equitable, interactive, and participatory an approach as education could be. Consequently, the introduction of Global Education is not in conflict with Step by Step but is a compatible extension.

Conference: “Towards the child-friendly classroom: enriching the curriculum; enhancing learning quality.” A single afternoon “interactive conference” was held as an introductory overview of Global Education. It developed in three parts: (1) a presentation on the child-friendly classroom, (2) group discussions, and (3) a plenary discussion session. Each country worked as a group to discuss the Global Education approach and how it could fit into their country’s context. Each group prepared questions to raise in the plenary discussion session. IIGE consultants responded to questions and gave different examples from Albanian, Jordanian, Iranian, and Japanese Global Education Initiatives. At the end of the conference, each country’s UNICEF program assistant spoke for the country participants and expressed a positive response and interest and willingness to learn more about Global Education.
Workshop: A three day workshop was held with about 55 people: 30 from Kazakhstan, (Almaty) and 25 from Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan. For political reasons Turkmenistan had only one representative, the UNICEF Program Assistant. Most of participants were educational officials and practitioners from respective Ministries of Education, universities, training Institutions, NGOs, the Step by Step program, and USAID representatives. Few if any were currently active teachers. The workshop plan was similar to that described in Addendum 1.

UNICEF Response. Nurper Ulkuier and Philippe Heffinck in attendance at the conference and workshop, asked David Selby, IIGE Director, to design Global Education Projects based on the country context. Selby asked to have more information about the needs and future vision from those country representatives who will participate in conference and workshop. Ulkuier asked the UNICEF Program Assistants to hold an informal meeting with each country group in order to give UNICEF representatives and consultants ideas on how to launch new projects in the future. These consulting sessions then took place.

Tajikistan: The Tajikistan’s group clearly felt that education needed urgent attention in their country. They identified problems in their education system as being lack of teacher’s capacity, lack of motivation for students and teachers, and lack of adequate education for teachers, especially in rural areas. Of great concern was the high number of student “drop-outs” due to lack of motivation. They emphasized the need to improve teaching and learning methods. They recommended that Global Education be started in 6 pilot schools, three of them in rural areas and three in urban areas. After field-testing results in these schools the Ministry of Education will decide whether to expand Global Education into the national curriculum.

Kyrgyzstan. The group described government policy to reconstruct curricula in two phases. Phase one, (2002-2004) implementing new curricula in 41 schools in rural areas. Phase two (2004-2006), in 62 schools. Representatives of Ministry of Education expressed their ‘open policy’ to collaborate with UNICEF and the Global Education project. They considered that Global Education approach fits with national objectives of education. They have plans to develop material and subsequently, follow-up teacher training. They consider the same 41 pilot school as a potential resource to start a Global Education project. They suggested creating two core teams, one as a strategic team and the other a technical team.

Turkmenistan. Only the UNICEF representative was present. Consequently, Turkmenistan teachers, leaders, and government representatives were not consulted.

Uzbekistan. Representative from Uzbekistan’s group described their educational situation and presented their national policy for teacher training. They
supported the idea of an IIGE – UNICEF Global Education project and suggested that they establish a core team to identify 25 – 30 schools in 5 different districts to implement Global Education.

Kazakhstan. The Kazakhstan representatives indicated that their sense is that Global Education philosophy does not fit with the goals of the Ministry of Education. They asked for more time to consult with their experts and researchers to include Global Education in their future plan. They expressed a need for more material to help develop their understanding of Global Education. David Selby concluded that the current information provided is not enough to write a project proposal for Kazakhstan.

Summary: After observation of schools only in or near Almaty, IIGE concluded that the educational system would benefit from the implementation of Global Education. UNICEF requested IIGE to consult individual countries and to design projects based on the country contexts. Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan described varying levels of need and varying states of system preparedness for the introduction of a project. All three supported the introduction of a Global Education Project but recommended variations in scope and approach. Turkmenistan could not be consulted. Kazakhstan indicated some resistance to a project and the IIGE consultant concluded that a project for Kazakhstan could not be created without more information. According to the observations and discussions during the time in Almaty, David Selby and Lidra Remacka from IIGE and Nurper Ulkuer, UNICEF, proposed that a Global Education Project be started in Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan in only 3 subjects including native language in grades 1 and 5.

The Project Features As Proposed.

In June 2002, David Selby, Director of IIGE, drafted a proposal for “Global Education in the CARK Region.” Significant in the proposal is the uniformity of approach in all five countries, the detail related to specifics of implementation time-lines, Core team formation, team responsibilities, and pilot school approach.

Significant sections from the Proposal:

- This is a proposal for five 78-month global education project in each of the countries of UNICEF CARK (Central Asian Countries and Kazakhstan), beginning July 2001. The five countries are: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.
- The project will involve a partnership of the Ministries of Education of the five countries, UNICEF CARK, universities and non-governmental organizations in the region, the International Institute for Global Education (IIGE), of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, and the College of St. Mark and St. John of Exeter University, Plymouth England.
- The project will address grades 1-10 and will have two complementary strands. First, it will seek to enrich, and add value and relevance to the curriculum in each country by applying global education models to curriculum design and by infusing global education themes - such as democratic citizenship, environment, health, multiculturalism, peace, the rights of the child, human rights, social justice...
– across the curriculum. Second, it will seek to renew learning and teaching through the implementation of global education interactive and participatory methodologies within the classroom, in out-of-school learning, and in teacher training. Underpinning the whole approach will be the twin objectives of building student competency for active and responsive citizenship and building the capacity of teachers involved so they become facilitative, flexible and reflective practitioners. The work will begin in a limited number of designated experimental schools in each country with consequent gradual movement to scale should the initial phase prove successful.

The first phase of each national project will be of maximum 30-month duration (July 2002-August 2004). Initial national global education workshops and opening National Core Team seminars will take place in the period July-December 2002 (Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan, July 2002; Turkmenistan, August 2002; Kazakhstan and Tajikistan between October and December 2002). Each workshop/seminar event will be of five days duration (3-day workshop and 2-day seminar). The purpose of the workshop will be to introduce the theory and practice of global education; also to identify potential National Core Team members. The purposes of the initial National Core Team seminar will be to: consider the phase schedules and deadlines; review subject curricula for grades 1 and 5 to determine opportunities for curriculum infusion; discuss unit writing for the experimental curriculum; establish a modus operandi for exchange of and feedback on units between IIGE and the National Core Team; practice unit writing; briefly review project evaluation and student assessment approaches. In the period that follows up to September 2003 IIGE and the National Core Team will jointly develop units for all subjects for throughout the school year. Additionally, data collection and evaluation instruments will be developed and refined, student assessment strategies and methods put in place, and teachers from the designated experimental schools trained. This will involve IIGE teams in visiting each country two further times in the period up to September 2003 (the first visit to further build the capacity of the National Core Team through collaborative unit development and to begin development of the project evaluation and student assessment approaches; the second to jointly undertake with the National Core Team the introductory five-day training for teachers). The National Core Team will be solely responsible for the second, unit-specific, five-day training of teachers. The curriculum approaches and materials developed for grades 1 and 5 will be field-tested in designated experimental schools throughout school year 2003-4. During the school year IIGE personnel will visit each country twice; first, in January 2004 to observe the field tests, discuss the interim evaluation report with National Core Team members (see 3.2), offer additional training to teachers, and help begin phase two of the project (see 3.2); second, in Spring 2004 for further field test observation and for discussion of the phase one evaluation report with the National Core Team. A national report, jointly written by IIGE personnel and National Core Team members, will be presented to UNICEF CARK and respective Ministries of Education by August 2004, with national
dissemination events taking place in September 2004.

Thereafter the project will adopt a two grades per 20-month development cycle with phase two (grades 2 and 6) unit development beginning in January 2004 and implementation and evaluation during the 2004/5 school year. Stages will follow the pattern established in phase one but with a foreshortened pre-implementation stage of eight months. The three subsequent 20-month phases would cover grades 3 and 7 (beginning January 2005); grades 4 and 8 (beginning January 2006); grades 9 and 10 (beginning January 2007). This approach will enable the cumulative four-year impact of the global education initiative upon students in grades 1 and 5 in the original field-testing schools in 2003/4 to be evaluated. Successive phases of the project will overlap by eight months. Hence, in January 2004 the preparation of curriculum and learning and teaching materials for grades 2 and 6 would begin while eight months still remain for the completion of the first phase (grades 1 and 5). To provide steerage for beginning and shaping the new phase, an interim evaluation will be conducted and interim evaluation report written in November/December of each year. The interim report will be particularly significant in the first phase as UNICEF CARK and UNICEF national offices consider priorities for the new 2005-9 program cycle and quinquennial budget, to be determined by December 2004. The phase one final report (August 2004) will also be of crucial significance in this regard.

In the first cycle the new curriculum and learning/teaching approaches will be field-tested in 20 MOE-designated experimental schools in each country. All subjects will be addressed. The schools will include a wide range of socio-economic and cultural circumstances and locations with special emphasis on rural and urban schools in underprivileged areas. Subject to ministerial approval, the number of experimental schools will be increased in each successive phase of the project.

The field tests will be evaluated using the 10-item data collection instrument itemized under 7.0 but with additional instruments as agreed and developed with each National Core Team. An interim evaluation report as well as a final evaluation report will be prepared and published for each phase. Independent evaluations of aspects of project implementation and impact may be commissioned from university faculties of education in each country as well as from extra-national agencies.

Given successful outcomes to each phase, project outcomes will be implemented to scale to a timetable determined by each MOE (decisions will need to be taken regarding the most effective means of more widely disseminating the new materials and approaches). Following completion of a phase, the new curriculum and learning/teaching approaches for specific grade levels, duly modified in the light of feedback, will be repeated with succeeding generations of students in the experimental schools, with re-evaluation principally directed towards modified elements.
Evaluative Observations:

- The February 2002 consultations, conference, and workshop were an effective beginning to the Global Education initiative. The involvement of representatives from many branches and levels of the education system was exemplary. The “official” sense of informing-consulting across sectors was important, although perhaps country participants had less of a hearing than they perceived.

The observation of schools in and near Almaty by IIGE was an important step. Clearly important aspects of the state of the education system were observed. The selection of Step by Step schools leads to some question as to how well they represent the program and pedagogy in general. However, since it was the intention of UNICEF, to include Step by Step schools in Global Education initiative, observing these schools was important. Such inclusion was subsequently ruled out by the government officials in order not to mix up the two models and because the ministry felt it was a priority to address the urgent need in south Kazakhstan.

- A project of this magnitude is usually built on a systematic needs assessment. IIGE was not asked to carry out an assessment and no such assessment was built into the project proposal. However, UNICEF had conducted the Monitoring Learning Achievement Study in four countries (not in Turkmenistan) in collaboration with UNESCO. The results revealed that children do well in maths, less well in language, and do least well in rural and “non-Russian” schools. This points to a need for language as “means of instruction” to be at the centre of attention in materials development and teacher education. The study also revealed that teachers use black board and chalk over 90% of classroom time and no “meaningful” child-centred activities were observed. The UNICEF document, Societies in Transition: A Situation Analysis of the Status of Children and Women in the Central Asian Republics and Kazakhstan, 2000 also provided a basis for the needs determination that formed the justification for the Global Education Project. There is no direct reference to these UNICEF studies in the project proposal, or in the IIGE Mission Report.

- The meetings with the country groups to discuss specific educational needs was important. The variations among countries reinforced the need for specific country needs assessments. Kazakhstan specifically indicated the need for more consultation. Turkmenistan was not represented other than by a UNICEF representative.

- The project proposal is detailed and comprehensive. Striking however is the seeming lack of responsiveness in the June proposal to the February requests by countries. This is apparently so because the June proposal was drafted not so much as an exact blueprint for contractual action as for fund-raising and further negotiation with governments. Selby and Ulkuers seem to recognize the need for flexibility in the development of the plan in the first stages before the actual contract with IIGE and the College of St. Mark and St. John. The need for such flexibility continues and flexibility needs to be built into the contract itself.

IIGE and Global Education hold as a fundamental philosophy the need for
participatory democratic approaches and for collaborative processes. Clearly, initiatives of the sort involved in the Global Education Project require strong leadership and must be part of established working relationships between government ministries and UNICEF. At the same time, however, it must be stressed that true collaboration, working together in consensus decision making, always remains a challenge. The spirit of Global Education requires that this challenge be constantly addressed. Obviously UNICEF sought a collaborative approach through a series of planning, monitoring and evaluation meetings throughout the year. Discussions with governments, as part of mid-term reviews, involved Global Education as one of the major priorities. Information on these events, was however, only briefly shared with the IIGE teams through e-mails. It is encouraging that the Global Education project is part of a larger program of cooperation between the respective government/ministries and UNICEF.

- The IIGE proposal was created on the basis of successful experience and as such does provide a blue-print for an approach that has been effective in other countries. It was to a large extent a re-working of previous proposals.

Concerns and Anticipated Project Outcomes

The proposal drafted was completed on June 20, 2002, and the workshops began on July 7. The formal evaluation process was begun at that point and significant participants in the process were interviewed to determine “input” expectations and concerns.

Larisa Miroshnichenko, Ministry of Education and Culture, Kyrgyz Republic:

- funding, for example, “even to make enough copies of some material for some people might be problem, also even in stationeries and papers.”
- reluctance or resistance from some parts of the education system
- some might ask this question: “why do we need this new democratic education or education for democracy, if I don’t have money for my family to eat, why do we need new ideas?”
- our main program is to reduce poverty, and the values and ideas of global education, like participation and tolerance, may help people adjust to the current situation and be more confident.
- It is very important for our successes to involve some participant from higher level education.

Philippe Heffinck, UNICEF CARK Area Representative

- The effect of the implementation of Global Education overall “should be very positive. It is part of the essential democratization process which all these countries have to go through, the participatory approach, the interactions, the battles between students and teachers on educational policies and programs, all of these are part of the democratization process. … It’s a long time process”
- Heffinck: flexibility and individuality by country has to be protected and so far I have seen global education managing that.

Bartel: Do you see that as a criteria for the evaluation of the success of this project? For example, if it had a slightly different permutation in every one of the 5 countries?

Heffinck: Yes, obviously.
Bartel: Would lack of uniformity in fact be success?

Heffinck: I would say it would be success because it would reflect the capacity of each country. I think it’s good to have a certain specificity that’s suitable for the situation of each country.

- One concern is the length of time of these undertakings. It could take 6 to 10 years or more for these things to be adopted nationwide. Some politician may want to have quicker results for internal consumptions.

- Another concern is making the experimentation fully suitable for the country, replicable and sustainable.

- Another concern is internal monitoring — all these things have to be monitored. I am concerned about the monitoring tools, the instruments, the frequency, and the analysis. We could easily become overly optimistic in terms of going to scale, in terms of the cost to go to scale.

- for some countries, particularly like Tajikistan, where is the money to go to scale? They are already struggling and they’re not succeeding in providing the very basic facility.

- Kyrgyzstan is very small country, but it has a very dynamic administration. It’s one of the countries where you find very highly qualified people … a lot of competent people open to the outside world, willing to do some changes. I’m quite confident in this country in particular. In the other countries we have to see how it works.

Nurper Ulkuer, Child Development Officer, CARK

- At the age of 7 they test children and they put the children in the classroom according to that. This is something that we should be looking into it. This is the time that the decision is made on the children’s future, whether they go to a specialized school, or go to grammar school, etc. These tests are on psychosocial, psychomotor, and cognitive development. For example, whether they are able to tell their names, their street. There are series of tests. Again, due to economic problems, they are not testing all children. The schools are competitive, and the better schools continue testing because they want to secure the best students. And there are schools for everything. There are schools for the deaf, there are schools for the visually impaired, and there are schools for motor disabilities, all kind of schools for different disabilities. And by the way, the disability rate is quite high. For example, one third of the children are disable, and that is a high number.

- A problem with the process of democratization: they feel so uncomfortable with participatory processes, they don’t like it, they feel lost. Because, this way they have to take the initiative, they have to be responsible for their actions, and they don’t want to take that responsibility. Participatory decision making is an uncomfortable process for them and sometimes they even accuse you of not knowing what you’re
talking about, that you’re just messing around. “Why do you have to have all these meetings one after another? what is the value of these roundtables or discussions? Tell us what to do and we’ll do it! You see, they’re not comfortable, and I understand that, they feel lost, and then they start blaming you that you are lost and that you don’t know what you’re talking about. It’s a difficult process in countries like here where people were told what to do all their lives, and if they didn’t do it properly, they would reprimanded publicly. They are afraid of that, they don’t want to be reprimanded. There is a high anxiety of failure.

Encouraging indicators for Kyrgyzstan:

- The minister of education is a strong leader and is supportive
- People from the university are “allies” – “this is their third or fourth training with us, and they have been in other training and they are in charge of training the future teachers or retraining of the teachers, so that is an indication of medium and long term sustainability for this project;
- The country is in the process of education reform and there are several other donor agencies and financial institutions like World Bank and Asian development Bank, they seem to be pushing the education reform and curriculum development towards the direction that global education is at, our locating, so when you put all these different indicators together, I think the project has a good prospect.

- Major concern is the funding base to take the project to scale. Twenty schools are possible or 40 schools but I don’t want to see that. It has to become part of the overall education reform, if it is not we failed.
- Four major assumptions for this project:
  - that UNICEF is going to take leadership
  - that UNICEF will find the money to fund it
  - that the government will be the leader for particular policy development,
  - and that the International Institute for Global Education, University of Toronto will be with us throughout.

I would like to see that this project should help the ministry to come up with good monitoring system so in fact the project should help the ministry to improving their capacity of monitoring or evaluation component, and after 3 or 4 years, it should be part of the regular monitoring evaluation system of the ministry in the country.

Tatiana Aderikhina, Education Programme Assistant, UNICEF CARK

- My real hope is that teachers will become more active in the classrooms and that they will be caring about the whole teaching process and change and use many process in the classroom to make the learning process easier and with good quality for children.

- What worries me is that some people may misinterpret the concept, and it’s for us to make sure they understood it well and spread the message around in the
right way. As well as, how far they can take it forward in the schools and how quickly we would be able to bring the attention of the education authority to that.

**IIGE stated outcome expectations:**

- The infusion of global education dimensions throughout grades 1-10 will both enrich the curriculum and enable a higher level of curricular cohesion and integration
- The new pedagogical approaches will vivify learning and teaching. Students will make significant gains in knowledge, understanding, and skills; they are likely to evince more pro-social attitudes; they will be more highly motivated within the enhanced learning environment that will follow from learning/teaching style diversity and the teacher assuming a more facilitative role.
- Teachers will acquire new skills and confidence; a new sense of professionalism.
- Ministry-level and provincial-level educational administrators will acquire new understandings and skills in the development, monitoring, and evaluation of children-centred curriculum and learning/teaching approaches. There will also be important learnings in terms of approaches to teacher development and training.
- Teacher training courses based upon delivering the new curriculum using interactive learning approaches will have been tried and tested.
- Through core team members and academics attached to the project, a major contribution is likely to be made to both academic and professional literature on curriculum and pedagogy in the CARK region.
Five National Global Education Workshops Completed

Kyrgyzstan National Workshop, July 7–11 Bishkek
Facilitators: David Selby, Linda Cameron, John Myers, Lee Bartel
Evaluator: Lee Bartel

The five days of the IIGE’s official visit to Kyrgyzstan were structured as follows: (1) a basic introductory global education workshop lasted for three days (see Addendum 1 for details of the typical Global Education introductory workshop that was essentially followed here) beginning in the afternoon of July 7 and concluding after a morning session on July 10; (2) the remainder of July 10 and July 11 introduced the Global Education in the UNICEF CARK Region initiative to the Core Team members, invited them to be a part of the Core Team, and explained their role and its concomitant benefits and responsibilities. All of the participants who were invited to be part of the Core Team agreed to do so, and returned for the July 11 session. The national workshop was attended by 34 educational leaders, which included educational specialists, Ministry personnel, teachers and principals from across Kyrgyzstan. For a more detailed description of the workshop and core team training sessions see the IIGE Kyrgyzstan Mission Report in Addendum 2.

Evaluative Observations:

- The participant group seemed to be predominantly non-teachers -- administrators, university professors, ministry officials, NGO representatives and so on. This seemed to give the workshop a theory-principle orientation, with less enthusiastic practical application. The participants seemed responsive to the theoretical ideas but not as responsive to the activities – intellectual agreement but short on practical capacity.

- There seemed to be an “officialness” about the UNICEF approach because there were so many Ministry of Education people involved. This could be helpful in policy approval but it may also contribute to a “top-down” approach which may already be part of the traditional approach the educational administration but which is quite contrary to a Global Education approach.

- There were some very enthusiastic participants but also some reticent ones.

Uzbekistan National Workshop, July 10-14, Tashkent.
Facilitators: David Selby, Neil Bolland, Fumiyo Kagawa, Lee Bartel
Evaluator: Lee Bartel

On July 10 the Global Education National Workshop began with formal opening speeches by Ms Brenda Vigo (UNICEF Uzbekistan Assistant Representative), Mr.Rustam Akhliddinov (Deputy Minister of Public Education), and David Selby, IIGE. From the afternoon of July 10 until noon of July 13 an introductory Global Education workshop was held (see Addendum 1 for details of the typical Global Education introductory workshop that was essentially followed here). Sixty two people were on the original participant list but not all attended the
main workshop. From July 13 noon and on July 14, an orientation to responsibilities and training in activity writing was given to the 23 members selected for the Uzbekistan National Core Team. For a more detailed description of the workshop and core team training sessions see the IIGE Uzbekistan Mission Report in Addendum 3.

Evaluative Observations:

- The Uzbekistan workshop followed the Kyrgyzstan workshop. David Selby and Lee Bartel moved from one to the other. The comparison between the two led facilitators to the perception that there was more enthusiastic and “livelier” participation in the workshop in Uzbekistan than in Kyrgyzstan. The explanation proposed was that this was a result of a greater proportion of teachers participating in Tashkent.
- The space for the workshop in Tashkent was small and somewhat restricting. Although a larger space was occasionally available, the bulk of the time was spent in a small room. This seemed to affect the freedom to move, group, and present material somewhat.
- The employment of cordless earphones were a great help in facilitating flexibility and compensated considerably for the small space.
- Leadership is crucial in projects and the enthusiastic support and “teacherly” understanding from UNICEF project assistant was encouraging and helpful.
- There was a sense of personal and systemic readiness for the project

Uzbekistan Workshop – Concluding Participant Reactions:

Explanatory Note: On the last afternoon of the workshop, the participants were asked divided into 5 groups and were asked to make a list of what they considered to be the strengths of the Global Education approach, or their expectations for the effect of Global education. They were then asked to make a list of the weaknesses in the approach or in the Uzbekistan context that might make success difficult. Thirdly, they were asked to think about the possibilities or opportunities that this project might create. And, finally, they made a list of what they thought might be risks or dangers in the implementation of the project. The lists from the five groups have here been combined and organized into thematic groups for easier interpretation.
The Strengths or the Expectations of the Global Education Approach:

**Pedagogy**
- Comprehensive child development;
- Development of skilled (developed) educational programmes;
- To improve education quality;
- New Child Friendly schools;
- Transition from solo pedagogic to cooperation;
- Possibility to self-expression, self-development and self-estimation;
- To improve education motivation;
- Including children with special needs into active live;
- Liberation;

**Public Support**
- To strengthen society attention to school.
- Readiness of teachers, parents and children to changes;

**Inservice Training and Resources**
- Availability of information on Global Education;
- Access to Global Education;
- Resources;
- Availability of qualified trainers;
- Availability of good partners, sponsors (UNICEF, Toronto University)
- Availability of international experience;

**Preparation and Will to Change in the System**
- Professional experience in Educational System;
- There is internal and external preparedness;
- Courage
- Willingness to change
- Aspiration to changes;
- Experience for starting;

**The Project Approach and Plan**
- Specific goal;
- Actuality of the project;
- Suitable, efficient, results
- National Programme (II stage).
- Integration to the process;
- To think non-standard, i.e. creativity;
- Realized behavior;
The weaknesses of the Global Education Approach or the Uzbekistan Context:

**Pedagogy**
- Lack of technical basis; Absence of methodological basis; Material-technical basis;

**Inservice Training and Resources**
- Lack of experience on Global Education;
- Weak information;
- Low motivation of trainers,
- Absence of individual training plan (selection of Programme)

**Preparation and Will to Change in the System**
- Low professionalism of teachers;
- Conservative spirit of officials;
- Fear of changes;

**The Project Approach and Plan**
- Combination of main work with work in project (physical overload),
- lack of time;
- New project;

**Financial Support**
- Insufficient financing of education system;
- Lack of educational, methodological and finance possibilities;
- Financing for retraining of teachers;

**Physical or School Context and Conditions**
- Local conditions; High filling in classes; Agricultural work.

The Possibilities of the Global Education Approach and Project:

**Increase Support for Uzbekistan Education**
- Use of foreign experience;
- To find sponsors;
- Support of partners
- Joining up efforts of MoPE and NGOs.
- To attract society;
- To disseminate information
- School – society
- To attract Mass Media;
- To attract enthusiasts, publicity, parents
- Solidarity of the society;

**Changes in Education of Children and Schools**
- Children will get qualitative knowledge and life skills;
- Increased interest to classes by children and teachers;
- Teacher-children are partners
- School in the network of Child Friendly school
- To develop possibilities for free thinking of the child;
- Quality of education improved;
- Interest to subjects;
- School democratization.

**Professional Development of Teachers**
- To retrain teachers;
- Creative relation of teachers and children to education;
- To improve adaptation.
- Increased authority of the teachers;
The Risks or Dangers in and to the Implementation of Global Education:

**Financial**
- Low motivation (finance)
- There is no support by instructions in PE system (financial support)
- Lack of financing
- Quality of polygraph [testing] products and its price;

**Workload for Teachers**
- Overload of teachers;

**Sustainability of Effort**
- Can become non-permanent action;
- Absence of society interest to Global Education;
- The experience of pilot school will not be shared
- Danger of rejection of ideas.
- Implementation of governmental side of education system;
- Selection of pilot schools for experience dissemination.

**Effect of Expectations on Children**
- Involving children to extracurricular activities (competitions, cleaning, etc)
- Evaluation of school children;

**Administrative Resistance**
- Conservatism;
- Non-understanding of Global education by management structures;

**Public Reaction**
- Misunderstanding;
- Political, economical, social changes.

*NOTE: Categorization of comments was done by the evaluator.*
Tajikistan National Workshop, December 9-13, Dushanbe

Facilitators: David Selby, Linda Cameron, Hugh Brewster, Lee Bartel
Evaluator: Lee Bartel

The Tajikistan National Workshop in Dushanbe took place from December 9-13 in the form of a 3-day workshop for 42 participants and a 2-day seminar for the 21 members chosen for the National Core Team. The basic 3-day workshop format was followed with only minor variations (see Addendum 1 for details of the typical Global Education introductory workshop that was essentially followed here). Opening speeches were given by Abdulbashir Rashidov, First Deputy Minister of Education, Munira Inoyatova, Head of the Department of Science and Education at the Presidential Office, Yuki Mokuo, UNICEF representative, and David Selby, IIGE. For a more detailed description of the workshop and core team training sessions see the IIGE Tajikistan Mission Report in Addendum

Evaluative Observations:

- There appeared to be a strong commitment to reform from highest levels – president’s office and Ministry of Education, demonstrated in opening speeches and in subsequent meeting between Selby, Rashidov and Mokuo.
- The weather created problems of attendance and participant frame of mind – resulted in a late start on the first day as well as necessitated time-table accommodation.
- The age of participants seemed balanced toward the mid-fifties. This seems to be the average age of personnel in the education system and that is a systemic concern. The lack of young teachers potentially affects the response and enthusiasm but more importantly the flexibility to adapt to new pedagogy. Young participants would be a better long-term investment. In general the consultants felt there was too large a proportion of men and deputy chiefs, methodologists, leaders of departments etc.
- A bigger problem than age, although the two variables are probably strongly correlated, was the fact that participants were invited on a representational basis making the group quite political and too administrative. According to an interview in Tajikistan specifically, and from information in other countries in general, this is the biggest problem for educational reform in CARK and will be the biggest barrier to effective implementation of Global Education in Tajikistan. The effect of this was seen in an argumentative spirit that emerged early on. Only persistent teaching and demonstration as the workshop continued did this argumentativeness diminish, although some in attendance stopped participating.
- Workshop had a clear effect on participation – a considerable number of very reserved, reticent people became enthusiastic participants. A few participated at first and then decided to no longer participate and “sat out” activities. This may well be an indication of
teacher response to the implementation effort, and indicates the need for specific pre-emptive strategies, like perhaps selection of teachers for pilot testing who clearly are positively responsive. It may also require additional time to build system and teacher capacity.

- Considering the shortage of professional interpreters in Tajikistan, the interpreters performed with strength and tenacity. However, despite the fine performance of the translators to translate into Russian, some participants were not proficient in Russian. Although a Tajik interpreter was present, the primary translation was into Russian. This is especially a worry when ideas are translated from English to Russian and heard by someone who does not even understand Russian well – what really is learned? This problem really underscores the need for the preparation of key materials in printed Russian form.

- The UNICEF person officially responsible had little connection to the workshop and relied on her assistant who did an enthusiastic and efficient job. However, more involvement by the Project Officer would have been welcomed by IIGE. However, neither “participated” in activities of the workshop but will have responsibilities for the supervision of the implementation. Additional training just for UNICEF assistants would be helpful. A Workshop strand planned for February 2003 will attempt to address this.

- Capacity of teachers – the lack of in-service training and lack of resource availability in the past 10 years has had an evident effect on all levels of the educational system.

- The realities of primary vs. secondary school teaching practice and curriculum, indicated the need to divide the Core Team into 1 and 5 sub-teams. Subject specialization happens at the secondary level (beginning with grade 5) but does not in primary. Subject specializations were intentionally placed within the subgroups. This approach has not been followed in all countries and some team reshaping may be needed.

- UNICEF support for the core team is essential to the progress of the activity writing and the success of the project. Here the UNICEF office did not seem fully prepared for the support function. This needs to be centrally and locally addressed.

- There was only one IIGE facilitator (a graduate student) left for the last day. This was necessitated by plans for a meeting for December 14th – however the meeting did not happen. Plans balancing future workshop staffing needs and meeting needs should be followed. More importantly, plans need to allow at least two facilitators to be present at all workshops.

- Although this may well be a general issue, it emerged here specifically. The fact that there were several translators present at the same time due to the need for Tajik and Russian interpretation, made it possible for the interpretation and the materials on overheads to be scrutinized. Some crucial translation errors were spotted on overheads. It is clear IIGE may need to take responsibility to have key concepts and terms translated, and re-
translated to check validity, in Toronto to create a glossary of terms to be used by interpreters. Although this has cost implications for the project, there is important value in accurate and efficient communication.

Kazakhstan National Workshop, December 11-15, Almaty

Facilitators: David Selby, Jim Christophers, Fumiyo Kagawa, Evaluator: Lee Bartel

The Kazakhstan National Workshop in Almaty took place from December 11-15 in the form of a 3-day workshop for only 18 participants and a 2-day seminar for the National Core Team consisting of all participants. The basic 3 day workshop format was followed with only minor variations (see Addendum 1 for details of the typical Global Education introductory workshop that was essentially followed here). Opening speeches were given by Nurper Ulkuer, UNICEF, and David Selby, IIGE. No Ministry of Education representatives were present due to location and event conflict. For a more detailed description of the workshop and core team training sessions see the IIGE Kazakhstan Mission Report in Addendum

Evaluative Observations:

- The low attendance at the workshop was unfortunate and the direct result of event conflict. Given the general lack of “felt need” for Global education by the Ministry of Education and Kazakhstan participants at the February 2002 introductory workshop, this attendance seemed symbolic. However, the level of enthusiasm by the participants tended to compensate in some ways for the disheartening attendance.

- The specific time the workshop was held seemed a significant factor in UNICEF preparedness and participation. The timing was necessitated by the decision to hold three country workshops during the same short time span. This logistical “inconvenience” seems to be directly indicative of the difficulties that may continue if all five countries of CARK are to be kept on a parallel track.

- The inclusion of all workshop participants in the core team was clearly an anomaly in IIGE procedure and may have resulted in the inclusion of some who would not, if there had been more selection, been included. Even with all included, the team is smaller than those in other countries. More participants should be selected with preference for teachers and procedures for this were put in place following the workshop.

- There was no involvement of Ministry of Education in the workshop but for further development and implementation of the project, the dialogue and collaboration with the Ministry will be crucial. Specific “ownership” by the Ministry will need to be developed and
endorsement and support to the team will need to be given.

- A specific focus on a geographic region may convince the ministry of the need for the project. It has been suggested that the focus for implementation be restricted to the Southern region, a poor area of Kazakhstan, where the quality of schools is low. This needs to be discussed further with the National Core Team, the Ministry, and UNICEF to define the parameters.

- The focus on southern, rural schools has the merit of fitting in with the Kazakh Year of the Village (2003). However, the core team has no representation from that region and success would be jeopardized without that. Obtaining significant representation and training those participants would take time and planning.

Turkmenistan National Workshop, December 16-20, Ashgabat

Facilitators: David Selby, Neil Bolland, Lidra Remacka, Heather Reid.
Evaluator: Fumiyo Kagawa

The Turkmenistan National Workshop in Ashgabat took place from December 16-20 in the form of a 3-day workshop for participants and a 2-day seminar for the National Core Team. The basic 3 day workshop format was followed with only minor variations (see Addendum 1 for details of the typical Global Education introductory workshop that was essentially followed here). Opening speeches were given by Mr. Sarykhanov, Minister of Education/ Director of National Institute of Education, Turkmenistan, the UNICEF representative, and by David Selby, IIGE. For a more detailed description of the workshop and core team training sessions see the IIGE Turkmenistan Mission Report in Addendum 7.

Evaluative Observations:

- There seemed to be a general attitude presented that the implementation of Global Education would be without problem – a very positive climate was portrayed. This does seem to some extent in conflict with the described state of rural schools and the expectation of Core Team members that they would receive no compensatory time for their work on Global Education.

- At the beginning of the workshop participants were a bit reticent but as the workshop progressed participants became increasingly interested and excited by the material. Facilitators noted a marked difference in the level of enthusiasm as the workshop entered Day Three and Four.

- There seems to be very strong “central coordination” taking place. The selection of Core Team membership had been predetermined prior to
the beginning of the workshop. The selection seemed to be “politically” motivated or representational rather than on the basis of potential for involvement in the details of Global Education implementation. This does not bode well for the success of the team.

- The Core Team members had great difficulty writing subject lessons infused with global education. Possibly the inclusion of more practicing teachers would be helpful.
- Core Team members anticipated that the extra time required for Core Team membership, specifically the time necessary for lesson writing, represented a significant constraint. Core Team members did not expect to be given time from their jobs to participate in the Core Team. UNICEF may need to negotiate with the Ministry of Education regarding this and compensate teacher time in some way.
- There was a real sense of commitment from the Core team members. They looked forward to more involvement and education in the methods of Global Education.

Facilitators: Linda Cameron, Lee Bartel
Evaluator: Lee Bartel

From the morning of December 16 until noon of December 18 a workshop was held for members of the National Core team of Kyrgyzstan. This workshop took place about six months after the initial workshop and was designed to:

- To reinforce understanding of the theory and practice of global education
- To evaluate the already created activities that the Core Team has written and to give feedback from the Toronto team
- To train the Core Team on the more effective development and writing of global education activities
- To collaboratively develop a plan of action for next steps

For details of the activities and accomplishments, please refer to the report in Addendum 9.

Evaluative Observations:

- The team seemed very reserved and hesitant at the beginning. This might have been because they had not met as a whole group since the workshop in July. For a team to function as a team, they should meet together but this had not been facilitated by the Core team coordinator or the UNICEF representative.
- The team seemed somewhat discouraged because the feedback from the first activities had been perceived as a negative judgment on their abilities to write activities, and that without adequate guidance on how to improve.

Two Follow-up Workshops
Kyrgyzstan Follow-up Workshop, December 16-18, Bishkek
After a review of concepts and approaches, the team believed they understood the concepts and global philosophy, but when they presented their activity to the group, an inadequate practical understanding became evident. One of the factors in this is that the team composition is dominated by non-teachers.

There are a number of controlling people that took over discussion and decision, and they were too often not the ones that fully understood.

A key element in Global Education is the substantial infusion of issues into facets of schooling. In this team, the issues were generally ignored in lieu of curriculum (subject sequence)...and in particular, skills. The theory seems to be understood but the methodology has not been internalized. More training and the inclusion of more teachers would be most helpful.

The practical group functions seem to have been oriented to the space of the Ministry of Education. Although this gives an “official” support to the venture, it can also be a serious constraint on creative divergence from standard practice. UNICEF has not, to date, designated space for the team to meet and work. This needs to be done for psychological and practical (materials) reasons.

A significant issue relates to the leadership style of the team coordinator. The coordinator attended only half a day of the workshop. Specific training on participatory leadership may be needed.

Four team members were added to the list since July. These members did not attend the workshop in July and consequently are not fully educated as to the principles and practices of Global Education. Of these four, only two are teachers and two more are from teacher training, bringing the total from teacher training to six.

The support of the ministry is crucial, and support in the form of representation of ministry on the Core team is desirable. However, the coordination of the Core Team by a ministry representative, especially in the non-participatory, bureaucratic style being used, may be counter-productive. There probably is a distinct danger of offending the ministry people if coordination arrangements are changed. Perhaps a different role for the ministry can be found, turning more direct practical control over to the group as a whole, and especially giving voice to active teachers.

UNICEF representatives were keenly involved in many parts of the workshop, both as participants and as support related to translation, copying and so on. This support was urgently needed since workshop material related to learning styles had not arrived in translated form. This kind of support bodes well for continuation of the project.

Uzbekistan Follow-up Workshop, December 11-13, Tashkent.

Facilitator: Lidra Remacka
Evaluator: Lidra Remacka

From the morning of December 11 until noon of December 13 a workshop was held for members of the National Core team of Uzbekistan. This workshop took
place about six months after the initial workshop and was designed to:

- to reinforce understanding of theory and practice of global education and its essence
- to evaluate all the activities that the Core Team had written and to give feedback from the Toronto team for all activities;
- to train the Core Team in the writing of activities and the applying of global education concepts and principles to existing curricula and new activities;
- to develop a plan of action for 2003 for the Core Team and the IIGE to work collaboratively on the writing and improving of Uzbek Global Education activities.

For details of the activities and accomplishments, please refer to the report in Addendum 10.

**Evaluative Observations:**

- Core Team participation was unfortunately not continuous everyday and so every session presented a challenge to the facilitator and the subject group members. The team managed despite this problem, but on-going “team work” requires the whole team.

- The Core team seemed convinced of the official acceptance and support for the Global education initiative, but expressed sincere worry about their ability to create appropriate activities for implementation. Particularly, there was a felt need for the involvement of more experienced teachers.

- Some of the problems of activity writing were primarily structural and could well be addressed with more active coordination and communication. Efforts should be made to enhance communications and connections between the Core Team members and Coordinator, and UNICEF and IIGE.
General Thematic Evaluation

The evaluative observations, discussions, and arguments in this section draw on the insights across the data from the entire project. Themes selected seem to emerge naturally to organize observations. Since the project participants, approach, and context are highly complex, many of these themes are inter-related and inter-dependent.

Global Education Approach in CARK Context

The dominant educational approach in the CARK region can be characterized as teacher-manual driven, linear, teacher-control oriented, content-focused instruction. Although Global Education differs dramatically in level and kind of student involvement, in “tone” of instruction, and in the nature of the content addressed, Global Education is not completely incompatible with existing teacher and school culture. The Global Education approach tends toward a formulaic approach with a pre-set “canon” of activities externally prepared, teacher controlled in use, and linearly related to the existing “textbook curriculum.” This means teachers should find the approach easy to understand as a pedagogical sequence approach. What the Core Teams have difficulty with is understanding how to create activities, but teachers will not, at least initially, be required to do this. They will simply have to understand the activity instructions and follow them. The result may be that the “spirit” of Global Education is not fully realized although activities are used as instructed, just as the intentions of Step by Step seem not to be fully actualized in CARK classrooms. In some other Global Education initiatives, teachers have moved towards: (a) offering creative amendments/alternatives to activities offered; (b) developing their own activities and to share them with the NCT and more widely, and (c) reaching the point where they teach in a ‘global education’ manner in an internalized way without reference to recipes (activities). If this is to happen in CARK, this needs to be made an explicit goal and workshop education planned to facilitate this development.

The previous point implies a lack in teacher understanding of the fundamental approach of progressive education, of which the activities of Global Education are a symptom. Workshops may be able to initiate short-term experience with “activity” but a full understanding of the underlying philosophies, psychologies, and culture of progressive education requires much more time than is now available in the workshops. An indication of this is that the idea of concept of an “activity” and its role in education is not fully understood (and is even debated at times by members of the IIGE team) and this shows in activity writing.

A related concept, that is a constant source of confusion, and one that is often raised as an issue potentially creating a serious barrier in the implementation of Global education in all CARK countries, is the concept of curriculum. According to Munira Inoyatova, Head of the Department of Science and Education at
the President’s Office, and Former Minister of Education in Tajikistan, the educational legacy of the former Soviet Union is a complete lack of a concept of curriculum as understood in North America. In CARK it is understood to be the allocation of specific time amounts to subjects to be taught. But, there is no concept of curriculum as a general set of outcome expectations attained through a particular set of topics and activities. And even less, as an understanding of curriculum as everything done under the authority and organization of a school — overt or covert, direct or indirect, planned or unplanned. The Global Education approach assume “infusion” of curriculum; however, if there is not curriculum, what is there to infuse? Must the reform not then begin with curriculum thinking and development?

Education in CARK is now heavily textbook dependent. The financial problems of the region are evident in education as a lack of textbook revision or creation, lack of textbook availability, and mismatch of prescribed instructional subjects and related textbooks. The Global Education approach is highly appropriate in this region for exactly that reason — it is not a text-dependent system. Except of course if the text is taken to be the “curriculum” and it is that “curriculum” that is to be infused with activities. The activity plans and related resources can be centrally duplicated and distributed with less “formal” effort than a text book. This bodes well for the implication of Global Education, assuming the issue of “curriculum” can be resolved.

One alternative suggested by IIGE consultants is that the creation of activities in itself can become a process curricular reform. However, it must be remembered that in “subjects” like math, science, language there is a discipline-dependent content and sequence that must be established on the basis of best research and best practice. That takes special effort and considerable time. It is not conceivable that the Core Team members will have the time or expertise to carry that out through the process of creating what must be seen essentially as the infusion or injection of some social issues along with considerable change in process. Curriculum reform will have to be a separate process.

The workshop approach of Global Education is very effective in providing an inspiring and motivating experience with a limited set of activities. However, most of these training workshop activities do not model specific connections to language and mathematics that form the bulk of the content of schooling. The emphasis on group dynamic, comfort levels, and trust building are very appropriate in the context of a three day workshop, have less play in the context of a year long secondary class, and practically no place in the small rural primary class where all students know each other and have known each other all their lives. But the three day workshop gives the illusion of understanding to the participant. However, when these participants are expected to employ this approach in their own classroom, “training” is the best one can hope for — that is, the replication of a set of demonstrated and rehearsed behaviours. The danger is that without fundamental education to encourage and govern self-initiated problem solving to achieve a selected goal, training degenerates into bland, thoughtless, behaviour replication. For
people to become effective trainers of others, and even more ambitiously, trainers of trainers, they will need considerably more “education” instead of training.

The social situation in the CARK region is such that, for educational changes of the sort proposed by Global Education to “take hold,” parents will have to be informed and involved. Several interviews and informal meetings raised the need to build parent workshops into the Global Education plan formally. The advantage is that Global Education is easily introduced and experienced through relatively short activities. These could become part of planned parent workshops conducted in conjunction with all schools where Global Education would be introduced.

The social, economic, and systemic context in CARK is highly complex. The question is: are we attempting to address a complex problem with a simple strategy – introducing an issues-oriented activities approach into classrooms? One of the realities about complexity is that much that appears complex is in fact quite simple and much that appears simple is in fact quite complex. Is the Global Education reform approach a balance between complexity and simplicity? Is it a simple strategy that is complex in its effect? There is no doubt that what appears to be a small change in giving children an opportunity to express opinions, beginning to encourage conscious, thoughtful choices among options, and raising awareness of the interrelationship of apparently isolated actions can within a generation have enormous repercussions on many of the systems of a society. Despite the potential significant effect on a complex system with a single-focus approach, it is worth a reexamination of plans to determine whether there ought to be some planned initiatives for teacher training, administrators, or parents.

Capacity of the International Institute for Global Education

Nurper Ulkuer observed during an interview in Kyrgyzstan that normally she has backup plans to any initiative, but in this case she has none. She is relying on IIGE to develop and carry through with the Global Education Project. Does IIGE have the capacity to develop and sustain projects in each of the five countries of CARK for the next 5 years? The first year of IIGE involvement has been marked by some considerable difficulty around getting commitments for specific workshop scheduling. For example, a workshop was proposed for Turkmenistan in August but IIGE had no available consultant to do this. It was then proposed for October but again it could not be done. Three workshops were then planned for December but considerable email correspondence argued that IIGE could not muster the consultant time commitment. Ultimately it was managed but leaving several workshops somewhat short staffed with only one graduate student facilitator present for the entire Uzbekistan follow-up workshop and graduate students completing several others.

Faculty. As identified earlier in the report, IIGE lists an impressive number of Faculty on its membership list. However, not all are available for international consulting. Of the three available directly from IIGE at University of Toronto, Lee Bartel is an
evaluation specialist. Linda Cameron is a recent addition to IIGE and that partially because of the ECCD potential in some areas in which IIGE has been consulting. Although her commitment to the principles of Global Education are strong and her love of educational reform benefiting children is great, her first professional priority is to ECCD. Projects in this area are under development and her recent UNICEF workshop with the five countries of the Persian Gulf is an indication of possible future involvements. She has additional involvements and her recent promotion to Coordinator of the single largest division within the largest Department (Curriculum Teaching and Learning) of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education may well curtail time available for involvement in the CARK project and other international consulting. David Selby as Head of IIGE is firmly committed to its work, is most richly experienced, and is the key to its future success. Dick Holland is not available for international on-site consulting but will play a significant role in anchoring the desk consulting related to activity writing.

Since the first workshops in July 2002, three additional Faculty members from the College of St Mark and St. John in Plymouth have become adjunctly connected to the work of IIGE. Jim Christophers, Cliff Harris, and Pat McGovern are indicating a willingness to work in the project. Of these only Jim Christophers has been involved to date. If all three commit to work in CARK, IIGE can still only muster one Faculty member per country. If for any reason anyone of these cannot participate, the project in five countries would be in jeopardy.

Faculty availability is one issue but Faculty involvement and commitment is another. If Faculty members are to be committed to a project, they must be involved in a collaborative and collegial way in most of the fundamental decisions that shape the project and involve them in it. They must feel “ownership” of both the material “taught” as well as the project details themselves.

**Graduate Students.** IIGE has been attracting exceptionally competent and motivated graduate students. Many of these are willing and eager to be involved in international projects. This is a tremendous strength of IIGE and makes the consulting currently contracted possible. It must be recognized of course that graduate student time in an institution is limited and so during the course of a 5 year project many will be involved.

Some students have an interest in developing research projects around international initiatives. This might make some form of country internships possible and even desirable. Possibilities for such internships have been discussed but specific academic, financial, logistic, and project involvement details need to be established. Internships could be of real benefit to the CARK Project.

**Other IIGE Commitments.** One of the significant factors influencing the capacity of IIGE for involvement in CARK is the existing commitment of IIGE to projects in Iran, Albania, Saudi Arabia and so on. Although experience in other countries benefits the efforts in CARK, the time and personnel
commitments to continue these projects detracts from availability and energy for the CARK project.

It is crucial that IIGE increase its list of available international consultants if it is to commit to a 5 year project in 5 countries. It will also have to exercise very specific communication strategies to involve busy Faculty members from universities in Canada and the UK. IIGE and UNICEF will need to schedule involvements at least 6 months in advance and contract Faculty members on an annual basis.

**IIGE Mission Reports**

The eight workshop or mission reports (included as addenda 1, 3-9) vary in detail and focus and quality. No specific IIGE approach, format, or model has been circulated as a standard. Since numerous people are involved over time, the reporting approach should become more consistent. At least two approaches are evident: the detailed description of what was done (Addenda 3, 4, 6, 7) and a more reflective, evaluative report (Addenda 5, 8, 9). To inform future decisions and actions the reflective report is considerably more useful. As an historic record of what was done the detailed description has value. If this historic record is of value, the two approaches should be blended — a brief outline of activities but with an emphasis on thematic reflection.

**UNICEF CARK**

**Administration.** Although UNICEF administrative structure is nearly impossible for an outsider to understand, several levels of administration are evident and important to the Global Education Project. At the highest leadership and decision-making level there is enthusiasm and support for the Global Education Project bordering on passion. The apparent strong commitment to making it a 5 country project activated by the autumn of 2003 may be more passionate than realistic and may need to be re-examined.

At the logistical administration level, UNICEF staff have been exceptionally patient, hard-working, meticulous, and forgiving. Problems with visas in December taxed everyone’s creativity and determination but in the end the workshops went ahead and succeeded. Clearly, all involved must be careful to give and heed instructions and to employ accountability systems through multiple copies, clear and direct communication, adequate lead times, and reminders or requests for acknowledgement.

**Communication.** Communication with all levels has been uneven – there seem to be times when communication is fast and reliable and at others where email messages vanish into cyberspace for too long. This is probably related to people being absent from offices or away in places where email is not readily available. Both UNICEF and IIGE participants need to alert each other of anticipated communication gaps and empower someone to respond on their behalf during such absences. IIGE has attempted to address this with the appointment of a specific graduate project “coordinator” to facilitate reporting, sharing, filing, ensuring swift turnaround of activity feedback, etc.

**National Level.** The country assistants have had considerable responsibility of logistics, financial matters, workshop
attendance, and so on. Clearly these obligations have been extensive and have generally been highly successful. One of the IIGE expectations that may not have been shared by UNICEF was for the country assistants to be more actively involved in the workshops themselves. Related to this was the assumption that the UNICEF assistant would have a continuing role with the Core Team. This seems not to be taking place consistently and needs to be re-examined and possible responsibilities more clearly discussed and decided.

Consultant Team Resourcing and Briefing. For project proposals, workshop content, consulting strategies, and training focus to be context sensitive, consultants need to be as fully briefed with crucial information as possible. In this CARK context, IIGE has little time to learn to understand the country context through observation and participation. Consequently, a supply of all available, relevant resource material would have been highly desirable. Inadequate provision of key UNICEF materials for responsive design and conduct of training means IIGE could not adequately situate Global Education in the CARK system. This same lack of materials has been evident related to country educational material description (curriculum). The need for situational information remains a constant need and UNICEF should take responsibility to inform and educate IIGE consultants on a continuing basis. This should also take the form of briefings – like the one that took place in Kazakhstan for the team on December 7. An opportunity missed was the full-day wait by the team in Bishkek on December 15 without a contact from the UNICEF assistant.

UNICEF Restructuring in CARK. The planned change in the UNICEF administrative structure in 2004 creates considerable uncertainty about the future evolution and administration of the CARK Global Education project, especially if it proceeds as a five country, lock-step approach. Perceptibly different levels of support and enthusiasm for the project at the country UNICEF level cry out for greater consultation with the national level in the shaping of the procedures for the next 2 years especially. Although the financial and administrative structure requires a central approach at this point, a distributed, country sensitive, differentiated approach to project implementation is needed. Both in a sense of ownership and in preparatory national UNICEF leadership training, UNICEF CARK needs to build a stronger, more empowered country collaboration into the project development process.

Translation/Interpretation.
Since all communication between national participants and IIGE consultants is through interpretation, this is of immense importance to the success of the project. Simply the difference between cordless and wired headsets makes a considerable difference in the communicated “tone” and example of flexibility. But more crucial is the accuracy of the translation/interpretation. The responsibility rests to some extent on IIGE in the provision in adequate time materials to be translated as well as an “approved” translation of key concepts. As mentioned earlier in the report, IIGE needs to take responsibility to provide a comprehensive glossary of
terms and concepts, translated in Toronto, and retranslated for validity.

**Global Education Material in Russian.**
Related to translation is the urgent need to provide a book of key Global Education materials in Russian. This idea was discussed and agreed to in principle, but no action has been taken. The initiative for this must lie with IIGE in the submission to UNICEF of the exact copies of material to be translated. UNICEF then needs to have this translated and printed.

**Process**

Global Education represents and advocates a collaborative and participatory democratic approach. In fact it stresses that this is part of the content of education and cannot simply be talked about or illustrated but must be lived. It is natural then to assume that this very process would be the mainstay of relationships within IIGE and between it and agencies with which it deals. There is a significant difference between a consultative process and a collaborative one. Both UNICEF and IIGE seem to have used a hurried and limited consultative process in the initial and progressive stages of the project to date. The “inward dimension” is a strong element as well in the Global Education model and needs to be honored in the process of planning and debriefing. The initial project proposal seems to have been created in a consultative mode and in some haste, while the redraft in the summer of 2002 was done in the unsettled atmosphere of Dr. Selby’s decision-making about a move to England. Now that the project has involved and informed numerous people who have become stakeholders, a more collaborative process of decision-making should be employed. The internet makes this possible regardless of location in Almaty, Bishkek, Dushanbe, Plymouth, or Toronto. It takes time, however, and skillful facilitation which IIGE consultants obviously possess.

**Core Team Capacity**

Core Team capacity to understand and absorb the concepts and practices of Global Education, and to apply them in educational prescriptions for teachers in schools has been a constant question. In some countries like Kazakhstan where the group was small and enthusiastic it was easy to believe that Global Education had been understood and accepted. However, a simple metaphorical activity like the weather report circle (an activity requiring each person to describe how the day was experienced with the language of a weather report) was not successful with the majority of the group (as it also had not been in Kyrgyzstan). Most simply literally described the weather of the day. It leads to questions of fundamental understanding. In most workshops, activities that had instructions for the maintenance of complete silence were not carried out according to instructions. From leaders to teachers, an often heard opinion was that the former Soviet educational system was excellent. Admiration for that system seems general. We know that teachers “are prisoners of their own model of learning.” How does that impact the potential for change to a more democratic, participatory approach? A clear underlying desire from methodologists, administrators, as well as teachers is to be given very clear “technical” direction – the RIGHT
method. This is inherent in the mind-set. To some extent Global Education implementation, at least in its initial stages, matches this desire with prepared activities, but even this, what appears to progressive educators in North America to be somewhat linear and inflexible, appears to them to be overly loose, fuzzy, and uncomfortable. Change takes time, multiple experiences, a high self esteem and self efficacy, and collegial and systemic positive reinforcement. There is great need in every country for more opportunities to experience and experiment with the ideas of Global Education in a practical way.

Activity writing and feedback process: The initial round of activity writing in Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan revealed an inadequate understanding of the concept of “activity,” a lack of understanding of the difference between unit, lesson, activity, and a lack of educational “purpose” for the activities. The follow-up workshops confirmed this reading and attempted to address the problem. A problem that contributed to this lack of successful activity creation was the “bunching up” of activities for feedback. If fewer activities were created and received immediate constructive feedback, the process could be more productively guided and shaped toward success. Mutually agreed timelines with frequent submission dates, fast feedback turn-around, and specific positive examples of subject-oriented activities would facilitate success. In some countries submission timelines were drawn up during the December workshops. IIGE has stated its intention to respond to activity submissions within ten days of receipt. If this process is followed, the production process and the required learning by Core teams should be facilitated.

Leader Participation. A problem in both follow-up workshops was attendance, especially by the coordinators. Does the CARK societal context expect a leadership style of “distance”? A demonstration of status or power through non-attendance or non-participation with the “ordinary people”? In Global Education core teams this is an unacceptable practice. Is the same cultural “role definition” and influencing UNICEF assistant’s toward “non-participation”? Leaders need to be as well informed as those they lead. They need to be participants in the process of activity writing itself—even if that reveals they do not have superior knowledge to those they lead. This is an inherent pragmatic assumption of Global Education process. Specific leadership training for Global education needs to be done with coordinators and UNICEF leaders.

Project Plan or Proposal

The project plan was originally created with an assumption of at least initial country uniformity in implementation. There may be administrative reasons and efficiencies urging uniformity, but five country uniformity runs counter to expressions of country need and desire in February 2002, it contradicts UNICEF express request in February 2002, and it does not align with observed country potentials during the past year. This policy of uniformity extends from format of workshop, formation and organization of core team, activity format, and implementation timeline. Later starts, country requests, level of competence, systemic readiness, and
Alternative Approaches: One immediate alternative to consider (e.g., Tajikistan and Turkmenistan) is a longer initial stage with more opportunity to educate a key group of leaders and practitioners. Focus could be strategically on a group of teacher educators with a pilot project in their institutions; on a group of teachers who begin with a very small group of activities; and a group of administrators. If these groups could be aligned, the second year could see a much more strategic launch of educational change. 

Another alternative could be considered in Kazakhstan, where the core team is relatively small and has no representation from the region where the implementation may be conducted. In the first year two small groups could be identified: (1) a small steering group within the Core team consisting of a coordinator and 4 subject-oriented people (2 primary and 2 secondary) and, (2) an adjunct teacher training group consisting of about 5 people who would initiate some pilot projects in the university. Some or all of these people could be given extra training, perhaps in conjunction with other country efforts or maybe in Canada or England. These two teams could identify and begin work with teachers and leaders in the target region. During the second year these “leaders” would take much more initiative to construct and carry out an implementation of Global education, and perhaps even function as consultants to other CARK country initiatives.

National Financial Capacity for Reform

A concern expressed as a fear or worry by UNICEF and national leaders is whether the financial capacity of CARK countries will allow implementation to scale of the Global Education reform. Philippe Heffinck expressed a very clear requirement that this project should be sustainable in the long-term. Nurper Ulkuer stated that if the project only reached the pilot schools she would consider the project a failure. Fiscal planning for reform efforts takes time, and governments need adequate information about realistic cost expectations to plan several years in advance for full-scale implementation. Such estimates require the expertise of an economist to model and predict. Economic models require some fiscal stability and that may not exist in all countries in CARK. Potential funding involvement being investigated with organizations like the World Bank, CIDA, or DFID may result in a feasibility to go to scale. Such involvement seems crucial to the long-term sustainability of the project.
Key Recommendations:

9. A needs assessment for curriculum development or clarification should be done immediately.

10. A plan to facilitate teacher growth from “recipe followers” to “autonomous progressive educators” should be built into the project.

11. IIGE needs to expand its complement of consultants immediately and assure UNICEF of adequate capacity to conduct the project for the duration of the plan or insist on limiting the number of countries for implementation.

12. Country specific variations in the implementation plans should be considered immediately, based on:
   a. Core team capacity
   b. Leadership strength
   c. Political will and climate
   d. Preparedness of schools and teachers
   e. Need for curriculum development

13. Key Global Education materials should be translated into Russian.

14. In the spirit of Global Education, to assure ownership and team-building, and to model participatory democracy, all crucial planning and decision-making should be thoroughly collaborative with senior consultants and not merely periodically consultative.

15. Implication for the Global Education Project of the plans to restructure UNICEF in the CARK region should be anticipated, discussed, and addressed within the next year.

16. Communication between UNICEF and IIGE problems often result from preparation timelines that are too short. All activities should be planned and scheduled a year in advance with final commitments in place four months before any event.
Anticipated Project Evaluation Framework

Project evaluation will be focused primarily on formative priorities – what we can learn to make the next stage more successful. Of course, by the end of the project summative conclusion will be drawn from the project data. To make these formative and summative decisions, data must be gathered from the following stakeholders: Students, Teachers, Administrators, Parents, and UNICEF. Essentially three forms of data acquisition will be employed: talking (interviews), writing (journals, focused feedback), rating (paper-based attitude and response testing), and seeing (observation by evaluators). In each case the final product will become a written transcript, translated, and reviewed by IIGE.

Although specific details need to be CARK teams responsive, the basic anticipated structure is as follows:

Students:
- will be required to complete written feedback sheets responding to the experience of individual activities
- pre-and post trial testing of attitudes
- group debriefing
- observation of involvement and response by evaluators

Teachers:
- reflective diaries of the experience
- interviews with some selected teachers
- written questionnaires to other teachers
- observations of implementation and response by evaluators

Administrators
- interviews
- questionnaire

Parents
- questionnaire
- observed workshop participation

UNICEF
- interviews by IIGE evaluators

Samples of Possible materials and a description of past approaches is included in ADDENDUM 15.

In addition to monitoring and evaluation of the success of the project implementation, evaluative approaches need to be applied to the current CARK curriculum. A possible plan follows:

Proposed CARK Curriculum Review and Needs Assessment

Rationale: Representatives of both UNICEF CARK and country Ministries of Education have pointed out that the concept of “curriculum” in Russian and in the school context is not well defined. Essentially the terms does not differentiate between plan of study, lesson plans, hours assigned to a subject, teacher’s manual, or textbook. The Global Education project approach is one of curriculum infusion, but if there is no clear and evident curriculum it is hard to know what is being infused. Practically matters are more confusing since various organizations are active in CARK addressing “curriculum” in some way; however, the exact scope of this is not known. Further, it became evident in December that in some countries new or alternative text books are available but it is not know what the probability is that these will be used. Consequently, an
immediate descriptive review of “curricula” is needed to determine whether more specific curriculum revision is needed. This needs to be focused on grades 1 and 5 only since a year from now changes may have been made in grade 2 and 6. Grade 2 and 6 need to be assessed between October and December, and so on.

Proposal:

1. Appoint one person within IIGE to conduct a curriculum review – a graduate student or IIGE research associate.
2. Appoint 2 people in each country to supply needed information requested by the task-force.
3. UNICEF assistant in each country be responsible to carry out NGO and government-related information gathering.
4. Information gathering begin in February at the workshop in Bishkek, continue by email, at the April follow-up workshops, and report before the summer teacher-training workshops.
5. Although questions are expected to emerge in the process of the study, the following questions would provide a start to the review:

In relation to present status:
   a. How many classes per week are allotted to each “subject.”
   b. Is there a fixed textbook?
   c. Is there a teacher’s manual?
   d. Are there new textbooks available as options?
   e. What is the sequence and scope of topics in each subject?
   f. How closely are these linked to a textbook?
   g. How much flexibility to vary topics is there?
   h. What are the learning outcomes expected?
   i. What is the nature of any standardized testing related to the curriculum?

In relation to initiatives and developments:
   j. Is the Ministry of Education or someone under their authorization, currently revising the textbook or topic sequence for any subject
   k. What is the expected time-line for any revision?
   l. What projects are underway by other NGO’s and what effect are they expected to have?
ADDENDA 1 – 15
ADDENDUM I:
 REPORT OF THE IIGE MISSION TO KAZAKHSTAN

MISSION REPORT: 09-16 FEBRUARY 2002
Toronto, February 20, 2002
Author: Lidra Remacka

Summary
The mission conducted by Dr. David Selby the Director of the International Institute for Global Education (IIGE), Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada and IIGE Researcher, Lidra Remacka.

1. The mission involved five elements: 1. visiting some schools in Almaty peri urban and urban areas and in Talgar District (Rayon); 2. meeting with the Area Representative Mr. Philippe Heffinck; 3. conducting the regional conference “Towards the child-friendly classroom: enriching the curriculum; enhancing learning quality”, (Almaty, Kazakhstan 12 February 2002); 4. facilitating a the three-day workshop (13-15 February); 5. meetings with the educational program assistants and country representatives from Tajiksitan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan.

2. Representative and Dr. Nurper Ulkuer, Head of Child Development Section, UNICEF CARK. The need for curriculum reform and pedagogical renewal in the Central Asian countries was addressed. Mr. Philippe Heffinck expounded the educational and health overview in the region of Central Asia. He underlined the Soviet Marxist indoctrination approach in the school system in the region. He then considered the role of the education system as an important part of the new democratic reality. The consultants, Dr. David Selby and The pre conference and workshop meetings were held with Mr. Philippe Heffinck UNICEF CARK Area Mrs. Lidra Remacka briefed Mr. Heffinck on the holistic philosophies of Global Education and interactive, participatory and cooperative teaching and learning methodologies.
Dr. Ulkuer suggested meetings with all UNICEF country officers to create a clear picture of their needs, plans and vision for the global education future in their countries.

3. The Regional Conference “Towards the child-friendly classroom: enriching the curriculum; enhancing learning quality” had been planned as a presentation focusing on Educational reform. It covered:
 Basic learning: scope and outcomes,
 Article 13, 29, Convention on the Rights of the Child,
 Some predominant characteristics of traditional classrooms,
 Some key characteristics of the child-friendly classroom,
 Interactive learning process, co-operative learning,
 Understanding self-esteem, comfortability/challenge,
 Realizing cognitive and affective goals,
 Infusion, Integration,
 Role of the National Core Team in national global education reform initiatives,
Feed back and the evaluation instruments, UNICEF MENA Global Education Initiative.

30 people from Kazakhstan (Almaty) participated as well as 25 from other CARK countries (Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan). For political reasons Turkmenistan had only one representative, the UNICEF Program Assistant. Most of participants were educational officials and practitioners from respective Ministries of Education, universities, training Institutions, NGOs and the Step by Step program, USAID representatives. Handout conference materials were distributed to all participants.

4. The workshop included representatives such as the Head of Education Department in the Ministry of Education, the director of Programs on Civic Education, the head of Human Development Department from Kazakhstan. Also Ministry personnel, education specialists, trainer-consultants, and school principals from Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan. The number of participants totalled 35. The workshop’s format involved a combination of inputs sessions, activities, activity debriefings, and discussions.

5. Formal and informal meetings were held separately with UNICEF educational program assistants and country representatives from Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan. Each of them represented the current status of educational system and training system. The representatives voiced their commitment to reform the system of teaching and learning using Global Education philosophies and interactive methods.

**DAY BY DAY REPORT**

**11 February 2002**

(3:00 a.m.) On the early morning of February 11, consultants arrived in Almaty.

Consultants met at (10:00 a.m) in the morning with **Dr. Nurper Ulkuer** for school visits to Talgar city. Mrs. Gulbadan Zakaeva master teacher in the Step By Step Program in Kazakhstan accompanied the group.

The first school visited was a primary school of 800 students in grades 1-4. Classes were extremely “traditional” with the teacher as center of the class. Students were very friendly and receptive.

The second was School No 8 (Juri Gagarin). It was a school, which implements the Step by Step program for grades 1-4 in four classrooms. The atmosphere was lively and positive. Desks were in groups of four according to four centers of learning; science, art, Russian, reading. The teacher was the center of the classroom and the teaching approach was individualistic and result oriented. The topic was environmental protection. Students worked individually to achieve the result that the teacher requested. Asking of questions was in only the ‘frontal’ direction; teacher to student. Some parents came to the classroom during our visit. The objective of their presence was not clear.

During lunchtime with teachers, school principal presented that students in child center class are very positive and they are learning better under new approach.

The day continued with a meeting (3:00 – 4:30 p.m.) with **Mr. Philippe Heffinck** UNICEF CARK Area Representative and **Dr. Nurper Ulkuer**. A second meeting continued with **Dr. Nurper Ulkuer** (4:30 – 6:30 p.m.) where she presented a global map indicating UNICEF areas of involvement, and programs and project in region involving UNICEF alone or in the partnership with with other international
organizations. These include: School and class management, Life skills training, Center for School Improvement, School based education, Information Center for Civic Education, Step by Step program. Dr. Ulkuer defined the role of consultant: First as person with technical expertise, second as institutional partner, third as fund-raiser. She pointed out UNICEF’s long term educational objectives in the Region and asked Professor Selby to design Global Education projects based on the country context. Consultants asked to have more information about the needs and future vision from those country representatives who will participate in conference and workshop. They agreed to have an informal lunch or dinner with each group of representatives from the five countries.

12 February, 2002

(10:00 a.m. – 13:00 p.m.) Consultants accompanied by Mrs. Gulbadan Zakaeva visited 2 schools in Almaty city. They observed three Kazak Step by Step classes in grade 3 and 2 in School No. 124. Students were sitting on the carpet in circle and the teacher asked questions about animal protection. They then worked individually in (four) separated learning centers. In the end consultants had very open and interesting conversation with students on how to protect nature and how to save our planet. Consultants also participated in traditional math class, (grade 4) in this school. The teacher with a long stick in her hand, taught in an extremely traditional approach. Total silence predominated while student worked individually in their notebooks. The teacher’s authoritarian approach didn’t allow them to talk or discuss with each other.

In Zhyldyz school No 325, consultants observed the Step by Step program in a grade 2 class. There were two teachers for one class. This allowed for separating the class in two parts. Consultants’ impressions from interaction with the Step by Step classes are that equipment and physical environment are more enriched than traditional class. The physical setting of chairs and tables allowed students to work in group but they actually still learned in an individualistic way. During tea time consultants had an informal discussion with teachers and the principal about the new methods of teaching and learning and the standards of the Ministry of Education. Teachers considered standards as a guide but at the same time they looked for more flexibility to operate in daily experience. The school principal complained about the traditional class’ lack of resources.

(3:00 - 6:00 p.m.) In Sanatorium Allatau Professor David Selby conducted the National Conference “Towards the child-friendly classroom: enriching the curriculum; enhancing learning quality”. It developed in three parts; presentation on the child-friendly classroom, the groups discussion and finally plenary discussion sessions. Every country worked in group to discuss the new approach and how it can fit into their country’s context. Every group prepared questions to raise in the plenary discussion sessions. Consultants responded to questions and gave different examples from Albanian, Jordanian, Iranian, and Japanese Global Education Initiatives.

Following a reception, the consultants, Dr. Ulkuer, and UNICEF education program assistants from five countries held a wrap-up meeting to share opinions, problems and feedback for the first day. Every program assistant voiced on behalf of country representatives positive impressions from the conference and willingness to know more about Global Education philosophies. Dr. Ulkuer informed program assistants to hold an informal meeting with each country group in order to give UNICEF representatives and consultants ideas on how to launch new projects in the future. She
also suggested keeping an eye out for those individuals from the attending countries whose 
enthusiasm and creativity indicated.

13 February, 2002

The first day of three-day seminar on Global Education, (six sessions over three days). 
On the first day (10:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.), the consultants covered; an introductory session, general 
overview of four-dimensional model, Global Education as a vehicle for child-friendly learning and the 
participatory classroom as a classroom of comfortability and conviviality. All participants participated in 
six activities. After each activity, the consultants and participants spent time debriefing to reflect, to 
share their feelings, thoughts, and opinions about activity implementation in a country context. A lot of 
creative variations were developed by participants.

The consultants, Dr. Ulkuer and UNICEF education program assistant and representatives from 
Tajikistan had an informal meeting during dinnertime. The Tajikistan’s group presented problems in 
their education system as being lack of teacher’s capacity, lack of motivation for students and teachers, 
and lack of adequate education for teachers, especially in rural areas. They emphasized the need to 
implement Global Education in Tajikistan as soon as possible.

(10:00 – 11:00 p.m.) In the evening the consultants, Dr. Ulkuer and UNICEF education program 
assistants from five countries had a wrap up meetings to share opinions and problems and feedback from 
the first workshop day. Every program assistant reported on group problems. Dr. Ulkuer called upon 
them to be more attentive and punctual in the preparation phase in term of equipment, materials, and 
translating handouts and transparencies for workshop.

14 February

(10:00a.m. – 10:00 p.m.) On the second day of the workshop the consultants facilitated a further three 
sessions on Global Education including 1) creating conditions and processed for child-friendly learning, 
2) the participatory classroom as harmonizing medium and message, 3) classrooms of interdependence, 
classroom of challenges, dissolving the wall between classroom and community. Seven activities were 
engaged in.
The Jordanian Global Education Initiative was presented in a Jordanian film describing the classroom 
implementation of Global Education in Jordanian elementary schools prepared by Jordan’s Ministry of 
Education. During plenary discussion participants expressed optimism and desire to start Global 
Education in their countries.

The consultants, Dr. Ulkuer and UNICEF education program assistant and representatives from 
Uzbekistan had an informal meeting during lunchtime. The Uzbekistan group presented their teacher 
training system and structure. They considered it as a strong resource and advantageous in starting 
global a education project.

The consultants, Dr. Ulkuer and UNICEF education program officer and representatives from 
Kyrgyzstan had informal meeting during dinnertime. The Kyrgyzstan group described a government 
policy to reconstruct curricula in two phases. Phase one, (2002-2004) implementing new curricula in

(10:00a.m. – 11:00p.m.) In the evening the consultants, Dr. Ulkuer and UNICEF education program assistants from five countries held a wrap-up meeting to share opinions, concerns and feedback from the second workshop day.

15 February

(10:00a.m. – 12:30p.m.) On the third and final day of workshop consultants presented the Albanian Global Education Initiative.
Every country presented formally in the final plenary session, their future plans for a Global Education Project.

Representative from Tajikistan’s group presented the system of education in Tajikistan and a variety of problems in their education system. More obvious for them was the high number of drop out students due to lack of motivation. They emphasized the need to improve teaching and learning methods. They intend to start Global Education first in 6 pilot school, three of them in rural areas and three in urban areas. After field-testing results in these schools the Ministry of Education will decide whether to expand Global Education into the national curriculum.
A Tajikistan core team needs to be established to coordinate and manage the Global Education Project. It is also important for them to involve the media in the Global Education campaign.

Representative from the Kyrgyzstan’s group described long and short term strategic plans to reform national curricula. Kyrgyzstan has already started to reform preschool system of education. They considered that Global Education approach fits with national objectives of education. They have plans to develop material and subsequently, follow-up teacher training. They consider 41 pilot school as potential resources to start a Global Education project.
They have plans to create two core teams, one will be a strategic core team and the other will be a technical team. David Selby re explained the role of the national core team as not a representative group but as a technical team that;
1. Will serve as a panel to advise on the cultural and educational appropriateness of activities developed and suggested by consultants,
2. Will develop activities and materials,
3. Will contribute to the training of teachers’ trainers and teachers.

Representative from Uzbekistan’s group presented their national policy for teacher training based on local trainers. They wanted to establish the core team to identify the 25 – 30 schools in 5 different districts that will implement Global Education. A representative from an NGO affirmed her support for the project and hoped for a fuller collaboration with government, UNICEF and IIGE.

Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, indicated strong support for starting Global Education Project in their countries.

Representative from the Kazakhstan’s group presented educational reform in primary and secondary education. They expressed their need for greater material to help solidify their understanding of Global Education. Their sense is that Global Education philosophy doesn’t fit with the goals of Ministry of
Education. They asked for more time to consult with their experts and researchers to include Global Education in their future plan.

The consultants, Dr. Ulkuer and representatives from Kazakhstan held informal meeting during lunchtime. They expressed the same thoughts and concern about implementation of Global Education in Kazakhstan as they expressed during the formal presentation. They considered Global Education as a future alternative. They proposed 2003 as a date to start Global Education. Kazakhstan representatives asked Dr. Ulkuer to further support existing and ongoing reform in two provinces, Almaty and Pavlodar for 40 school of rural areas. Professor Selby stated that current information provided is not enough to write a project proposal for Kazakhstan. Dr. Ulkuer stated that the budget is not sufficient to cover restructuring of all schools.

(6:00 – 8:00p.m.) Workshop and group presentation having been concluded, consultants held a final meeting with Dr. Ulkuer and Ms. Tatiana Aderikhina in the UNICEF office to decide next steps. According to the observations of consultants and Dr. Ulkuer during the workshop and based on strong training system of the in national level it was proposed that;
- Global Education Project be started in Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan with these steps in Phase One (2002-4):

1. National workshop to present Global Education philosophies and implementation, and to establish Core Team;
2. Training a Core Team (capacity building), activity writing, and TOT;
3. Training Core team as evaluators,
4. Training of teachers;
5. Curriculum Implementation;
7. Dissemination Report;
   - To start curricula implementation in parallel in grade one and grade 5;
   - To start curricula implementation in three subjects (including native language).

Lidra Remacka
Researcher
Institute of Global Education,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Ontario
ADDENDUM 2:

CARK GLOBAL EDUCATION NATIONAL WORKSHOPS, UNICEF CARK

PROGRAM (not distributed to participants)

[Note: we may use home groups at the end of each session – fifteen minutes discussion and fifteen minutes plenary – to enable groups to give us more regular feedback. Organizers should arrange colour-coded name badges, in English and Russian, the colours denoting home group membership. Home groups should contain a cross-section of professional types represented at the workshop and should number 6-8. If we use home groups, which is likely, we can use the ‘spillover’ approach so things from one session spill into the next, or drop certain items or a mixture of the two.]

DAY ONE: THE FOUR DIMENSIONS OF GLOBAL EDUCATION

9.30-13.00 SESSION ONE

9.30 Introduction and welcome; workshop content and style; right to opt out; overview of four dimensional model (OHT1); model used in UNICEF global education curriculum and pedagogical renewal projects in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Albania and Iran.

9.40 Activity: Globingo (H1) [mention other uses]

10.05 Input: The Spatial Dimension; interconnectedness, interdependence; fragmentalism (OHT1,2,3,4)

10.30 Activity: Rights Balloon Game (H2; OHT 5-9)

11.00 Break

11.20 Input: The Issues Dimension 1: Issues (OHT1)

11.40 Activity: Woolly Thinking

12.20 The Issues Dimension 2: Interconnectedness of Issues/Perspectives (OHT1,10,11,12; H3; R1)

12.40 Activity: Two Mules (H4; OHT13) [discuss Syrian Personal Safety version for Arabic Language (H5)]

13.00 Close

[Fruits of the Forest as back-up (OHT14; H6).]

14.00-17.00 SESSION TWO

14.00 Activity: Drawing upon the Future
14.20 Input: The Temporal Dimension 1: Introduction; Possible, Probable and Preferred Futures (OHT1)

14.35 Activity: Future Time Lines (OHT15,16,17)

15.15 Input: The Temporal Dimension 2: why a future-oriented curriculum (include discussion of questions about the future activity), some key concepts (OHT18,19); link to education for democracy, link to child participation aspects of CRC

15.35 Break

15.55 Activity: Going Dotty (H7,8) [explain cross-curricular uses]

16.15 Input: The Inner Dimension (OHT1)

16.25 Home groups of 6/8 to determine two questions they most want to ask about global education

16.40 Plenary

17.00 Close

DAY TWO: CREATING CONDITIONS AND PROCESSES FOR CHILD-FRIENDLY LEARNING

9.00-13.00 SESSION THREE

9.00 Outline of the day; global education as a confluence of worldmindedness and child-centredness traditions in education; global education as a vehicle for child-friendly learning

9.10 Activity: People Search (H9) (Sonia; as per Iran H1) Why? What is learnt?

9.30 Activity: Globetrotting [refer to other examples]

9.55 Input: The Participatory Classroom (1): Harmonizing Medium and Message (OHT 20,21,22) [relate to what was said in the presentation]

10.15 Activity: Co-operative Squares (OHT 23,24,25,26) [refer to uses for maps, rain cycle in MENA]

10.40 Break

11.00 Input: The Participatory Classroom (2): Classrooms of Interdependence (OHT 20,27,28)

11.25 Activity: Feelings Cards (H10)
11.50 Input: The Participatory Classroom (3): Classrooms of Comfortability and Conviviality *(OHT 20,29,30,31,32; H 11; R2)* [self-esteem building; self-esteem activities]

12.15 Circle Time [two rounds: ‘one things that pleases me…’ ‘one thing that puzzles me..’] followed by discussion of the morning.

13.00 Close

**14.00-17.00 SESSION FOUR**

14.00 Activity: Zoom!

14.10 Input: Comfortability and Challenge *(OHT 20, 33)*

14.15 Activity: Fruits of the Forest *(OHT14; H6)* or Picture Linking *(H12)*


15.05 Activity: Nine-dot Problem *(OHT 35,36,37,38,39; H12)* [reinforce last bullet of OHT 34]

15.20 Break

15.40 Activity: Time Chairs *(OHT40)*

16.10 Input: The Participatory Classroom (5): Relational Modes of Knowing *(OHT 20,41,2,3,42,43,4)* [traditional teaching and learning built upon compartmentalism, its predominant messages, dualisms, web and billiard ball models, learning about a flower]

16.30 Input: The Participatory Classroom (6) Dissolving the Wall between Classroom and Community *(OHT20,4)* [school in community, community in school; school as metaphor; Petals of Blood, Ngugi wa Thiong’o in Earthkind, role of teacher, Daring to be a Teacher]

16.40 Plenary discussion

17.00 Close

**DAY THREE: SITUATING GLOBAL EDUCATION WITHIN THE COUNTRY: DISCUSSIONS, PROPOSALS AND PLANS**

**9.00-13.00 SESSION FIVE**

9.00 Input: UNICEF MENA Initiative *(OHT 44,45,46.47,48,49; H14,15)* [pros and cons of infusion integration, following MENA book p.14 et seq, and briefly revisit MENA Initiative – 1. process/schedule, 2. role of national core team, 3. evaluation process, 4 outcomes]
9.20 Jordan video (VHS)
9.45 Discussion
10.15 Break
10.35 Input: The UNICEF CARK Global Education Initiative
11.55 Home group discussion groups
12.25 Plenary
13.00 Close
14.00-17.00 SESSION SIX
14.00 Input: Implications for Teachers (OHT 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56)
14.20 Discussion
14.40 Planning Session [structure and process to be determined]
16.55 Final words (OHT 57, 58)
17.00 Close
ADDENDUM 3:

REPORT ON THE IIGE WORKSHOP IN KYRGYZSTAN
July 7-11, 2002

Prepared by John P. Myers
International Institute for Global Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
of the University of Toronto
jomyers@iose.utoronto.ca

Summary

The Kyrgyzstan workshop was the first national workshop in the Global Education in the UNICEF CARK Region project, following an initial workshop in Almaty, Kazakhstan. Professors David Selby and Linda Cameron facilitated the workshop with the assistance of John P. Myers and UNICEF staff. Professor Lee Bartel also attended the workshop in order to interview key actors in the project, as well as to observe the workshop procedures. Due to the pairing of the Kyrgyzstan workshop with the workshop in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, Professor Selby facilitated the first three days in Bishkek and then departed to commence the Uzbekistan national workshop. Professor Bartel left on July 10 for Tashkent.

I. The opening session was attended by numerous Kyrgyz and UNICEF officials, including the Minister of Education of Kyrgyzstan. Introductory speeches were made welcoming the IIGE team to Bishkek and to express a commitment to educational reform of the curriculum and of teaching and learning processes based on a Global Education philosophy and approach. Professor Selby explained basic concepts of global education and presented an overview of the Global Education in the UNICEF CARK Region initiative.

II. The five days of the IIGE’s official visit to Kyrgyzstan were structured as follows: the global education workshop lasted for three days, beginning in the afternoon of July 7 and concluding after a morning session on July 10. The remainder of July 10 and July 11 were employed to introduce the Global Education in the UNICEF CARK Region initiative to the Core Team members, to invite them to be a part of the CORE team, and to explain their role and its concomitant benefits and responsibilities. All of the participants who were invited to be part of the Core Team agreed to do so, and returned for the July 11 session.

III. The national workshop was attended by 34 educational leaders, which included educational specialists, Ministry personnel, teachers and principals from across Kyrgyzstan.

IV. There were four primary goals for the Kyrgyzstan national workshop: 1) to introduce the conceptual and curricular principles and aims of global education to Kyrgyz educational specialists, especially in the two areas of curricula subject content and teaching/learning processes; 2) to identify a Core Team that would be comprised of 16 attendees of the workshop; 3) to train the Core Team in applying global education concepts and principles to existing curricula and from which to create new
lessons; and, 4) to develop a plan of action for the upcoming months for the Core Team and the IIGE to work collaboratively on the writing of curriculum units.

V. The format of the workshop was a combination of short presentations on the conceptual principles of global education, pedagogical activities embodying these concepts, discussions on the participants’ reactions, understandings and observations on the activities, and group activity work that culminated in short presentations by the participants and open plenary sessions.

VI. In addition to the national workshop, there was a visit to a local school arranged by UNICEF staff, at which Professor Cameron made a presentation on global education for a group of teachers.

**Daily Report**

*7 July 2002*

- The IIGE team arrived at 8am. The day began at 12:30pm with a lunch meeting with the UNESCO officials coordinating the project, followed by the opening session with the Minister of Education and other officials.

- At 4pm, the global education workshop began with an introduction by Professor Selby, during which he outlined the general content and approach of the workshop, the participants’ right to withdraw, and presented an overview of the four dimensional model of global education. The first of these dimensions, the spatial, was also explained and illustrated in activities.

*8-9 July*

- The issues, temporal and inner dimensions of the global education model were introduced, in conjunction with global activities and discussion about the activities.

- The traditions of child-centredness and cooperative learning, based in documents such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child, were explained and critically examined. Additionally, principles of a participatory approach to classroom pedagogy were developed, which focused on synchronizing teaching and curricular content, manifestations of interdependence in the classroom, and balancing the creation and support of comfortability and challenge in the classroom environment.

*10 July*

- In the morning, Professor Cameron facilitated an in-depth session on issues of cooperative learning and teaching practices that support a participatory approach.

- In the afternoon, Professor Bartel outlined in greater detail the Global Education in the UNICEF CARK Region initiative to the Core Team members, including the timetable, procedures, and expected outcomes.
11 July

- The final day was particularly productive, as the Core Team and the facilitators had by this time a greater understanding of the global education approach introduced during the workshop, and were more comfortable and familiar with each other.

- A major outcome was the development of a standard lesson plan design that is adopted to the global education approach. Professor Cameron led a collaborative work session in which the existing global education template for lesson plans and the current Soviet-era lesson plan being used in Kyrgyzstan were examined, discussed and critiqued. The resulting lesson plan design form is expected to be used as the model for curriculum development in all of countries in the CARK project. This form is attached. 31 October 31 2002 was agreed upon by the facilitators and the Core Team as the date that the first lesson plans would be submitted to the consultants by the Core Team curriculum groups.

- The rest of the day was spent with the Core Team members being divided into their specialist curriculum areas, and then proceeding to work in the groups on the adaptation of an existing lesson plan to incorporate global education principles. First, existing Kyrgyzstan curriculum materials were examined and an appropriate lesson was selected by each group. The groups then worked on adapting the lesson or in some cases in creating a new lesson based on global education. The day ended with presentations to the entire team of each subject area’s lesson plan, which were critiqued and assessed by the facilitators.
ADDENDUM 4:

CARK UNICEF REPORT: THE UZBEKISTAN NATIONAL WORKSHOP FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION
Tashkent, Uzbekistan 10-14 July, 2002

Monday July 8, 2002

Two consultants, Neil Boland and Fumiyo Kagawa, traveled to Tashkent as per schedule.

Tuesday July 9, 2002

In the afternoon Neil and Fumiyo visited the UNICEF Uzbekistan office and met with Ms Brenda Vigo, UNICEF Uzbekistan Assistant Representative and Ms. Yulia Narolskaya, UNICEF Project Assistant. Neil and Fumiyo checked the transparencies and handouts for the workshops. Ms. Vigo asked the consultants to do an overview presentation on Global Education initiatives for Wednesday morning in case Professor Selby arrived late. After the meeting, Neil and Fumiyo checked the meeting rooms at the Intercontinental Hotel with the help of Yulia and prepared a Global Education overview presentation.

Wednesday July 10, 2002

Professor Selby arrived at 9 a.m. in Tashkent from Bishkek. Ms. Tatiana Aderkhina, UNICEF CARK Project Assistant, arrived in the afternoon.

This day consisted of opening remarks and Day One of the workshop program.

Opening remarks (Summary)

Ms Brenda Vigo (UNICEF Uzbekistan Assistant Representative)
Ms. Vigo said that both the Uzbekistan Government and UNICEF share strong concerns for children's rights for education, improvement of quality of learning, and achieving the goals of Education for All. The global priorities of UNICEF are: girls' education; early childhood development; deprivation of HIV/AIDS; protection of children from exploitation. Global Education initiatives could be practical tools to meet these educational needs.

Mr. Rustam Akhliddinov (Deputy Minister of Public Education)
Mr. Akhliddinov said that improving the quality of education and employing interactive teaching and learning methods, and respecting the Convention of Rights of the Child throughout education in Uzbekistan are important. UNICEF and Uzbekistan Government have been collaboratively working on activity development, pre-school education and interactive methods by offering trainings and conferences for teachers.

Professor David Selby
Dr. Selby said that educational reforms of the last 100 years have improved 'access' to and content of education but not necessarily 'quality' of education. The process of learning has often been a blind spot in curriculum reform. Global Education is a response to the failure of 'traditional' education to connect children to the real world. Global Education is a model for improving the quality of basic education. Its concepts are in line with those in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) and the World Declaration on Education for All (1990).
Some of the key characteristics of Global Education classroom are: teacher as a facilitator; the textbook as but one of many sources; child-friendly classrooms; a positive view of the child; interactive teaching and learning; enhancing life skills of children; infusing cross cultural themes. Dr. Selby then explained the model used in UNICEF Global Education curriculum and pedagogical renewal project in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Albania and Iran.

**Morning Session**

- **(Input) Introduction:** Workshop content and style were introduced. Active participation of all was encouraged but it was said that participants were also entitled to opt out. Brief overview of four-dimension model of global education was offered

- **(Activity) Globingo:** Participants asked questions of each other in order to fill rows of four squares horizontally, vertically or diagonally. Many participants noted that this was a good icebreaker, because it helped them to know each other. Everyone was engaged in this very lively first activity.

- **(Input) The Spatial Dimension 1:** Concepts of interconnectedness and interdependence were introduced. Because of a dynamic, multi-layered world system within which the local is in the global and the global in the local, the education process should foster an awareness and understanding of the interdependent nature of lands and peoples.

- **(Activity) Rights Balloon Game:** First participants individually read the list of rights and thought about which rights they were prepared to surrender and which rights they wanted to keep as long as possible. Then a group of four or five shared their own order. It is important to acknowledge each student has his/her own preference and perspective. Participants stressed that rights and responsibilities are two sides of a coin.

**Afternoon Session**

- **(Input) The Issues Dimension 1:** The concept of the interlocking nature of global issues was introduced. A compartmentalized worldview will not allow us to see such connections.

- **(Activity) Woolly Thinking:** After this activity many participants expressed their surprise at finding out the complex interconnectedness among issues such as the arms races, environmental pollution, unemployment, terrorism, human rights violations, malnutrition, and urbanization. They acknowledged that understanding of these issues and solutions requires an holistic approach.

- **(Input) The Issues Dimension 2:Interconnectedness of Issues/ Perspective:** As recent UN declarations emphasize, Global Education tries to bring different fields of education together. Only a broad focus allows us to see interconnectedness among issues. Students’ perspective on any issue is only one among many; therefore they need to be exposed to diverse and broader perspectives in order to make informed decisions and judgments.

- **(Activity) Two Mules:** Participants formed groups of six and each member of the group was given a different mule picture. They were asked to arrange the picture in sequence without showing their own pieces to others. In debriefing they expressed a positive experience in this collaborative problem solving process.

- **(Activity) Drawing upon the Future:** After individually drawing the images of the future, participants exchanged each other's vision of futures. This activity aimed at clarifying each participant's values position. Although there is no one right answer, justification of the story is necessary. Tensions between global future and personal future and green future and high tech future were expressed. Different interpretations of 'time span' and 'our' future (who are 'we'?) as well as gender difference were discussed.
Thursday July 11, 2002

Professor Lee Bartel arrived in the morning from Bishkek.

Day Two of the workshop portion of the programme continued with a series of activities and input sessions.

Morning Session

- **(Activity) People Search:** This activity is similar to *Globingo*, but it includes questions about feelings. Participants pointed out the importance of sharing feelings, because it allowed them to know each other more. Comments on implications of this activity in the classroom included the need for open sharing between teachers and students and paying attentions to students' feelings.

- **(Self Introduction)** Participants were asked to stand in a circle and introduce themselves by addressing, "who I am, why I am here, and one thing I like to do best in the world."

- **(Input) The Temporal Dimension 1:** Participants were introduced to the concept of possible, probable and preferred future. Traditional curriculums are heavily past or present oriented and lack the future perspective. Bringing future components in the classroom is one of the key components of Global Education.

- **(Activity) Future Time Lines:** Participants worked in pairs and drew individual, national, regional, or global probable future and preferred future. Then some presented their drawings. As an extension, for instance, teachers can use this activity at the beginning of the school year and thus focus student needs and help them to realize their preferred future.

- **(Input) The Temporal Dimension 2:** Bringing future oriented components into the curriculum is beneficial to students in many ways. For instance, it meets their real hopes and fears, allows imaginative work and creative thinking, helps clarify their values, and enhances skills and attitude necessary for effective participatory democracy.

Afternoon Session

- **(Activity) Going Dotty:** Participants formed a circle and closed theirs eyes. Facilitators stuck a colored dot on each participant's forehead. Then they opened their eyes and tried to form groups of the same-color dots without speaking. Participants shared feelings during the activity and thoughts on non-verbal communication. The importance of collaboration and interdependence in real life environments were referred to.

- **(Input) The Inner Dimension:** The outer journey is also the inner journey. Critical awareness of our own assumptions, attitudes, values and patterns of behaviour is necessary. Body, mind, and spiritual connections need to be recognized and utilized in learning. Learning should be for whole person development.

- **(Activity) Globetrotting:** Each participant had a label stuck on their back, on which names of cities in the CARK region were written. Without speaking they had to locate themselves at the appropriate position in the big regional map drawn on the floor.
Day Three of the workshop portion of the programme continued with a series of activities and input sessions:

Morning Session

- **(Input) The Participatory Classroom 1**: students were asked to consider the importance of harmonizing the medium and the message with regard to delivering content. Teaching about peace, for example, requires a peaceful process. Students must be active participants in the learning. Learning must employ democratic principles like cooperation, listening and empathy. Unless harmony exists between the medium and the message the best intentions of the teacher can be nullified.

- **(Activity) Co-Operative Squares**: In groups of five or six participants were required to assemble identically-sized squares from diverse shapes. This activity required participants to work co-operatively to achieve a goal. In plenary, participants noted that the activity required them to think beyond their own goals (assembling their own square) in order to achieve the group goal (all assembling squares).

- **(Input) The Participatory Classroom 2**: participants were asked to reflect on the importance of establishing classrooms where teachers and students strive towards co-operative learning rather than the traditional individualistic and competitive approach. Likewise, the benefits of co-operative learning (development of empathy, interdependence and self-esteem) were highlighted.

- **(Activity) Feeling Cards**: working in small groups participants shared feelings based on ‘feeling statements’ on cards. Participants reported that the activity required a significant level of comfort and trust within the group. Participants noted that the small group dynamic provided a sense of security that a large group may not. Many noted that the activity could be used as an excellent way to learn more about a student’s concerns and feelings.

- **(Input) The Participatory Classroom 3**: participants were introduced to the concept of classrooms of comfortability and convivialty. The global classroom is one where students are given the opportunity to develop a greater sense of self-esteem. Students with a good sense of self-esteem tend to take risks, are willing to oppose social injustice, and demonstrate a higher level of empathy towards fellow students. The development of a classroom of comfort, security and enjoyment is crucial to this process of self-esteem building.

- **(Activity) Circle Time**: to follow-up the discussion of comfortability participants were asked to stand in a circle. First, each participant described their feelings of the day using 'weather terms.' Then they turn to their left to ‘thank’ the person next to them for something they did or something they contributed to the workshop that day. Participants commented that this small act of recognition filled the room with a sense of warmth and made individuals feel good.

Afternoon Session

- **(Activity) Zoom!**: fun activity whereby participants stand in a circle and mimic car noises by passing the noise to the right or left of the circle.

- **(Input) Comfortability and Challenge**: participants were introduced to the concept of introducing challenge into the global classroom. Once a sense of comfort and security has been established, it is necessary to introduce content that will challenge the student’s ideas and beliefs. This period of challenge can create an environment of significant learning and reflection.
• **(Activity) Fruits of the Forest:** working in pairs, students were asked to consider their level of comfort concerning the use of forestry resources and products. Participants were required to place the forestry resource uses on a continuum ranging from ‘acceptable use’ to ‘unacceptable use’. Participants were encouraged to negotiate with each other. Individually, participants were required to indicate their individual position on the continuum by ‘drawing a line’ between acceptable and unacceptable uses. This activity demonstrated the importance and value of adding challenge into the comfortable atmosphere of the global classroom.

• **(Input) Classroom of Challenge:** participants were introduced to the idea of creating productive learning environments by developing within the classroom a delicate and tensile balance between comfortability and challenge. Participants were presented with a model of introducing challenge to students with the hope of stimulating a response followed by reflection and analysis. From this stage the hope is that students might act upon the information in a positive and participatory way. Important in this model is a return to the security and comfort of the classroom once the challenge has been fully investigated.

• **(Activity) Nine-dot Problem:** participants were required to solve a problem involving linking dots on a page with few pen strokes. The point of the exercise was to raise the level of difficulty (challenge). Throughout the activity continuing to challenge participants to find better solutions to the problem raised the level of challenge and difficulty and necessity for lateral and divergent thinking. Following the activity participants commented on the rising level of challenge within the room.

• **(Activity) Time Chairs:** returning to the temporal dimension, participants took part in an activity that allowed them to interview each other in the present, the past, and the future. Participants were required to ask the same series of questions during all three time-periods. Following the activity participants noted that discussing the future is a difficult task. Many commented that the traditional approach to teaching lacks any real or meaningful examination of the future. Students, many commented, are not provided with the opportunity to reflect upon the future.

David Selby then gave a presentation on the global education project. Then participants watched the Jordanian Ministry of Education Global Education Project video. Following that, participants were asked to meet in home groups and consider the material presented to them during this session and the previous two. Likewise, participants were asked to focus on the role of the teacher within the global classroom. Using chart paper and markers participants presented some of their observations, questions and concerns related to the material presented. The discussions indicated that participants were developing a good understanding of global education. The concern for many participants, however, was their ability to develop lessons and curriculum on their own. Many agreed that while global education is the required direction, implementation would be difficult.

To close the session on Day Three, we did an activity called Cooperative Gurning in which participant form a big circle and pass funny facial expressions to the person next to them. This activity carries implications for the change process.
Saturday July 13, 2002

Day Four: Conclusion of workshop; beginning of Core Team Work

Morning Session
In order to complete the workshop portion the morning of Day Four was used to complete two input sessions delivered by David Selby (Relational Modes of Knowing and Dissolving the Wall between Classroom and Community). Following these inputs some concluding comments and pieces.

During the morning of Day Four, final decisions were made regarding National Core team involvement. The decision making process for National Core Team selection involved input from David Selby, Lee Bartel, Neil Boland and Fumiyo Kagawa. Yulia Narolskaya (UNICEF) made the final decision and announcement. The list of National Core team members was read to all group members. The intention was that Core team members would remain for the rest of Saturday and Sunday to continue working. The decision to announce Core team membership caused some participants to question the decision-making process. Several participants demonstrated their desire to participate despite their name not being included. Participants not selected to Core Team positions were asked to write a report based on the workshop and to continue to actively contribute to the overall initiative.

Afternoon Session

National Core Team: Introduction of Initiative Goals

Lee Bartel welcomed members to the National Core Team. Members were given a detailed explanation of the role of the national core team and a review of the timeline and expectations of the CARK initiative. Team members were informed that membership of the core team represented a significant contribution of time and energy. Likewise, members were reminded of the opportunity that team membership presented in terms of their ability to implement and introduce global education into the national curriculum. Team members were informed of the relationship between the National Core team and the IIGE consultants. Team members were told that as the initiative progressed the Core Team would be responsible for more and more aspects of the project. IIGE involvement would diminish as the Core team assumed more responsibility. A timeline of future workshops, target curriculum dates was also discussed. Core Team members were informed that the initial focus in terms of curriculum development was for Grades 1 and 5.

To conclude Day Four participants were divided into subject specific groups: mathematics, social studies, science, language, music and art. Since it had been determined that curriculum in Uzbekistan schools was limited to textbooks, participants were asked to spend time reviewing specific content taught in grades 1 and 5 in their specialty subject. Using textbooks, members were asked to report back highlighting the areas of study within the subject and the grade. This exercise was required in order to allow the IIGE consultants an opportunity to, first, understand some of the content covered in the respective grades and subjects, and, second, begin to look for opportunities to infuse global education into the existing curriculum.
Day Four ended with several groups reporting back on the curriculum covered in the school. To conclude, members were asked to continue to investigate their subject content for grades 1 and 5 and to report some of their findings for the next day.

Sunday June 14, 2002

Day 5: National Core Team

The objective for day five was to assist team members in developing initial lesson plans based on their subject for grades one and five. Core team members broke into subject sub-groups and began to look for opportunities within their subject and grade levels to infuse global education. As groups worked, consultants met with individual sub-groups and clarified the task. Likewise, consultants highlighted opportunities for global education to be infused into specific areas of the curriculum. Core team members were given one hour to brainstorm ideas. After the hour, the core team met as a large group and presented ideas. After each presentation the consultants highlighted possible areas to pursue towards lesson planning. Core team members demonstrated a solid understanding of the participatory element of global education. Many, however, struggled somewhat with the inclusion of ‘values-added’ material within the curriculum. Some members demonstrated difficulty extending mathematics lessons, for example, beyond content and towards an examination of social or environmental concerns.

Following the sub-group (subject) presentations, team members were presented with the format for writing global education lesson plans. Following this presentation, team members were invited to return to their sub-groups and, using the global education lesson plan format, begin to create specific grade and subject level lessons based on the ideas presented during the brainstorming session. Members were given one and a half hours to write a lesson. During this work period consultants visited sub-groups and attempted to redirect or assist the process where necessary.

Following this work period team members reassembled and presented their initial lesson plans. Following each presentation core team members and consultants commented and offered critical analysis of the group’s progress. Likewise, UNICEF officials worked to translate lesson plans presented into English for further study following the presentations. The results of the initial lesson writing exercise proved quite positive.

Consultants and Core team members identified the lack of formal curriculum and the possibility of outdated textbooks as areas representing possible constraints to the project. The final day of Core teamwork revealed that most educators in the country format curriculum based on the content of national textbooks. As such, most educators seem to equate curriculum with textbook content. The creation of lessons independent of textbooks provides a significant challenge to the members of the Core team. Looking ahead, it is important to identify this as an area of constraint and perhaps considerable resistance in terms of creating and disseminating global education curriculum.

To conclude the workshop team members, with Yulia Norolskaya's direction, decided on a future date to reconvene. The consultants once again informed the core team of key upcoming dates. Likewise, the consultants gave a time frame of fifteen days to complete the initial lesson-writing component.
The workshop ended with a sense of tremendous enthusiasm. Participants and consultants exchanged gifts, hugs and good wishes. The IIGE Consultants and UNICEF officials left with a sense of real commitment from the Core team members. Core team members agreed that this initial workshop provided them with an excellent introduction to global education. Several participants commented that the style and delivery of the workshop allowed them to become comfortable with the information without being overwhelmed. Likewise, many welcomed the opportunity to begin to develop lessons and curriculum during the final two days of the workshop. All agreed that they looked forward to continuing the work.

Monday July 15, 2002

Consultants left for Toronto as per schedule.
ADDENDUM 5:

TAJIKISTAN NATIONAL GLOBAL EDUCATION WORKSHOP REPORT
By Hugh Brewster

INTRODUCTION

As outlined in David Selby’s *Global Education in the UNICEF CARK Region Proposal* (2002), the Tajikistan initiative took the form of a 3-day workshop for 42 participants, and a 2-day seminar for the 21 members we chose for the National Core Team. In addition, I was able to complete one field-visit to a school where several NCT members teach. This report is divided into the following sections:

1.1 Workshop Structural Strengths
1.2 Workshop Structural Challenges
1.3 Building Teacher Capacity
1.4 Strengthening Curriculum Cohesion
1.5 Teacher Professionalism
2.1 National Core Team Seminar Report
2.2 National Core Team Requests
2.3 Structural Challenges to Seminar
3.1 Report from Field-visit to Gymnasium #74, Dushanbe
3.2 Observations from Grade 7 History Class [taught in Tajik]
3.3 Comments from Senior Student Question & Answer Period
3.4 Notes on Teacher Question & Answer Period
3.5 Notes from Interview with Principal of Gymnasium #74

1.1 WORKSHOP STRUCTURAL STRENGTHS

The commitment of high-level officials in the Tajik government to educational reform was demonstrated from the deputy minister of education’s opening speech onward. Mr. Rachidov acknowledged the difficulties facing the Tajik educational system and affirmed the important role that new, progressive educational philosophies and praxis can play in the renewal of the country following the civil war. Tajikistan’s former minister of education discussed similar themes. She affirmed that the post-Independence period has witnessed a dangerous decline in both the number of children attending school, and the quality of their learning. Critiquing her country’s support of ‘pedagogics of violence’, the former minister commended Global Education’s emphasis on peace education and child-centred pedagogy. The speeches and active participation of governmental officials during the conference’s first morning showed both participants and consultants that the Global Education initiative was a governmental priority.

The translators’ commitment to the success of the workshops was also a significant advantage. As the seminar progressed it was obvious that their engagement in the project transcended professionalism. They expended incredible energy and focus on ensuring that effective dialogue could take place between participants and consultants. Their motivation had become intrinsic; they believe that the Global Education initiative will bear excellent fruit in their country. The heroic
efforts of a UNICEF staff person’s daughter in ensuring that all materials to be distributed to participants were ready and a very competent sound person also facilitated smooth sessions.

In a context where so much uncertainty still reigns, the daily provision of an ample lunch and regular coffee breaks enabled participants to focus on each session’s agenda. While the language barrier (and desire to give translators ‘time off’ as well) prevented consultants from fully participating in the community-building which the sharing of meals allows, we observed bonds of affinity between participants growing. Evidence of this included frequent bouts of good-natured laughter shared by all, the willingness of many participants to share openly about personal/professional struggles and active engagement in activities where one has to ‘risk’ looking somewhat foolish. This unity will be especially important as the National Core Team (NCT) prepares activities plans, and ultimately collaborates in preparing Global Education training workshops of their own.

1.2 WORKSHOP STRUCTURAL CHALLENGES

Nature’s caprice provided the first structural challenge to the workshop. A freak snowstorm the week prior to the conference left much of the country without power and closed most rural roads. While the weather changed for the better, eight (of forty) participants missed a significant portion of the first day’s training due to transportation difficulties. Dushanbe’s unstable infrastructure meant that each day approximately five participants would arrive significantly late. The schedule of the workshop also had to be adjusted as many participants had enormous challenges getting public transportation home once darkness fell. While not affecting the conference directly, widespread power blackouts throughout the week meant that many participants were expending significantly more energy at home trying to prepare meals for their families.

UNICEF’s selection of participants also posed initial difficulties. Despite our request to have younger classroom teachers make up the bulk of attendees, the number of participants in this category was dwarfed by the number of administrators, officials and representatives from NGOs. While the fact that principals in Tajikistan still teach in the classroom made this disparity less striking, some educators closer to the end of their careers seem to find the paradigm shift required by Global Education to be difficult. During the first two days especially, some of these men would tend toward using feedback and debriefing time to ‘soapbox’.

While the engagement of the translators was exemplary, the lack of cordless equipment for the facilitators meant that where some feedback sessions would have been most conducive to simultaneous translation we were forced to rely on the time-consuming practise of consecutive translation. The language of translation itself was also an issue. While all participants seemed to understand Russian, a few participants only communicated in Tajik. When our Tajik translator was present, this need could be accommodated. The fact that several participants did not understand Tajik meant that the input of these Tajik-speaking men was only conveyed to the non-Tajik speakers with difficulty.

The impact of the final structural challenge may be more acutely experienced now that the workshop is over. Our UNICEF representative and problem-solver was highly skilled, motivated, and committed to the success of the workshop - and to the positive experience of the consultants. The demands of her position at UNICEF however, meant that she was only able to attend workshop
sessions infrequently. It is unfortunate that a representative of UNICEF was not able to have her
duties cleared for the week that she might devote all her energies to the task at hand. Now that the
consultants are back in Toronto, she is the only person to have both a ‘big picture’ understanding of
the potential role of Global Education in Tajikistan, as well as having begun to develop a personal
relationship with the NCT members. Her ability now to problem-solve and give guidance may be
hampered by the fact that she was unable to attend many of the week’s sessions.

1.3 BUILDING TEACHER CAPACITY

As the draft CARK proposal makes clear, one of the twin objectives of the Global Education
initiative is to build the capacity of teachers to become “facilitative, flexible and reflective
practitioners” [Selby, 2002, 1.3]. Much progress and growth was observed in these areas over the
week. A few of the older men appeared reluctant to both engage in some of the more ‘creative’
activities and to join groups with people they did not previously know. Yet by the third day several
of these men were heard to comment on the tremendous impact that the sessions were having on
their conception of education.

These few men aside, participants were very eager to invest in all activities. The activities which
seemed to have the most resonance involved thinking about preferable/probable futures,
exclusion/inclusion and participatory classrooms. Debriefing sessions were, at times, tinged with
emotion as reflections on the impact of Tajikistan’s transition to independence and civil war were
shared. Activities rooted in the ‘inner dimension’ and aimed at community-building and validating
individuals’ experiences and opinions, were also received enthusiastically. Participants took
initiative in sharing with their colleagues ideas of how these activities could be applied during
debrief sessions. Specific Global Education facilitative tools were also identified by participants as
highly relevant to Tajik classrooms. These included the use of brainstorming, sharing-circles,
tableaux, and allowing learners to form small task/reflection groups and giving them space to teach
their peers.

1.4 STRENGTHENING CURRICULUM COHESION

The need for the educational system to address the challenges of peace-education, healthy life-skills,
human rights education and environmental education were voiced by various participants on
numerous occasions. Tajik school-aged children during the past decade were referred to as
potentially becoming a ‘lost generation’ because of post-independence struggles and the armed
conflict. Consensus also emerged concerning the paucity of ‘spiritual values’ in the present
educational system, including kindness, mindfulness and hope.

It is unclear whether any of these areas are explicitly addressed within present Ministry of Education
documentation. Indeed the notion of ‘curriculum’ itself [when translated into Russian] was not one
familiar to most of the educators assembled. The two main pedagogical guides with which teachers
were familiar were the list of curricular foci, in terms of hours per subject per week (mandated by
the Ministry) and the topic groupings contained in most textbooks.

Participants passionately affirmed the central Global Education concept of ‘interconnections’ on
both a global and school community-based level. Yet ideas on how these interdependencies could be
addressed within the present school system must still be considered nascent. Participants expressed their strong subject-based identification, and some exhibited resistance to the notion that their primary task is to teach children, not to teach particular subjects. Further opportunities to explore how the four dimensions of Global Education can be applied in a comprehensive, rather than component by component level may also be required.

1.5 TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

Some workshop participants had recently received ‘in-service’ training from organisations such as the Open Society Institute or Aga Khan, yet it was generally affirmed that most Tajik teachers had not received ‘in-service’ training since Independence. Participants were very receptive to both the ‘new’ ideas which the sessions proposed, as well as the chance to reflect, discuss and apply their learning within small groups. The ‘luxury’ of having space to do so was brought to the fore when the fact that most teachers have not had the resources to buy newspapers, let alone stimulating books was discussed.

Input sessions facilitated by IIGE professors seemed to remind teachers, amidst situations which are still very challenging, of the hope and promise which drew many of them to teaching in the first place. Frank discussion of the difficulties teachers find in coping with the economic hardships of the present situation, as well as the continued fall-out from the civil war, were pivotal in building a sense of colleagueship amongst participants. The avowal of consultants that they were not advocating pedagogical imperialism, but rather relying on the agency, skills and gifts of Tajik educators in creating activities also affirmed the professionalism of the NCT.

2.1 NATIONAL CORE TEAM SEMINAR REPORT

It must be avowed that not all of the outcomes for the NCT seminar outlined in the section 3.1 of the proposal were achieved during this visit. The participants lack of experience with the concepts of ‘curriculum’, activity plans, and unit writing necessitated spending much more time than had been anticipated in these areas. NCT members were divided into broad subject areas of:

- Humanities (language arts)
- Mathematics
- Science & Technology (life-sciences)
- Arts (visual arts, physical education, music)
- Social Studies (history, geography)

Within these groupings, a sub-grouping dyad for grade 1 and grade 5 was also established. Near the end of the final day, consensus emerged that science could not be construed to be generally taught at the grade 1 level at all- thus this group decided to focus exclusively on grade 5.

Participants had some experience in applying the Activity Plan Guide requirements to an activity they had corporately experienced during the week. The exigencies of activity plan writing are quite specific, and while participants found the Guide helpful, the succinctness required of an effective plan took much practise and reinforcement to be grasped. Participants also worked collaboratively on developing ideas for unit plans which demonstrated aspects of the Four Dimensions of Global
Education. These plans demonstrated much creativity and child-centeredness within specific subject areas. The resonances of many Global Education processes as well as philosophic emphases were evident in their work. The task of ‘chunking’ these ideas into individual or linked activities was challenging.

An initial deadline of January 15th was established to have each subgroup’s first activity plans submitted to UNICEF Dushanbe. The participants are aware of IIGE’s commitment to have a maximum 10 working day ‘turn-around’ for comments and encouragement from IIGE members once their plans have been translated and received. In consultation with UNICEF, consultants chose a Tajik speaking team co-ordinator who lives in the Dushanbe area. He will liaise between the group and UNICEF as well as speaking on behalf of the NCT to the IIGE.

2.2 NATIONAL CORE TEAM REQUESTS

Topping the list of requests by NCT members was for further workshops to be scheduled for the near future. They feel they need more training and one-on-one feedback before they will be equipped to address the needs of the whole Tajik curriculum -or help facilitate workshops for their colleagues. A desire to have a more sustained IIGE presence in Tajikistan was also expressed (thankfully the idea of requesting that the government reject my departure visa so that I might lead more workshops was dismissed...). Members enthusiastically proposed having a IIGE consultant stay in Dushanbe for a two-month period. Another request of the NCT was to have the opportunity to meet and collaborate with other CARK NCTs. Participants were assured that while many details concerning the future shape of the Global Education initiative in Tajikistan were still being shaped, their input would be accorded high consideration.

2.3 STRUCTURAL CHALLENGES TO THE SEMINAR

While intended outcomes of the CARK draft proposal have not yet been satisfactorily achieved, both participants and consultants left the week feeling very encouraged by the growth and learning that had been initiated. Even an additional two days’ worth of seminar time with the NCT would have been very productively used. A time-consuming challenge within the set structure was that UNICEF was not yet prepared to firmly offer space or even a computer for the use of the NCT following the workshop. The fact that these sort of negotiations were ongoing during the last few hours of the workshop was a distraction to the overall focus of the group.

The geographic distribution of NCT members means that some working groups had to be adjusted to allow for collaboration without incurring onerous transportation costs. Had a plan for this eventuality been discussed prior to the last day of the workshop, additional time could have been accorded to activity-plan learning.

Finally, it was unfortunate that only one consultant was available to conduct the bulk of the final day’s seminar. While much corporate discussion concerning Activity Plans and the Activity Plan Guide was engaged, participants [rightly] desired one-to-one interaction. Where time for this was available, much progress was made. More progress in preparing the NCT to write their own activities had more consultants been available to work alongside individual groups on the final day of the conference.
NOTES FROM FIELD-VISITATION TO GYMNASIUM #74, DUSHANBE

3.2 OBSERVATIONS FROM GRADE 7 HISTORY CLASS [taught in Tajik]

The 29 students, wearing ‘dress’ clothes, are bunched around 3 tables. Posters of great Russian men adorn the walls along with a pictorial collages of topics such as My Favourite City (Dushanbe), Literature and Art. A large banner hangs at the front of the class which reads (in Russian) Don’t like books, love them. They will teach you treat yourself and others with respect. Many plants sit on the bookshelves at the back of the class.

The pace and energy in the classroom is dizzying. The teacher [one of our NCT members] uses a loud voice (which we did not hear during the workshops) to address the class and paces the front of the room. First activity is a rapid-fire review of topics from the last class. Students whisper excitedly to one another as they try to remember the answer to each question and many hands are always straining to be called upon. Once acknowledged, students stand behind their desk and say the answer in a loud voice.

Next, the teacher asks for volunteers to write vocabulary words or new concepts they encountered in their homework reading on a large sheet of paper taped to the blackboard. A student assured me that this was the routine following classroom reading assignments. Once the list was compiled, individual students were asked to orally explain what they had learned about the term they had written on the sheet. Students must be resourceful to complete this assignment as few have access to dictionaries at home. All students in this class, however, have their own textbook [Narochinsky, A. World History 1640-1870. pub. 1987, translated into Tajik in 1989, ISBN: 5-670-00095-1]

The teacher then orally adds further clarification to the answers students have given. After a brief review of France’s position on the map, the new homework assignment is written on the blackboard. Using pages 69-75 of the textbook, students are asked to write a paragraph answering the question: What is the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie?

Before dismissing the class, the teacher announces that table 2 were the ‘winners’ of this day’s class, which is greeted by cheers by the students in the group. The instructor reminds table 1 and table 3 that they had previously been winners as well and encourages them to work hard in future classes.

Overall, the students were highly engaged in the lesson, were permitted to work collaboratively on in-class assignments and encouraged to write on the board themselves. Oral learners were privileged in this lesson, as little visual reinforcement was given to the material covered [use of the map aside]. The textbook seemed to be the primary source of knowledge valued in this lesson. Students were never given more than 2 seconds of ‘think time’ before being called on to answer questions, and no in-class questions seemed to address higher-order inquiry skills. No time was given in this lesson for students to explore contemporary (inter)connections of the issues involved in the French Revolution.

3.3 COMMENTS FROM SENIOR STUDENT QUESTION & ANSWER PERIOD

Students sat in a U-shape in front of the teacher’s desk, where I was seated in front of a miniature Canadian flag which they had made in my honour. Many of the 25 students were very eager to
demonstrate their considerable English skills, about a third of the students were reluctant to ask questions in English.

Students identified the following strengths of Gymnasium #74:
· excellent, caring, exigent principal
· good teachers in math and English
· high standards of academic success

Students discussed the following skills which students need to be successful at their school:
· good behaviour
· hard work, no laziness
· getting help from caring teachers

When asked what makes a class interesting?, students responded:
· when they are allowed to give their opinions
· when they are allowed to converse with peers
· when the teacher uses games which turn on students’ opinions
· when the material covered isn’t just from the textbook
· when the teacher doesn’t just ask questions all period
· when students are well-prepared for class, the class is generally more fun
· when they are allowed to explore interesting facts about English-speaking countries

3.4 NOTES FROM TEACHER QUESTION & ANSWER PERIOD

The 12 staff members present agreed that their school was probably the best in the city. They largely attribute this success to the leadership and recruiting of their principal. Other factors in their enthusiasm about their workplace include the emphasis on sharing of resources, on encouraging one another to be more creative and on the principals’ support of teachers attending every ‘in-service’ opportunity available. The fact that students must complete entrance exams to enrol and the provision of textbooks for every student also helps teachers’ ability to teach well. Several of their students have recently received scholarships for learning opportunities through an American organisation (American Councils?). Several staff members have earned awards for the school such as a new printer through competitions sponsored by Soros.

Many schools have been crippled by teachers’ leaving the profession because of poor pay, and #74 has not been untouched by this phenomenon. Out of a current staff of 95, only 10 male teachers remain. The parent-teacher association has been able to supplement teachers’ salaries through what is called “pity pay” - this money is also used for infrastructure needs as they arise. Despite the widespread knowledge of #74's higher pay, the school is still suffering from a teacher shortage - causing most teachers to teach over 40 forty-five minute lessons a week.

When asked how the educational system can best address the present needs of Tajik students, teachers pointed to the pressing need for ‘peace-education’. Citing the paucity of ‘spiritual values’ which students currently demonstrate, teachers assert that schools must focus on teaching children to be kind. Time must also be accorded to helping students distinguish between war and peace.
Reform in Tajik schools, these teachers asserted, must begin with principals. Supportive, visionary principals (which they believe that they have) foster creative, professional teachers. The lack of textbooks in most schools is also a pressing need. “In-service” training was found to be generally unhelpful during the last decade of the Soviet period (trips to Moscow aside), but many of these teachers have had positive recent experience in ‘in-service’ training through international organisations. Finally, they assert that parent-teacher relationships in many communities are quite strained. They believe that the support of parents is essential to school success.

3.5 BRIEF INTERVIEW WITH MS ELENA RUZIEVA, PRINCIPAL GYMNASIUM #74

Ms Ruzieva believes that following reforms would allow her to teach children more effectively:

· More independence from bureaucracy: there are presently three supervisory levels to which she is accountable. Each level makes demands of her time and challenges efforts at innovation.

· More training for teachers. Her teachers require regular ‘in-service’ training. She is very enthusiastic about the methods and philosophy which Global Education espouses.

· More contemporary materials: Budgets are very tight and new textbooks are hard to come by.

Ms. Ruzieva mentioned the interactivity in the History class that I observed as a model for her teachers. She believes that ‘play’ must have a central role in children’s learning, and for that reason appreciates Global Education activities. She also mentioned that while the culture of her school is one that encourages students to participate, this sort of culture is not widespread in Tajikistan. In particular, she singled out Northern communities as ones where students are taught never to disagree with the teacher and that it is impolite even to raise one’s hand in class.
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Day by day report

Tuesday, December 10, 2002
Jim Christopher arrived in Almaty on the 9th of December from England and David Selby and Fumiyo Kagawa arrived in Almaty from Tajikistan on the 10th of December. Consultants had a dinner meeting with Ms Nurper Ulkuer UNICEF Area Officer for Child Development/ Education and Ms. Tatiana Aderkhina, UNICEF Project Assistant and translators in the evening.

Wednesday, December 11, 2002
This day consisted of opening remarks and Day One of the workshop program.

Opening remarks (Summary)
Ms. Nurper Ulkuer, UNICEF Area Officer for Child Development/ Education
Ms. Ulkuer explained the reason why there were a small number of participants (18 participants at the opening). It was because many conferences took place in Kazakhstan at the same time. She said that elements of Global Education-- promoting a child friendly school and gender equity, bringing global issues into classroom, and developing communication skills and problem solving skills-- are crucial in the Central Asian countries, where massive socio-political changes have been taking place.

Professor David Selby
Dr. Selby said that educational reforms of the last 100 years have improved 'access' to and 'content' of education but not necessarily the 'process' of learning. The process of learning has often been a blind spot in curriculum reform. Global Education is a response to the failure of 'traditional' education to connect children to the real world. Global Education offers a model for improving the quality of basic education. Its concepts are in line with those in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) and the World Declaration on Education for All (1990). Some of the key characteristics of Global Education classroom are: teacher as a facilitator; the textbook as but one of many sources; child-friendly classrooms; a positive view of the child; interactive teaching and learning; leaning style diversity; enhancing the life skills of children; infusing cross cultural themes. Dr. Selby then explained the model of CARK UNICEF Global Education project.
A question and answer session followed the presentation. The questions raised included roles and selection of National Core Team members; selection of pilot schools; the degree of government involvement in this project.
Morning Session

*(Input) Introduction:* Workshop content and style were introduced. Active participation of all was encouraged but it was advised that participants were also entitled to opt out. Brief overview of four-dimensional model of global education was offered

*(Activity) Globingo:* Participants asked questions of each other in order to fill rows of four squares horizontally, vertically or diagonally. Everyone was engaged in this very lively first activity. Many participants noted that this was a good icebreaker, which is both interactive and stimulus. This activity is also a good example for participants to experience the congruence between medium and message.

*(Input) The Spatial Dimension 1:* Concepts of interconnectedness and interdependence were introduced. Because of a dynamic, multi-layered world system within which the local is in the global and the global in the local, the education process should foster an awareness and understanding of the interdependent nature of lands and peoples.

*(Activity) Rights Balloon Game:* First participants individually read the list of rights and thought about which rights they were prepared to surrender and which rights they wanted to keep as long as possible. Then a group of four or five shared their respective orderings. It is important to acknowledge each student has his/her own preference and perspective. The importance of moving away from a right/wrong answer was emphasized.

Afternoon Session

*(Input) The Issues Dimension 1:* The concept of the interlocking nature of global issues and was introduced. A compartmentalized worldview will not allow us to see such connections.

*(Activity) Woolly Thinking:* After this activity many participants expressed their surprise and excitement at finding out the complex interconnectedness among issues such as the arms races, environmental pollution, unemployment, terrorism, human rights violations, malnutrition, and urbanization. They acknowledged that understanding of such interconnections is necessary for students. Several examples of applying this model into, for instance, language, religion, social study lessons were well explained by the facilitator.

*(Input) The Issues Dimension 2: Interconnectedness of Issues/ Perspective:* As recent UN declarations and conventions emphasize, Global Education tries to bring different fields of education together. Global Education attempts to bring them into curriculum. Only a broad focus allows us to see interconnectedness among issues. Students' perspective on any issue is only one among many; therefore they need to be exposed to diverse and broader perspectives in order to be challenged and make informed decisions and judgments.

*(Activity) Two Mules:* Participants formed groups of six and each member of the group was given a different mule picture. They were asked to arrange the picture in sequence without showing their own pieces to others. In debriefing they expressed a positive experience in this collaborative problem solving process.

In the evening David Selby, Jim Christophers and Fumiyo Kagawa had a meeting with Ms. Ulkuer at UNICEF CARK office. Schedule and issues around the project were discussed.

**Thursday, December 12, 2002**

**Day Two** of the workshop portion of the programme continued with a series of activities and input sessions.
**Morning Session**

*(Activity) Drawing upon the Future*: After individually drawing the images of the future, participants exchanged each other's vision of futures. This activity aimed at clarifying each participant's values position. Although there is no one right answer, justification of their views expressed in their drawings is necessary. Participants were fascinated by expressing and sharing own views on future. The facilitator pointed out that school curricula do not have opportunities for developing futures thinking, but argued that future should be included. Some also pointed out that drawing was a very good tool for self-expression.

*(Input) The Temporal Dimension 1*: Participants were introduced to the concept of possible, probable and preferred future. Traditional curriculums are heavily past or present oriented and lack the future perspective. Bringing future components into the classroom is one of the key components of Global Education.

*(Activity) Future Time Lines*: Participants individually drew either individual, national, regional, or global probable future and preferred future. Then participants put their drawings on the wall and visited their pair’s drawings. As an extension, for instance, teachers can use this activity at the beginning of the school year and thus understand student needs and help them to realize their preferred future.

*(Input) The Temporal Dimension 2*: Bringing future oriented components into the curriculum is beneficial to students in many ways. For instance, it meets their real hopes and fears, allows imaginative work and creative thinking, helps clarify their values, and enhances skills and attitude necessary for effective participatory democracy. Future education is education for democracy.

**Afternoon Session**

*(Activity) People Search*: This activity is similar to Globingo, but it includes questions about feelings. Participants pointed out the importance of sharing feelings, because it allowed them to know each other better.

*(Activity) Going Dotty*: Participants formed a circle and closed theirs eyes. Facilitators stuck a colored dot on each participant's forehead. Then they opened their eyes and tried to form groups of the same-color dots without speaking. Participants shared feelings during the activity and thoughts on non-verbal communication. The importance of collaboration and interdependence in real life environments, such as discrimination and dual identities of immigrants, were referred to.

*(Activity) Globetrotting*: Each participant had a label stuck on their back, on which the name of a city in the CARK region was written. Without speaking they had to locate themselves in the appropriate position in the big regional map taped on the floor. Then the participants were asked to dramatize different geographical elements by body movement. Similar to Going Dotty, this activity requires collaboration among participants to accomplish the task.

*(Input) The Inner Dimension*: The outer journey is also the inner journey. Critical awareness of our own assumptions, attitudes, values and patterns of behaviour is necessary. Body, mind, and spiritual connections need to be recognized and utilized in learning. Learning should be for whole person development.

*(Input) The Participatory Classroom 1*: Students were asked to consider the importance of harmonizing the medium and the message with regard to delivering content. Teaching about peace, for example, requires a peaceful process. Students must be active participants in the learning. Learning must employ democratic principles like cooperation, listening and empathy. Unless harmony exists between the medium and the message the best intentions of the teacher can be nullified.

*(Activity) Co-Operative Squares*: In groups of five participants were required to assemble identically-sixed squares from diverse shapes. This activity required participants to work co-operatively to achieve
a goal. In plenary, participants noted that the activity required them to think beyond their own goals in order to achieve the group goal.

(Input) The Participatory Classroom 2: Participants were asked to reflect on the importance establishing classrooms where teachers and students strive towards co-operative learning rather than the traditional individualistic and competitive approach. Likewise, the benefits of co-operative learning (development of empathy, interdependence and self-esteem) were highlighted.

(Activity) Feeling Cards: Working in small groups participants shared feelings based on ‘feeling statements’ on cards. In plenary, participants made positive comments on this activity. Many noted that the activity could be used as an excellent way to learn more about a student’s as well as parents’ and teachers’ concerns and feelings. This activity required a significant level of comfort and trust within the group.

(Input) The Participatory Classroom 3: Participants were introduced to the concept of classrooms of comfortability and conviviality. The global classroom is one where students are given the opportunity to develop a greater sense of self-esteem. Students with a good sense of self-esteem tend to take risks, are willing to oppose social injustice, and demonstrate a higher level of empathy towards fellow students. The development of a classroom of comfort, security and enjoyment is crucial to this process of self-esteem building.

(Activity) Circle Time: Participants were asked to stand in a circle and each was asked to describe briefly their feelings of the day using 'weather metaphors.' Participants seemed to misunderstand the instruction of this activity since most of them described the real weather of the day.

Friday December 13, 2002

Day Three of the workshop portion of the programme continued with a series of activities and input sessions:

Morning Session

(Activity) Zoom!: Fun activity whereby participants stand in a circle and mimic car noises by passing the noise to the right or left of the circle. It enhanced the warm atmosphere of the group.

(Input) Comfortability and Challenge: Participants were introduced to the concept of introducing challenge into the classroom. Once a sense of comfort and security has been established, it is necessary to introduce content that will challenge the students’ ideas and beliefs. This period of challenge can create an environment of significant learning and reflection.

(Activity) Fruits of the Forest: Working in pairs, students were asked to consider their level of comfort concerning the use of forestry resources and products. Participants were required to place the forestry resource uses on a continuum ranging from ‘acceptable use’ to ‘unacceptable use’. Participants were encouraged to negotiate with each other. Individually, participants were required to indicate their individual position on the continuum by ‘drawing a line’ between acceptable and unacceptable uses. This activity demonstrated the importance and value of adding challenge into the comfortable atmosphere of the global classroom.

(Activity) Picture Linking: Each group was given a set of pictures and asked to choose pictures which they think are linked. Then they discussed the best sequence. All groups expressed holistic link among themes in the pictures. Debriefing focused on the skills used during the activity. Skills such as negation, active listening, value clarification, interpretations were pointed out.

(Input) Classroom of Challenge: Participants were introduced to the idea of creating productive learning environments by developing within the classroom a delicate and tensile balance between comfortability
and challenge. Participants were presented with a model of introducing challenge to students with the hope of stimulating a response followed by reflection and analysis. From this stage the hope is that students might act upon the information in a positive and participatory way. Important in this model is a return to the security and comfort of the classroom once the challenge has been fully investigated.

(Activity) Nine-dot Problem: participants were required to solve a problem involving linking dots on a page with few pen strokes. The point of the exercise was to raise the level of difficulty (challenge). Throughout the activity, continuing to challenge participants to find better solutions to the problem raised the level of challenge and difficulty and necessity for lateral and divergent thinking. This activity showed participants that we need paradigm change to break limitations in our thinking, which we may take for granted.

In this morning several personnel from World Bank came in order to observe the workshop. A brief meeting was held during a coffee break. They questioned about selection of the participants, situation of government involvement in each country, learning objectives in the five-day workshops, evaluation of previous Global Education project, sustainability of the project.

Afternoon session
(Activity) Trust Fall: Participants stands in circles of seven and one person in the centre of the circle allows herself to fall backwards, forwards, or sideways. Whichever she falls, the people nearest to her push her gently in to on upright position again. This is a trust building activity. Participants spoke of the usefulness of this activity at school to develop trust among students.
(Activity) Time Chairs: Participants took part in an activity that allowed them to interview each other in the present, the past, and the future. Participants were required to ask the same series of questions, either global or personal, during all three time-periods. Following the activity, participants noted that the traditional approach to teaching lacks any real or meaningful examination of the future. Participants said that they experienced how past, present and future are interlocking.
(Activity) Guided Fantasy: Participants were asked to sit comfortably or to lie down with their eyes closed and explore the images guided by the story by a facilitator. Participants expressed how powerful this experience became and how important this experience will be in classroom.

(Input) The Participatory Classroom 5: Relational Modes of Knowing Opposing to predominant dualism in western thought, Global Education values a whole-brain approach, thinking holistically. It helps to build empathy and deeper understanding of both commonality and difference.
(Input) The participatory Classroom 6: Dissolving the Wall between Classroom and Community. What Global Education promotes is that learning should happen everywhere. Students need to reach our community and people in the community need to come to school. In the future school should be a metaphor: school in community and community in school.

Saturday December 14, 2002
Day Four: National Core Team Work
All participants are invited to join NCT because of the small number of participants in the workshop. All decided to join.

Morning Session
Details of pro and cons of two models of Global Education, Infusion and Integration were explained.
Fumiyo Kagawa left for Ashgabat at 11am.

**Afternoon Session**
Participants were informed of the strategy used for MENA initiatives, including role of National Core Team and field testing. Participants watched the Jordanian Ministry of Education Global Education Project video.

**Sunday December 15, 2002**
**Day 5: National Core Team Work**

**Morning Session**
All day National Core Team members practised activity writing. David Selby left at about 11:15 am for Ashgabad. Prior to his departure he had introduced the first activity (see details below) and discussed and agreed the schedule for the development of the programme. NCT has decided to send activities every 10th of the month from February to consultants.

**ACTIVITY 1**
Future Time Lines was selected as the focus of this activity which was attempted by three groups. Initially there was some confusion, with two groups actually undertaking a Future Time Lines activity rather than writing one. This supported some valuable group interaction in respect of the role and value of ‘uncertainty’ within activities. Feedback, as always with this group, was detailed with much discussion. The major issue was a tendency to be over-prescriptive in the instructions given to teachers and there was good discussion about the differences between instructing and informing. All three outcomes revealed a real willingness to innovate.

After David’s departure, Jim Christopher, Nurper Ulkuer and Aigul met with the group to discuss issues, in particular:

**Constructing groups.** There were not enough participants to create 5 groups and the nature of the professional interests of the participants was such that there was no clear alignment along subject lines. The quality of the work undertaken by the three extant groups was acknowledged and it was proposed that these groupings should be retained. There was discussion; especially about communication strategies and the potential for meetings within geographically dispersed groups. No firm resolution was achieved.

**Appointment of a coordinator.** There was much discussion about the nature of the role and the qualities of a good coordinator. It was acknowledged that the coordinator should be a facilitator rather than a leader and that an important dimension of the role would be to represent the core team, especially in discussions with the Ministry, UNICEF and IIGE, and to act as a conduit for communication with the core team. There was a strong groundswell of support for the appointment of Natalya Bakhmutova and she graciously accepted the position. It was agreed that Natalya Bakhmutova, Nurper Ulkuer, Aigul and Jim Christophers would meet at the UNICEF offices on the 18th of December at 10am.

**Schedule.** It was recognised that interim arrangements would need to be put in place for this small group. This group should not be expected to produce the number of activities required from larger national core teams and it would be unable to span the 5 subject areas. It was agreed to identify 3 sub-groups and to remove the subject requirement so that generic activities could be produced and submitted to the database.
The remainder of the workshop. Some participants were expecting an early conclusion to the final day. It was agreed that those who could stay would spend a further night in the hotel so that maximum use could be made of the whole day. It was agreed that we should focus on activities 1 and 2 and not attempt activity 3.

ACTIVITY 2
‘An Environmental Issue’ was selected as the focus for this activity which was attempted by two groups (some participants had already departed).

The activity commenced at about 4:15pm with interim feedback at about 5pm. Both ‘charts’ were at an early stage of completion at this stage (especially in one case) but there was a good and dynamic discussion of issues, especially in respect of the language to be used when writing the procedures, the relationship between ‘procedures’ and ‘extension’ and the presentation of ‘goals’ and ‘objectives’.

Work then continued until about 7:15 pm and one of the groups reconvened after dinner and worked late into the night to complete the activity.

Monday December 16, 2002
Extra Day: National Core Team Work
The full group met at 9am to debrief activity 2. The workshop closed at about 11am.

Charts were displayed on the wall and visited by the other group. An activity was constructed by Jim Christophers inviting each group to consider the work of the other group and to identify:
  • 3 very strong features of the activity;
  • 3 recommendations that would enhance the quality of the activity;
  • 3 modifications they would make to their activity having had the opportunity to consider the work of the other group;
  • 3 questions they would like to pose to the authoring group.

Follow-up and feedback took place as follows:
Each group returned to their chart and made the modifications they had identified for themselves. Tasks 1, 2 and 4 were undertaken in sequence and in turn, moving from one chart to the other each time (this physical movement is an important aspect of the activity). Participants were discouraged from defending their work, rather it was expected that they should receive the feedback and only ask questions for clarification – not an easy brief for this group.
Groups were given time to modify the description of their activity in the light of points raised in the feedback.
Both groups came together to debrief the experience and to discuss the next steps.

Two activities will be submitted for approval. There was much interest in ‘field testing’ their own activity. Level of prescription and use of instructional language remained as difficulties although much progress was made.
Summary/ Recommendations

The number of the participants in Kazakhstan workshop was very small, but they showed strong interests and all were eager to learn about theory and practice of Global Education. The workshop finished with feeling of success on the part of both facilitators and participants.

All participants were invited to be in the National Core Team and they agreed. It will be necessary to recruit more members in the NCT, especially school teachers.

There was no involvement of Ministry of Education in the workshop (although they were informed of this workshop and there were some attempts to invite them and visit them). For the further development and implementation of the project, the dialogue and collaboration with the Ministry will be crucial. This was also the concern raised by the participants. They expressed the need of recognition or approval from ministry to be involved in any new initiative.

Because of several educational initiatives which have been already taking place in Kazakhstan (Step by Step, Spiritual Education, Ministry of Education’s interest in development in higher education), the Kazakh project is better to be focused on certain regions of the country (Southern region/poor area, where the quality of school is low). This has to be discussed further with NCT and UNICEF. The proposal has the merit of fitting in with 2003 being identified as the Kazakh Year of the Village.
ADDENDUM 7:

CARK UNICEF TRIP REPORT: THE TURKMENISTAN NATIONAL WORKSHOP:
ASHGABAD, TURKMENISTAN
16-20 DECEMBER 2002

Day One

Following introductory remarks by the Minister of Education and the UNICEF representative, Dr. David Selby delivered a brief presentation on Global Education and the Turkmenistan initiative. Dr. Selby said that educational reforms of the last 100 years have improved 'access' to and content of education but not necessarily 'quality' of education. The process of learning has often been a blind spot in curriculum reform. Global Education is a response to the failure of 'traditional' education to connect children to the real world. Global Education is a model for improving the quality of basic education. Its concepts are in line with those in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) and the World Declaration on Education for All (1990). Some of the key characteristics of Global Education classroom are: teacher as a facilitator; the textbook as but one of many sources; child-friendly classrooms; a positive view of the child; interactive teaching and learning; enhancing life skills of children; infusing cross cultural themes.

Dr. Selby then explained the model used in UNICEF Global Education curriculum and pedagogical renewal project in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Albania and Iran and other member countries involved in the CARK project.

Following the introductory session, IIGE consultants, Heather Reid, Lidra Remacka, Neil Boland and David Selby, invited participants to begin the Turkmenistan workshop program.

Morning Session

(Input) Introduction: Workshop content and style were introduced. Active participation of all was encouraged but it was said that participants were also entitled to opt out. Brief overview of four-dimension model of global education was offered.

(Activity) Globingo: Participants asked questions of each other in order to fill rows of four squares horizontally, vertically or diagonally. Many participants noted that this was a good icebreaker, because it helped them to know each other. Everyone was engaged in this very lively first activity.

(Input) The Spatial Dimension 1: Concepts of interconnectedness and interdependence were introduced. Because of a dynamic, multi-layered world system within which the local is in the global and the global in the local, the education process should foster an awareness and understanding of the interdependent nature of lands and peoples.

(Activity) Rights Balloon Game: First participants individually read the list of rights and thought about which rights they were prepared to surrender and which rights they wanted to keep as long as possible. Then a group of four or five shared their own order. It is important to acknowledge each student has his/her own preference and perspective. Participants stressed that rights and responsibilities are two sides of a coin.

Afternoon Session

(Input) The Issues Dimension 1: The concept of the interlocking nature of global issues was introduced. A compartmentalized worldview will not allow us to see such connections.

(Activity) Woolly Thinking: After this activity many participants expressed their surprise at finding out the complex interconnectedness among issues such as the arms races, environmental pollution, unemployment, terrorism, human rights violations, malnutrition, and urbanization. They acknowledged that understanding of these issues and solutions requires an holistic approach.

(Input) The Issues Dimension 2: Interconnectedness of Issues/ Perspective: As recent UN declarations emphasize,
Global Education tries to bring different fields of education together. Only a broad focus allows us to see interconnectedness among issues. Students' perspective on any issue is only one among many; therefore they need to be exposed to diverse and broader perspectives in order to make informed decisions and judgments.

(Activity) Two Mules: Participants formed groups of six and each member of the group was given a different mule picture. They were asked to arrange the picture in sequence without showing their own pieces to others. In debriefing they expressed a positive experience in this collaborative problem solving process.

(Activity) Drawing upon the Future: After individually drawing the images of the future, participants exchanged each other's vision of futures. This activity aimed at clarifying each participant's values position. Although there is no one right answer, justification of the story is necessary. Tensions between global future and personal future and green future and high tech future were expressed. Different interpretations of 'time span' and 'our' future (who are 'we?') as well as gender difference were discussed.

Day Two

Morning Session

(Activity) People Search: This activity is similar to Globingo, but it includes questions about feelings. Participants pointed out the importance of sharing feelings, because it allowed them to know each other more. Comments on implications of this activity in the classroom included the need for open sharing between teachers and students and paying attentions to students' feelings.

(Input) The Temporal Dimension 1: Participants were introduced to the concept of possible, probable and preferred future. Traditional curriculums are heavily past or present oriented and lack the future perspective. Bringing future components in the classroom is one of the key components of Global Education.

(Activity) Future Time Lines: Participants worked in pairs and drew individual, national, regional, or global probable future and preferred future. Then some presented their drawings. As an extension, for instance, teachers can use this activity at the beginning of the school year and thus focus student needs and help them to realize their preferred future.

(Input) The Temporal Dimension2: Bringing future oriented components into the curriculum is beneficial to students in many ways. For instance, it meets their real hopes and fears, allows imaginative work and creative thinking, helps clarify their values, and enhances skills and attitude necessary for effective participatory democracy.

Afternoon Session

(Activity) Going Dotty: Participants formed a circle and closed theirs eyes. Facilitators stuck a colored dot on each participant's forehead. Then they opened their eyes and tried to form groups of the same-color dots without speaking. Participants shared feelings during the activity and thoughts on non-verbal communication. The importance of collaboration and interdependence in real life environments were referred to.

(Input) The Inner Dimension: The outer journey is also the inner journey. Critical awareness of our own assumptions, attitudes, values and patterns of behaviour is necessary. Body, mind, and spiritual connections need to be recognized and utilized in learning. Learning should be for whole person development.

(Activity) Globetrotting: Each participant had a label stuck on their back, on which names of cities in the CARK region were written. Without speaking they had to locate themselves at the appropriate position in the big regional map drawn on the floor.

Day Three

Day Three of the workshop portion of the programme continued with a series of activities and input sessions:
Morning Session

- **(Input) The Participatory Classroom 1:** students were asked to consider the importance of harmonizing the medium and the message with regard to delivering content. Teaching about peace, for example, requires a peaceful process. Students must be active participants in the learning. **Learning must employ democratic principles like cooperation, listening and empathy.** Unless harmony exists between the medium and the message the best intentions of the teacher can be nullified.

- **(Activity) Co-Operative Squares:** in groups of five or six participants were required to assemble squares from diverse shapes. This activity required participants to work co-operatively to achieve a goal. In plenary, participants noted that the activity required them to think beyond their own goals (assembling their own square) in order to achieve the group goal (all assembling squares).

- **(Input) The Participatory Classroom 2:** participants were asked to reflect on the importance establishing classrooms where teachers and students strive towards co-operative learning rather than the traditional individualistic and competitive approach. Likewise, the benefits of co-operative learning (development of empathy, interdependence and self-esteem) were highlighted.

- **(Activity) Feeling Cards:** working in small groups participants shared feelings based on ‘feeling statements’ on cards. Participants reported that the activity required a significant level of comfort and trust within the group. Participants noted that the small group dynamic provided a sense of security that a large group may not. Many noted that the activity could be used as an excellent way to learn more about a student’s concerns and feelings.

- **(Input) The Participatory Classroom 3:** participants were introduced to the concept of classrooms of comfortability and conviviality. The global classroom is one where students are given the opportunity to develop a greater sense of self-esteem. Students with a good sense of self-esteem tend to take risks, are willing to oppose social injustice, and demonstrate a higher level of empathy towards fellow students. The development of a classroom of comfort, security and enjoyment is crucial to this process of self-esteem building.

Afternoon Session

- **(Activity) Zoom!** Fun activity whereby participants stand in a circle and mimic car noises by passing the noise to the right or left of the circle.

- **(Input) Comfortability and Challenge:** participants were introduced to the concept of introducing challenge into the global classroom. Once a sense of comfort and security has been established, it is necessary to introduce content that will challenge the student’s ideas and beliefs. This period of challenge can create an environment of significant learning and reflection.

- **(Activity) Fruits of the Forest:** working in pairs, students were asked to consider their level of comfort concerning the use of forestry resources and products. Participants were required to place the forestry resource uses on a continuum ranging from ‘acceptable use’ to ‘unacceptable use’. Participants were encouraged to negotiate with each other. Individually, participants were required to indicate their individual position on the continuum by ‘drawing a line’ between acceptable and unacceptable uses. This activity demonstrated the importance and value of adding challenge into the comfortable atmosphere of the global classroom.

- **(Input) Classroom of Challenge:** participants were introduced to the idea of creating productive learning environments by developing within the classroom a delicate and tensile balance between comfortability and challenge. Participants were presented with a model of introducing challenge to students with the hope of stimulating a response followed by reflection and analysis. From this stage the hope is that students might act upon the information in a positive and participatory way. Important in this model is a return to the security and comfort of the classroom once the challenge has been fully investigated.

- **(Activity) Nine-dot Problem:** participants were required to solve a problem involving linking dots on a page with few pen strokes. The point of the exercise was to raise the level of difficulty (challenge). Throughout the activity continuing to challenge participants to find better solutions to the problem raised the level of challenge and difficulty and necessity for lateral and divergent thinking. Following the activity participants commented on the rising level of challenge within the room.

- **(Activity) Time Chairs:** returning to the temporal dimension, participants took part in an activity that allowed them to interview each other in the present, the past, and the future. Participants were required to ask the same
series of questions during all three time-periods. Following the activity participants noted that discussing the future is a difficult task. Many commented that the traditional approach to teaching lacks any real or meaningful examination of the future. Students, many commented, are not provided with the opportunity to reflect upon the future.

Following the activities, participants watched the Jordanian Ministry of Education Global Education Project video. Participants were asked to meet in groups and consider the material presented to them during this session and the previous two. Likewise, participants were asked to focus on the role of the teacher within the global classroom. Using chart paper and markers participants presented some of their observations, questions and concerns related to the material presented.

The discussions indicated that participants were developing a good understanding of global education. The concern for many participants, however, was their ability to develop lessons and curriculum on their own. Many agreed that while global education is the required direction, implementation would be difficult.

Day Four

Conclusion of workshop; beginning of Core Team Work

Morning Session

In order to complete the workshop portion the morning of Day Four was used to complete two input sessions: Relational Modes of Knowing and Dissolving the Wall between Classroom and Community. Following these inputs some concluding comments and pieces.

During the morning of Day Four, final decisions were made regarding National Core team involvement. The decision making process for National Core Team selection involved some input from IIGE consultants, however, Core Team selection, for the most part, appears to have been pre-determined prior to the beginning of the workshop by Unicef officials. The final decision and announcement was made by the Unicef representative. The list of National Core team members was read to all group members. The intention was that Core team members would remain for the final two days of the workshop.

Afternoon Session

National Core Team: Introduction of Initiative Goals

National Core Team members were given a detailed explanation of the role of the national core team and a review of the timeline and expectations of the CARK initiative. Team members were informed that membership of the core team represented a significant contribution of time and energy. Likewise, members were reminded of the opportunity that team membership presented in terms of their ability to implement and introduce global education into the national curriculum. Team members were informed of the relationship between the National Core team and the IIGE consultants. Team members were told that as the initiative progressed the Core Team would be responsible for more and more aspects of the project. IIGE involvement would diminish as the Core team assumed more responsibility. A timeline of future workshops, target curriculum dates was also discussed. Core Team members were informed that the initial focus in terms of curriculum development was for Grades 1 and 5.

To conclude Day Four participants were divided into subject specific groups: mathematics, social studies, science, language, music and art. Since it had been determined that curriculum in Turkmenistan schools was limited, for the most part, to textbooks, participants were asked to spend time reviewing specific content taught in grades 1 and 5 in their specialty subject. Using textbooks, members were asked to report back highlighting the areas of study within the subject and the grade. This exercise was required in order to allow the IIGE consultants an opportunity to, first, understand some of the content covered in the respective grades and subjects, and, second, begin to look for opportunities to infuse global education into the existing curriculum.
Day Four ended with several groups reporting back on the curriculum covered in the school. To conclude, members were asked to continue to investigate their subject content for grades 1 and 5 and to report some of their findings for the next day.

**Day 5: National Core Team**

The objective for day five was to assist team members in developing initial lesson plans based on their subject for grades one and five. Core team members broke into subject sub-groups and began to look for opportunities within their subject and grade levels to infuse global education. As groups worked, consultants met with individual sub-groups and clarified the task. Likewise, consultants highlighted opportunities for global education to be infused into specific areas of the curriculum. Core team members were given one hour to brainstorm ideas. After the hour, the core team met as a large group and presented ideas. After each presentation the consultants highlighted possible areas to pursue towards lesson planning. Core team members demonstrated a solid understanding of the participatory element of global education. Many, however, struggled somewhat with the inclusion of ‘values-added’ material within the curriculum. Some members demonstrated difficulty extending mathematics lessons, for example, beyond content and towards an examination of social or environmental concerns.

Following the sub-group (subject) presentations, team members were presented with the format for writing global education lesson plans. Following this presentation, team members were invited to return to their sub-groups and, using the global education lesson plan format, begin to create specific grade and subject level lessons based on the ideas presented during the brainstorming session. Members were given one and a half hours to write a lesson. During this work period consultants visited sub-groups and attempted to redirect or assist the process where necessary.

Following this work period team members reassembled and presented their initial lesson plans. Following each presentation core team members and consultants commented and offered critical analysis of the group’s progress. Likewise, UNICEF officials worked to translate lessons plans presented into English for further study following the presentations. The results of the initial lesson writing exercise proved quite positive.

Consultants and Core team members identified the lack of formal curriculum and the possibility of outdated textbooks as areas representing possible constraints to the project. The final day of Core teamwork revealed that most educators in the country format curriculum based on the content of national textbooks. As such, most educators seem to equate curriculum with textbook content. The creation of lessons independent of textbooks provides a significant challenge to the members of the Core team. Looking ahead, it is important to identify this as an area of constraint and perhaps considerable resistance in terms of creating and disseminating global education curriculum.

To conclude the workshop team members, with direction from UNICEF, decided on a future date to reconvene. The consultants once again informed the core team of key upcoming dates. One key point agreed upon by all parties was the submission of Core Team; subject-specific lesson plans by the 10 February. Lessons will be submitted to UNICEF, translated into English and electronically sent to IIGE consultants in Toronto. Consultants agreed to a ten-day turnaround period whereby IIGE consultants will provide feedback on lessons before sending them back electronically to the Core team via UNICEF. Core team members agreed to this time frame though many acknowledged that the time frame represented a significant challenge.
Observations:
Some points discussed by IIGE consultants during the workshop:

- As the workshop progressed participants became increasingly interested and excited by the material. Consultants discussed a marked difference in the level of enthusiasm as the workshop entered Day Three and Four.
- The selection of Core Team membership seems to have been predetermined prior to the beginning of the workshop. While consultants agreed that it is important that key individuals are included, it is equally important that capable, enthusiastic individuals are offered CT membership. Likewise, consultants agreed that it is important to include young classroom teachers within the CT.
- CT lesson writing revealed that while participants are skilled at participatory learning techniques they struggled with the addition of ‘values added’ content. In short, CT members had great difficulty writing subject lessons infused with global education.
- CT members anticipated that the extra time required for CT membership, specifically the time necessary for lesson writing, represented a significant constraint. CT member did not expect to be given time from their jobs to participate in the CT.

The workshop ended with a sense of tremendous enthusiasm. The IIGE Consultants and UNICEF officials left with a sense of real commitment from the Core team members. Core team members agreed that this initial workshop provided them with an excellent introduction to global education. Several participants commented that the style and delivery of the workshop allowed them to become comfortable with the information without being overwhelmed. Likewise, many welcomed the opportunity to begin to develop lessons and curriculum during the final two days of the workshop. All agreed that they looked forward to continuing the work.

Neil Boland,
IIGE Consultant
3 January 2003
ADDENDUM 8:


Prepared by Lidra Remacka
International Institute for Global Education
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
of the University of Toronto
lremacka@yahoo.com

The Uzbekistan workshop was the follow up workshop, following an initial workshop in Almaty, Kazakhstan in February 2002 and the first national workshop in the Global Education in the UNICEF CARK Region project in July 2002. Lidra Remacka facilitated the follow up workshop/seminar.

The format of the workshop, the content and style was a combination of short presentations on the essence of global education philosophy, interactive activities embodying this philosophy, open discussions on the participants’ work, understandings and reflections on the activities, sharing feedback and group activity work that culminated in short presentations by the participants.

Summary/Recommendation

1. There were four primary goals for the Uzbekistan follow up workshop: 1) to reinforce understanding of theory and practice of global education and its essence 2) to evaluate all the activities that Core Team has written and to give feedback for all activities that Toronto team was prepared; 3) to train the Core Team how to write activities and to consult on applying global education concepts and principles to existing curricula and from which to create new activities; and, 4) to develop a plan of action for 2003 for the Core Team and the IIGE to work collaboratively on the writing and improving of Uzbek Global Education activities.

2. The workshop had been planned as involving all members of Core team with mixed experience and educational background. The participation of Core team members was not continuous everyday or every session presented a challenge to facilitator and subject group members but it was a challenge that was faced very well.

Recommendation 1: Given numbers of Core team members now involved, regular, preferably continuous, participation for all subject group meetings and workshops/seminars should be considered essential.

3. The Core Team's sense is that Global Education is accepted from educational expert in Uzbekistan but that problems remain with regard to communication access for the members of Core Team, and the concern for many participants was their ability to develop activities. Meanwhile they expressed more confidence and familiarity with global education philosophy.

Recommendation 2. The writing activities skills are likely to be even further enhanced by cooperation with experienced and innovative teachers.
4. The follow up workshop/seminar provided an important opportunity to clarify misunderstandings, reinforce earlier interventions and allay concerns. It was very well and enthusiastically received by Core team members. A major outcome was the development of an activity guide format and an agreement on terminology used. 5. Global education activities based on the Uzbek curricula are being produced By Core Team members. The activity descriptions are lacking in all sections, especially in the 'Objectives', 'Resources' and 'Potential' sections of the activity descriptions. Also, the activities both within and across subjects are not written to a consistent stay and format.

**Recommendation 3.** The Core team should follow the guide format and also should seek to improve the quality and thoroughness of the 'Objectives', 'Resources', and 'Potential' sections of the activity descriptions.

**Recommendation 4:** Efforts should be made to enhance communications and connections between the Core Team members and Coordinator, and UNICEF and IIGE.

**Recommendation 5:** Follow the action plan, respecting communication agreement between Core Teams members, UNICEF and IIGE.

**Recommendation 6:** Efforts should be made to achieve the 'visibility' of Uzbek Global Education Core Team thought media strategy, writing articles to prepare the terrain of starting implementation of the project in September 2003.

Day by day report

**Sunday - Monday-Tuesday December 08-10, 2002**

Consultant, Lidra Remacka, traveled to Toronto-Frankfurt-Almaty as per schedule.

**Tuesday, December 10, 2002**

In the morning two consultant Lidra Remacka and Jim Christophers visited the UNICEF Kazkhstan office and met with Ms Nurper Ulkuier, UNICEF CARK Assistant Representative and Ms. Tatiana Aderkhina, UNICEF CARK Project Assistant, in Almaty and discussed the phases of CARK project 2003-2004 according to the project proposal.

In the afternoon consultant, Lidra Remacka, traveled from Almaty to Tashkent as per schedule. Consultant visited the UNICEF Uzbekistan office and met with Ms Brenda Vigo, UNICEF Uzbekistan Assistant Representative and Ms. Yulia Narolskaya, UNICEF Project Assistant. Consultant and Ms. Yulia Narolskaya checked the transparencies and handouts for the workshops.

**Wednesday, December 11, 2002**

This day consisted of opening remarks and Day One of the follow-up workshop program. The workshop was attended by 24 Core team members, which included educational leaders, educational specialists, Ministry personnel, representatives of NGO-s, teachers and principals from across Uzbekistan.

Ms. Brenda Vigo UNICEF Uzbekistan Assistant Representative mentioned that both the Uzbekistan Government and UNICEF share strong concerns for children's rights for education, improvement of
quality of learning, and achieving the friendly environment classroom. Global Education initiatives started in Uzbekistan on July 2002 and now we have Uzbekistan National Core Team to lead Global Education Project and 20 pilot schools from different districts that will start to implement the Global Education activities based in Uzbekistan context in September 2003. Ms. Gulyandon Alimova the Director of Republican Center for PE expressed a commitment to educational reform of the curriculum and of teaching and learning processes based on a Global Education philosophy and methods will improve the quality of education in Uzbekistan. She mentioned the new responsibilities of Uzbek Core Team combining Global Education approach with Uzbek culture and traditional.

Lidra Remacka noted the essence of Global Education as a response to the failure of 'traditional' education and as a connection to the children with the real world. Global Education as a holistic model for improving the quality of learning and teaching process. She explained the role of Uzbek Core Team and the model used in UNICEF Global Education curriculum and pedagogical reform in Albania and Iran.

On the first day (10:00 a.m. – 17:30 p.m.), the consultant covered an introductory session and workshop content and style were introduced. After each activity, the consultants and participants spent time debriefing to reflect, to share their feelings, thoughts, and opinions about activity implementation in a country context.

In the morning session, the consultant facilitated an in-depth session on the essence of Global Education, the goals and implications for school and four-dimension model of global education. Active participation of all was encouraged to consider that everything is included in the program (inputs and activities) is related with new activities that the Core Team will develop. Activities such as 'Art Gallery' and 'Tell me' were used as examples for Core Team members how to write new global education activities. First, everyone was engaged in the activity and then each subject group rewrote the activities. The Math group was an observer group and responsible to give the feedback for all groups and to present the whole activity, language group was responsible to rewrite objectives and resources needed, the art group was responsible for rewriting the procedure and the science group wrote the potential of activity and time needed and the social studies group wrote the extension of the activity. They switched their responsibilities for the other activity. A lot of creative variations were developed by participants based on Uzbek school programs and textbooks.

In the afternoon, the concepts of interconnectedness and interdependence, infusion and integration model were introduced. The workshop program continued with two activities such 'Peaceful negotiation' and 'Shapes, Sizes and Spaces'. The Consultant gave as homework to determine two questions that each participant most wanted to ask about Global Education.

Thursday, December 12, 2002

Day Two (9:00 a.m. – 17:00 p.m.), of the workshop was programmed to continue with a series of activities and input sessions.

In the morning session participants were introduced to the concept of interconnectedness and the aims of Global Education. Then an activity typology and activity composition and sequencing was conducted by consultant:
Activities 'Reading photographs' and 'Global Education Objectives' were used to reinforce the inputs in practical way.

In the afternoon session consideration of characteristics of a Global Education activity, what Global Education activities are appropriate for, how to write a global education activity and different models of activities was facilitated by consultant and practiced by Core Team members.

**Friday, December 13, 2002**

Day Three (8:30 a.m. – 16:30 p.m.), of the workshop continued with input 'Learning styles' and developed an action plan during morning Session and writing activities from the Core Team subject groups during afternoon session. The final day was particularly productive; as the Core Team had by this time a greater understanding of the global education philosophy introduced during the workshop, and were more comfortable and familiar with each other.

The Consultant gave a presentation on the global education project, facilitated the process of developing an action plan, and arriving at the decision to select coordinator for the Core Team in presence of Ms. Yulia Narolskaya, UNICEF Project Assistant. Members were given a detailed explanation of the specific role of the Uzbek Core Team and a review of the timeline and expectations of the CARK initiative. Team members were informed that membership of the core team represented a new responsibility, significant contribution of time and energy. Team members were informed of the relationship between the National Core team and the IIGE consultants. Following that, participants were asked to work in subject groups and regarding to the action plan to develop a general list, specific tasks, number of activities according to the subjects and communication issues of the members of each group. Irina Nasirova the Head of Department on Innovative Technologies, Republican Educational Center, Tashkent was chosen as Coordinator of Core Team by members of Core Team with consensus. During the discussions that participants demonstrated a good understanding of the role and responsibility of Core Team.

In the afternoon session working in subjects group writing activities based on Uzbek school text book for first and fifth grade for period of September October 2003. As subject groups worked, the consultant met with individual sub-groups and clarified the tasks, gave and shared feedback, suggestions and advice. The Consultant highlighted opportunities for global education to be infused into specific areas of the school program and textbook. The core team met as a large group and presented their ideas. After each presentation the consultant highlighted possible areas to pursue towards activities.

In the end of the day consultant and Ms. Gulyandon Alimova (Director of Republican Center for PE) gave final words and conclusions of workshop in a very friendly and enthusiastic atmosphere. The consultant, Ms. Gulyandon Alimova, Ms. Yulia Narolskaya, UNICEF Project Assistant left with a sense of extreme commitment from the Core team members. Participants commented that the content and style delivery of the workshop allowed them to become clear and aware with their new role and responsibility in the future. All agreed that they looked forward to continuing the work in the project.

After workshop the consultant and members of Core Team visited together National Museum of Uzbekistan and Amir Temur Park.

The Consultant interviewed Ms. Yulia Narolskaya, UNICEF Project Assistant, two members of Core Team, and randomly collected the feedback pages from notebook's participants because of process of evaluation of workshop from Professor Lee Bartel.
The Consultant came away with a sense of a lively and committed Core Team membership and a readiness and openness to innovation in the light of national needs, UNICEF commitment to improving the quality of basic education in Uzbekistan and the availability of funding to support global education project.

**Saturday December 14, 2002** the Consultant left for Ashgabat as per schedule.
ADDENDUM 9:

CARK UNICEF REPORT: KYRGYZSTAN GLOBAL EDUCATION FOLLOW-UP WORKSHOP
Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
December 14-18, 2002

This was the follow-up workshop to an initial introductory global education workshop presented in Almaty, Kazakhstan in February, 2002 and an initial national workshop, July 2002. The workshop was facilitated by Linda Cameron and was assisted by Lee Bartel who was attending as an evaluator in particular, but shared expertise on some topics.

The workshop was designed to review global education principles and concepts, to refresh the core team on the nature of global activities, to deepen the understandings through participation in further examples of global activities, and to clarify and give further direction on how to write global activities. The workshop used a combination of input sessions, activities, feedback dissemination, Learning Styles inventory and assessment, discussion, and the collaborative writing of activities with at-elbow response and consultations.

The workshop was held in the UNICEF Boardroom in the office building which made it convenient to orchestrate the onsite needs of the workshop but had limitations in flexibility due to space limitation and static tables. The room also had other meetings happening adjacent to it, which we accommodated to but found somewhat distracting. The core team ate lunch in a local restaurant which provided an exercise and fresh air break, the coffee breaks were accommodated in an adjacent room.

The members of the core team had been altered since our last meeting, augmented by four new members who had volunteered upon hearing about the project. They had been briefed by members of the core team and had been provided handouts from the initial national training session by Gulsana, however required clarification on the philosophy and practice of Global Education and further training opportunities. The team still is limited in the number of teachers and over subscribed by Ministry of Education administrators and “Directors,” “ Chiefs,” and teacher trainers. The Core Group Coordinator (Galina Asmanovna: Deputy Head of the general, secondary, preschool and extracurricular education departments in the Ministry of Education) came only for a short time during the workshop and had no time to discuss the project or to receive any guidance. Questions about how the coordination was done and recommendations about how it might be fulfilled more effectively will be discussed in the formal evaluation report. In response to concerns, we appointed two associate coordinators who more fully understand the nature of the task at hand and who can facilitate activity writing at the grade one and grade five levels. We divided the group into those with expertise in the primary grades and those more comfortable at the grade five level and balanced subject expertise (particularly math and language expertise) across both. The groups had time to work together on the specific curriculum expectations and to brainstorm how to infuse global education activities into that. The teams seemed adequately balanced as we observed them working together. The coordinators were chosen as we observed the natural leaders emerge while working.

See appendix A attached for the list of Core Group members, their work and specialization.
The workshop:

December 16 and 17:
Began at 9: There were no opening remarks or welcome. I welcomed participants who were very subdued sitting around the formal Board table. We began by sharing the UNICEF story book entitled “For Every Child”, a summary of the convention of the rights of the child to connect us to the work at hand. We talked about the essence of our work in the Global Education Project and referred to the four dimension model in Global Education.
The purpose of the workshop was four fold:
- To reinforce understanding of the theory and practice of global education
- To evaluate the already created activities that the Core Team has written and to give feedback from the Toronto team
- To train the Core Team on the more effective development and writing of global education activities
- To collaboratively develop a plan of action for next steps

(Note: The coordinator was not present in the am day one and not at all day two or three).

The workshop was organized with inputs followed by a related activity which in each case was debriefed. We followed the suggested outline approximately with some deviations as a result of questions or misunderstanding of participants. All activities and input were directly related to the apparent needs from the work done already by the core team.

The participants enjoyed the art gallery activity. They felt they benefited enormously from determining their own learning styles and contemplated the necessity for considering learning styles in their activity development. We used tableau to demonstrate and debrief teacher centred versus child centered participatory classrooms…that was very engaging and effective. We used graffiti to refocus what global education is and to redefine our directions. The Reading photographs and global education objective activities were also used.

We spent considerable time talking about the activity design and writing one activity that we participated in together as an example. The groups then worked on activities in pairs and regrouped into groups of four to examine the strengths of the two activities they had designed. I was able to work as an at elbow consultant to assist in the process.

We also preceded further activity development by defining the curriculum content for the first term across the subject areas for each of grade one and grade five. We looked at what had been written already to see where it fit and determined what needed to be done next. It was very obvious to us that the core team was still not able to write effective activities…they wanted to just adopt the activities we had done with them and deposit a traditional concept into that frame without considering the viability and authenticity of that choice. Even after working with the groups, believing that they had “got” the concepts and global philosophy…when they presented their activity to the group…something had “slipped” away. It was quite discouraging.
One of the difficulties was that there are few “real” teachers in the group. There are a number of controlling people that took over and they were too often not the ones that fully understood global education. Brian Cambourne says that “we are all prisoners of our own model of learning” and this “truth” was reinforced throughout the time.
I feel that the group needs considerable time and practice with assistance before they really understand the “why” and therefore the “how” of making global education real, meaningful and relevant. The issues were generally ignored in lieu of curriculum…and in particular, skills. The theory seems to be understood but the methodology has not been internalized.

We looked at the textbooks that were provided and there are some newer and more acceptable ones available than we were made aware of in July. The social studies texts were not infused with the issues dimension topics inherent in Global Education. More time is needed to explore the potential of the tools and resources available.

There is not a place set up for the team to work. There has not been time worked out when the group could work together on writing but rather they were assigned the tasks and they had worked on them individually. There are some logistical problems that require attention that are being presented in the evaluation report.

December 18:

We had only the morning to work together due to travel arrangements. We dedicated most of the time working on writing and responding to activities to help with the process and to give meaningful feedback while we could. We were problem solving. We then summarized the project and the schedule and reiterated the critical aspects of activity writing and global education and responded to final questions. We left with limited confidence that the next set of activities will reflect the work that we did…knowing that they need more support in an on-going basis. Hopefully the workshops in February with some of the Core Team will once again bolster their understanding and capacity to transform education in Kyrgyzstan.

Linda Cameron
IIGE
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
ADDENDUM 10:

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
Global Education Workshop for the Republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan.
12-15 February 2002, Almaty, Kazakhstan

KAZAKHSTAN

Ms. Nurmuhamedova Zhazira, Chief specialist on primary education, MoE, Astana
Ms. Zaurezh Tolegenova, Chief specialist, Information and monitoring department, MoE, Astana
Mr. Chagai Ruslan, Deputy Head, Education Department, Kzyl-Orda Province, Kzyl-orda
Mr. Baihonova Saule, Deputy Head, Education department, East-Kazakhstan, Ust-Kamenogorsk,
Ms. Baisarina Aigul, Deputy akim, Katan-Karagai Rayon, East Kazakhstan Province
Ms. Shamen Akhimbekova, Initiative Schools Association of RK, President
Ms. Aliya Viculovskaya, Center Effective School, Director, Almaty
Ms. Svetlana Bekmambetova, Conflict Management Centre, Civic Ed Program Coordinator Almaty
Ms. Dina Aitzhanova, Step by step, Programme Director, Almaty
Ms. Alia Ergibaeva, Center for Democratic Education Program Coordinator, Almaty
Ms. Margarita Uskembaeva, Institute for Social and Gender Studies, Kazakh State Female Pedagogical Institute, Research Secretary, Almaty
Ms. Galina Khoruzhek, Almaty School Miras, Coordinator, teacher of biology
Ms. Maia Liokumovich, Fund Junior Achievements Economic Educ Program Director, Almaty
Ms. Ludmila Funso, Translator/Interpreter, Almaty
Ms. Ludmila Kibardina, Head, Department of pre-school and primary education, Bishkek
Ms. Tatyana Aderikhina, UNICEF CARK Programme Assistant, Astana
Ms. Aigul Kadirova, Kazakhstan Programme Assistant
Dr. David Selby, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
Ms. Lidra Remacka, General Research Assistant to Global Citizenship Education Research Project

KYRGYZSTAN

Ms. Galina Aylchieva, Ministry of Education and Culture, Deputy Head, Department of Pre-school, Basic and Non-school Education, Bishkek
Ms. Maya Kim, Leading specialist, Department of Pre-school, Basic and Non-school Education, MoE, Bishkek
Mr. Almanbet Abdiev, Head, Department of Mathematics and Science, Kyrgyz Institute of Education, Bishkek
Ms. Ludmila Kibardina, Head, Department of pre-school and primary education, Bishkek
Ms. Guldana Akieva, Director, Institute for refresher training and re-training for pedagogical staff
Ms. Tokon Orzbaeva, Head, Department for pre-school and primary education, Kyrgyz State Pedagogical University
Ms. Anara Asanbekova, Teacher
Ms. Atyrkul Alisheva, NGO Institute of the Regional Studies, Head of Education Programmes
Ms. Gulsana Turusbekova, Kyrgyzstan Programme Assistant, UNICEF Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek

TAJIKISTAN

Mr. Abdunazar Saibov, Director, Institute on Improvement of Teachers' Skills, Dushanbe
Mr. Nustratullo Amirov, Director, Oblast Center on Healthy Lifestyle, Kurgan-Tube
Mr. Sang Kholnazarov, Head, Educational Department of Khukumat of Khatlon Oblast
Ms. Marina Zhukova, UNICEF Programme Assistant, Dushanbe

TURKMENISTAN

Ms. Jeannette Shikhmuradova, Turkmenistan Programme Assistant, UNICEF Ashgabad

UZBEKISTAN

Mr. Bakhtiyor Kuchkarov, Leading Expert of the Secondary School Department
   Republican Centre for Public Education
Mr. Tajimurad Tursunov, Leading Expert and methodologist, Tashkent
Mr. Sabir Ziyaev, Pro-rector, Institute for Improving Skills of the Workers of Public Education
Mr. Talibdjan Karabaev, Head, Republican Centre for Technical Creative Activity
Ms. Khalima Djaksymova, Methodologist, MoPE Karakalpakstan
Ms. Larissa Karpova, Centre for Business Promotion, Trainer on Classroom/School Management,
   Ms. Natalya Muravieva, NGO Institute Woman and Society
Ms. Yulia Narolskaya, Uzbekistan Programme Assistant, UNICEF Uzbekistan
ADDENDUM 11:

Participants in the Turkmenistan National Global Education Workshop
16-20 December, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ministry of Foreign Affairs (representative) (Head of International Organisations dpt.)</td>
<td>Chary Atahanov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Youth Union Representative</td>
<td>Muhoyeva Jennet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Head of education dpt. Cabinet of Ministers</td>
<td>Pirliev Kurban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Minister of education</td>
<td>Saryhanov Mametdurdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Head of secondary education dpt. of MoE</td>
<td>Kurbanov Devletgeldy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Head of up bringing dpt. of MoE</td>
<td>Allamysheva Jahan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chief inspector of the secondary education dpt. MoE, primary schools head</td>
<td>Kurdurdiyeva Ogulkurban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chief inspector of the MoE, curriculum development</td>
<td>Amidov Nejip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Head of the pre-school and primary school dpt. National Institute for education (NIE)</td>
<td>Niyazberdy Rejebov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chief methodist of NIE</td>
<td>Orazmuradova Guncha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. National coordinator for EFA, scientific secretary of NIE</td>
<td>Soltanova Ogulsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Head of IT dpt. of NIE</td>
<td>Aman Hanberdiyev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahal region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Main education dpt., specialist</td>
<td>Aknamedov Annamamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Secondary school N2, Baharden region, teacher</td>
<td>Gylychmamedov Gurbanurdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Deputy principle, secondary school N1, Gavers region</td>
<td>Bekdurdiyeva Gozel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashgabat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Head of preschool N96</td>
<td>Charyyarova Sahra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Representative of Ministry for health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Representative of Women's Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Orphanages House</td>
<td>Byashimov Jumaguly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Secondary school N7, teacher</td>
<td>Chariyeva Aygul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Special school principle</td>
<td>Attagariyev Kakabay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkan region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Deputy head of main education office</td>
<td>Garyagdiyev Ashirgeldy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Inspector methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Deputy head of the education office of the Garry gala region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Secondary school N1, deputy principle, Esenguly region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Head of education dpt., Serdar region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dashoguz region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Methodist , main education office, Gorogly region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chief specialist, main education office of Dashoguz region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Head of the secondary education dpt. , Mani education office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Principle secondary school N9, Gorogly region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Main education office, specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lebap region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Deputy head of main education dpt. of the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Main education dpt., chief methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Main education dpt., chief methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Main education dpt., chief methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mary region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Main education dpt. of the region, specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Special school N2 , principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Secondary school 13, principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Secondary school N9, principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Representative of UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Representative of UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Representative of WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Representative of ADB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Representative of UNESCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ADDENDUM 12:**

**Uzbekistan National Core Team on Global Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Location/Institution</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matlyuba Akhunova</td>
<td>Director, Internat Khlebushkina</td>
<td></td>
<td>maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajimurad Tursunov</td>
<td>Head of Department on Innovative Technologies,</td>
<td>Republican Center for PE, Tashkent</td>
<td>Uzbek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majrifat Rasulova</td>
<td>Phylologist, Central Institute for Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irina Nasyrova</td>
<td>Methodologist, Republican Center for PE, Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleonora Sadirova</td>
<td>Methodologist, Republican Center for PE, Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulfira Valieva</td>
<td>Methodologist, Republican Center for PE, Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalima Djaksymova</td>
<td>Leading expert, MoPE, Karakalpakstan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhabat Shlimbetova</td>
<td>Teacher, Gymnasium #1, Nukus, Karakalpakstan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rights ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matlyuba Alimnazarova</td>
<td>Teacher, School #16, Andijan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uzbek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulkin Aliboev</td>
<td>Teacher, Akhunbabaev rayon, Fergana oblast</td>
<td></td>
<td>Russian/psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anvar Atadjanov</td>
<td>Gymnasium Istikbol, Margilan rayon, Fergana</td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiza Kan</td>
<td>Teacher of history, methodologist, Bekabad, Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilfuza Abdurazzakova</td>
<td>Methodist, Institute for Improving teachers skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Palnova</td>
<td>Teacher, School #195, Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavlyuda Iskhakova</td>
<td>Teacher, school # 103, Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uzbek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakhtier Tashaliev</td>
<td>Teacher, School #1, Syrdarya</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalya Muravieva</td>
<td>Director, Institute Woman and Society, Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Life skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukman Kazakov</td>
<td>Kamolot Youth Movement, Tashkent</td>
<td></td>
<td>psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilufar Abduraimova</td>
<td>Teacher, school #2, Gulistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>biology/chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubaida Faizieva</td>
<td>Head, Chair of Defectology, Central Institute for Improvement of skills of workers of PE</td>
<td></td>
<td>primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yulia Narolskaya</td>
<td>Project Assistant, UNICEF Uzbekistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saodat Turakhanova</td>
<td>Director, school #227 Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM 13: KAZAKHSTAN NATIONAL CORE TEAM MEMBERS

Bakhmutova, Natalya Ivanovna
- (Co-ordinator) Director of public/social association “Association of Young Leaders”
- Director of “Centre for Democratic Education “Leader” (NGO)
- Senior Lecturer, Dept. of Psychology & Pedagogy, Republican Teachers In-Service Institute (part-time)
- Almaty
- Specialisation: Teacher of Russian Language & Literature
- Supplementary Education: Economics, Leadership, Public Sector, Trainer + Trainer of Trainers
- Mainstream of Work:
  - Work with youth, pedagogues, public officials, representatives of NGOs
  - New forms and methods of work
  - Interactive methods of work
  - Democratic and civil education
  - Specialist in work with NGOs
  - “Samopoznaniye” (“Self-Cognition”)
  - Management
  - Monitoring & Evaluation
  - Fundraising

Ahimbekova, Shamena Smagulovna
- President, Social “Association of Initiative Schools or RK”
- Principal, School-Gymnasium #1 named after Abai Taldykorgan
- Education: Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences
- Skills
  - Research in education field
  - Evaluation of projects
  - Evaluation of educational needs
- Mainstream of Work:
  - Managing staff
  - Managing projects
  - National training in development techniques of “Critical Thinking using Reading & Writing”
  - “Civil Education” Project
  - Effective schooling, managing transformation processes

Ahmetova Gulnar
- Primary School Teacher, Shymkent

Anikina Lyudmila Nikolayevna
- Director, Karaganda Oblast Branch of “Association of Young Leaders” Temyrtau
- Specialisation: Mathematician, Lecturer
- Supplementary Education:
  - Training for NGOs
- Mainstream of Work
  - Work with youth
  - Development of leadership skills
  - Model United Nations
  - School councils
  - Interactive methods
  - Seminars for teachers

Chernetsova Elena Viktorovna
- Primary School Teacher, City School-Gymnasium # 38

Kalilahanova Karlygash Tanirbergenovna
- Kazakhstan National Women’s Pedagogical Institute
- Institute of Social & Gender Research
- Almaty
- Education: Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences
Livintseva Svetlana Nikolayevna
Primary School Teacher
Head of Primary School Dept, Multiprofile Gymnasium # 79
Almaty
Education:
- Kazakh State University
- Pedagogical College
Specialisation:
- Teacher of Russian Language & Literature

Marsali Raushan Omirbek kyzy
Head of Cabinet of Social-Humanitarian Disciplines & National Language, Oblast Public Officials Institute, Kyzyl-Orda,
Mainstream of Work:
- Children’s Rights in Kazakhstan
- Evaluation of activities of schools (attestation & self attestation of educational institutions)
- Methodology of teaching history, fundamentals of rights
- Translation from Russian into Kazakh, all fields, except medical

Mukhamedkhanova Almagulle
Dean of Humanitarian Dept, Semei State University, Semipalatinsk
Mainstream of Work:
- Administrative work ( 8 dept, 150 instructors)
- Co-operation with secondary schools, especially “rural-area-school”
- Methodological developments curricula in World History and History of Kazakhstan
- Working on Doctoral dissertation

Shakirova Gulnara Orazaliyevna
Assistant Director, “Bobek” centre, Almaty
Education:
- Candidate of Medical Sciences
- Specialist in International Relations field
Mainstream of Work:
- Co-ordination of “Samopoznaniye” project

Ten Natalya Ivanovna
Assistant Director in Educational & Innovative Work, Boarding School “Daryn” # 2, Shymkent
Specialisation:
- Teaching History in English language
Mainstream of Work:
- Integration of new technologies of education
- Introduction of new programs
- Training teachers

Uryvayev Sergei Vasilyevich
Assistant Director on Extracurricular Work, Gymnasium, Temyrtau
Education:
- Technical
- Management
Mainstream of Work:
- Trainer of “AYL” in leadership programme
- UNICEF consultant on School Council
- Working with parents
- Summer camps

Vikulovskaya Aliya
President, Social Fund “Effective School’ Centre”
Executive Director, Association of Educational Institutions, Almaty,
Area of Professional Interests:
- Improvement of school management
- Monitoring & evaluation of effectiveness of social projects
- Self-evaluation of schools (creating methodology)
- Promotion of “Community School”
- Trainer, member of interregional training organisation “Intertraining”
- Member of International Evaluators Organisation

Vlasyukova Irina Mikhailovna
Director, South Kazakhstan Oblast Branch of “AYL.”
Deputy Director on Extracurricular Work, “Daryn” School, Shymkent

Specialisation:
- Teacher of Arts & Drawing, History of Arts

Supplementary Education:
- Trainer of “AYL”

Mainstream of Work:
- Particularities of educational work with gifted children
- School councils
- Interactive methods
- Development of personality qualities

- Creativity & Talent/Giftedness

Non-traditional forms of events organising
# ADDENDUM 14. List of Kyrgyzstan Global Education Core Team members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place of work</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Akieva Guldana Salmarbekova</td>
<td>Director of the In-Service Training Institute under the Kyrgyz State Pedagogical University</td>
<td>University students – pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aylchchieva Galina Asmanovna</td>
<td>Deputy Head of the general, secondary, preschool and extracurricular education department in the Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Core Group Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kutanova Rano Alymbekovna</td>
<td>Teacher at the In-Service Training Institute under the Kyrgyz State Pedagogical University</td>
<td>School teachers and University students – biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4   | Suhodubova Natalia Alekseevna | Deputy director of the secondary school No. 83, Bishkek  
Teacher at the In-Service Training Institute under the Kyrgyz State Pedagogical University | School students – all subjects, Teachers of primary school – Country History     |
| 5   | Mambetova Zarya Djusupovna  | Senior scientist at the Kyrgyz Institute of Education                          | Teachers of primary school – Country history                                    |
| 6   | Orusbaeva Tokon Abdysamatovna| Deputy Chief of primary and preschool education at the Kyrgyz State Pedagogical University | University students, school teachers, kindergarten educators – pedagogy, methodology of preschool education |
| 7   | Atabaev Asan Djusupjanovich | Director of secondary school No. 7 in Naryn city                              | School students (5-11th grades) – Russian language and literature              |
| 8   | Kovalenko Marina Vasilyevna | Director of Children's Educational Centre                                     | University students – psychology, preschool age children – all subjects on intelligence and speech development, mathematics, reading and writing |
| 9   | Uzdenova Mariya Achakhmatovna | Director of secondary school in Kara-Jygach village                           | School students – Russian language and literature                               |
| 10  | Dudkina Olga Ivanovna       | Kyrgyz Institute of Education, senior teacher, department of preschool and primary education | Primary/secondary school students, university students – Russian language and literature |
| 11  | Shkolnyi Vladimir Aleksandrovich | Deputy director at secondary school, No.17 in Bishkek  
Department of regional research                                                  | School students (1-11th grades) – history, Civic education                      |
<p>| 12  | Alishova Atyrkul Rakishevna | Director of the Institute of Regional Research                                | University students – Civic education, teachers – training on Civic education   |
| 13  | Kim Maia Akhmedovna         | Chief specialist of school departments at the Ministry of education            | Former teacher of mathematics at secondary school                               |
| 14  | Abdiev Almanbet             | Kyrgyz Institute of Education, Deputy Head of natural-math. sciences          | School teachers and university students (future pedagogues) – mathematics       |
| 15  | Kibardina                   | Kyrgyz Institute of Education, Professor                                      | School teachers and university                                                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Position and Department</th>
<th>Students - Didactics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Esenalieva</td>
<td>Teacher at the Kyrgyz Institute of Education,</td>
<td>School students – Kyrgyz language and literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenjeke</td>
<td>department of Kyrgyz language and literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Attokurova</td>
<td>Teacher at the Kyrgyz Institute of Education,</td>
<td>Primary school students – all subjects, teachers of primary school –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinar</td>
<td>department of extracurricular and primary education</td>
<td>mathematics, teaching methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dauvalder</td>
<td>Deputy Director at the secondary school No. 26,</td>
<td>Primary school students (1-4\textsuperscript{th} grades) – all subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olga</td>
<td>Bishkek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men – 3  
Women – 14  
Pedagogues of in-service training on the teaching methodology – 8
INTRODUCTION POINTS

Evaluation of learning is a complex affair. No single form of evaluation can be relied upon to give us an accurate picture of what learnings have taken place in a classroom. The project will try to circumvent this problem by collecting different forms of evidence. By triangulating the different pieces of evidence, we should be able to achieve a fairly accurate ‘fix’ on what has actually taken place. The ten feedback/evaluation instruments recommended are outlined and discussed below.

1. TEACHER'S DIARY OF REFLECTIONS

From the very outset of the project, i.e. the first training day, the teachers are asked to keep a diary of personal reflections with an emphasis on feelings, not description. An entry should be made in the diary a) after each teacher training day; b) before the first project lesson, outlining hopes and concerns; c) between project lessons, reflecting on what took place in the last lesson and anticipating potential opportunities and problems presented by the forthcoming lesson; d) after the last lesson, reflecting on the last lesson and, more importantly, on the sequence of project lessons as a whole. Teachers should be informed at the start that the diary is to be handed to, and read by, the core team at the end of the trialling period. The core team's role is to read each diary, summarise (in English) the points made and prepare an English translation of passages felt to be especially significant to be sent to IIGE.

2. INTERVIEWS WITH TEACHERS

Ten teachers are to be interviewed immediately before and immediately after the classroom trials. ‘A’ and ‘B’ attached give the interview frameworks for, respectively, the pre- and post-trial interviews. The core team are to conduct interviews, taking one teacher each and produce a one-page summary, in English, of each interview. Summaries to IIGE. The ten teachers are also to be interviewed half way through the trials. These ten will also be regularly observed at least once a week by the same core team member (see 4 below).

3. PRE. AND POST.TRIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The thirty teachers not to be interviewed will each be asked to complete a pre- and post-trial questionnaire (see ‘C’ and ‘D’ attached).

4. PRE- AND POST-TRIAL TESTS OF STUDENTS
Pre. and post-trial tests should be designed for specific units to test attitudinal shifts and knowledge gains on the part of the students. These should be simple and amenable to quick analysis. For instance, for the grade 5 Science and Maths unit on Living Things, students could respond to twenty questions by ringing one of four numbers in each line, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I found a spider in the bath, I would kill it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears are nice to cuddle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snakes are horrible creatures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same test applied before and after the unit give some (but not a foolproof) indication of attitudinal shift. Some of the questions should be 'bland' and inconsequential so that students come to the 'big' questions off their guard. Each test sheet should have boxes for students to indicate their gender and location, i.e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core team should train the teachers in counting results and in filling in a summary of result pro-forma. These should be sent, in English translation, to IIGE. Note: all knowledge and attitudinal tests devised should be forwarded to IIGE for comment

5. LESSON OBSERVATION

5.1 BY CORE TEAM MEMBERS: The ten teachers selected for interviews should also be observed once per week during the field testing. This should be done with their full knowledge and agreement (it should be emphasized that your interest is in evaluating the activities rather than the teachers’ performance). Sheet ‘E’ is the observation checklist against which notes can be written. A summary of points noted should be shared with the teacher and a translated copy forwarded to IIGE. Other teachers' lessons should be observed on an occasional random basis.

5.2 By TEACHER PAIRS: The two teachers at anyone school should be encouraged to observe each others’ lessons, using sheet ‘E’ for noting down observations. The observation, and subsequent de-briefing, should be conducted in a non-judgmental manner. Sheets to be forwarded, in translation, to IIGE.

NOTE. OBSERVATION BY PRINCIPALS / OTHER TEACHERS
COULD ALSO BE ARRANGED.

6. STUDENT FEEDBACK

Sheet ‘F’ should be distributed to students at the end of, or immediately after each project lesson. The sheets should be collected and forwarded to the core team. An analysis of each batch is to be forwarded to IIGE (the first five questions to be summarized as a written overview the last as a quantitative analysis—care to be taken throughout to seek out any gender differentials in response).

7. TEACHER FEEDBACK

Sheet ‘G’ to be completed by each teacher trialling a specific activity. Sheets, in translation, to be forwarded by the core team to IIGE.

8. GROUP DEBRIEFING (TEACHERS)

At the close of the trialling period, the appropriate core team sub-group will lead a group debriefing with the teachers. Open-ended questions will be use to elicit responses (e.g., What have been the principal gains from the experimental lessons? ‘to what extent were your concerns about the activities dispelled?’ The debriefing will be tape-record then summarised in English (‘pithy' quotations in full), and the summary sent to IIGE.

9. GROUP DEBRIEFING (STUDENTS)

Selected students taught by the ten closely-observed teachers will be brought together and their views sought. This should be undertaken by the core team member responsible for observing the teacher without the teacher present. Similar open-ended questions should be used. The session should be tape-recorded, summarised and a summary sent to IIGE.

10. CORE TEAM DEBRIEFING

In sub-groups, then collectively, the core team should pool their reflections following the teacher and student debriefings. These should be written down (i.e. as sub-groups and as a whole group) and forwarded to IIGE.

FINAL REVIEWING AND ANALYSIS OF ALL EVALUATIVE MATERIAL WILL TAKE PLACE DURING AN IIGE VISIT. THE PHASE I FINAL EVALUATION REPORT WILL BE WRITTEN BEFORE PHASE 2 IMPLEMENTATION BEGINS.

(A)

UNICEF GLOBAL EDUCATION PROJECT:
PRE-TRIAL INTERVIEW FRAMEWORK

The following ten questions are designed as ‘lead’ questions to trigger teacher response to critical evaluation points. Each should be followed up with supplementary open-ended questions or promptings designed to further illumine
their response (e.g. ‘what do you mean when you say…….?'; ‘give me an example or two of what you are saying’; ‘Could you elaborate that point further?’)

1 What do you think are the most important qualities a teacher should have?

2 What, in retrospect, are your reflections on the two introductory workshops you attended?

3 Are you satisfied that you have been well-prepared for the trials of the experimental lessons?

4 How well, in your view, do the activities help students learn what must be learned in the course of study?

5 Having been introduced to the activities, what are your hopes and concern regarding their use in the classroom?

6 Could you specify an activity that particularly concerns you and explain the reasons for your concern?

7 Could you specify an activity that you expect will be particularly successful? Can you explain why you think it will be so?

8 In what ways do you anticipate your classroom will be different during the experimental period?

9 How do you think students are likely to respond to the activities?

10 What, as you understand it, is global education?
Again, ten ‘lead’ questions should be put and followed up with supplementary open-ended questions or promptings.

1. How, in your view, have the trials gone so far?
2. What have been the particular problems you have encountered?
3. What particular successes have you experienced?
4. Which activity has proved most successful? Why in your opinion?
5. Which activity has proved least successful? Why in your opinion?
6. What has surprised you most about the trials so far?
7. How have students responded to the experimental lessons?
8. Have the experimental lessons caused you to reflect upon or rethink your usual style of teaching?
9. Do you intend to change your lesson management or teaching approach in any way during the second half of the trials? If so, can you give particulars?
10. What do you think are the most important qualities a teacher should have?
1. What would your overall assessment of the trials be?

2. Have there been obstacles to carrying out the trials that it has proved difficult to overcome? Please identify and elaborate.

3. What aspects of the trials, in your opinion, have been the most successful?

4. What aspects of the trials, in your opinion, have been the least successful?

5. Have your attitudes to the activities changed in any way over the experimental period?

6. Has the student response to the activities changed in any way over the experimental period?

7. Have the experimental lessons caused you to reflect upon or rethink your classroom management and teaching approach?

8. Have you explained your experimental lessons to colleagues? Was this in a formal or informal context? With what results?

9. If you were only allowed four descriptive words to sum up the experience of the trials, what would those four words be?

10. If you were to repeat the experimental lessons, what changes would you wish to make?

11. In our first interview, you identified your hopes for the experimental lessons as . . . . . and your concerns as . . . . . To what extent have your hopes been realized and your concerns justified?

12. What do you think are the most important qualities a teacher should have?

13. What, as you now understand it, is global education?
UNICEF GLOBAL EDUCATION PROJECT:
PRE-TRIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

2. Name __________________________

3. Location of school  
   Urban _____ 
   Rural _____

4. Type of school:  
   State school ____  
   Private _____

5. Type of class:  
   Mixed gender class ___  
   All male class ____  
   All female class ___

6. List the five most important qualities you think a teacher should have?

7. Write down three comments that summarize your reflections on the two introductory workshops you attended.

8. How well prepared do you think you are for the trials? Circle the appropriate number:

   5  4  3  2  1
   Very well well adequately not adequately very poorly
   Prepared prepared prepared prepared prepared

9. What are your hopes and concerns regarding the trials?  
   Express up to three of each.

   Hopes                          Concerns

10. How do you think your students, in general, will respond to the trials? Circle the appropriate number.

    1  2  3  4  5
    Very positively mixed negatively very negatively
    Positively mixed response negatively

11. What do you think are the aims of global education?
UNICEF GLOBAL EDUCATION PROJECT
Post-Trial Questionnaire

1. Name __________________________

2. Location of school
   Urban _____
   Rural _____

3. Type of school:
   State school _____
   Private _____

4. Type of class:
   Mixed gender class _____
   All male class _____
   All female class _____

5. How successful do you think the trials, in general, have been?

   5         4     3     2  1
   Very       quite mixed   not very very
   Successful successful success successful successful

   Explanation:

6. Write down four words that sum up your experience of the trials.

7. Which activities have been the most successful, and the least successful? List two of each and explain why.

   Most successful 1.
   2.

   Least successful 1
   2.

8. Have there been any obstacles, in your classroom or school, that have made it difficult to carry out the trials? If ‘yes’ please elaborate.
9. How have your students responded, in general, to the trials? Circle the appropriate number.

   1       2       3       4       5
Very positively   mixed   negatively very negatively
Positively       response   response   negatively very negatively

10. How successfully do you think the activities have realized the goals of the program of studies? Circle the appropriate number and explain your answer.

   5       4       3       2       1
Very successfully adequately not very successfully un successfully
Successfully       adequately   not successfully un successfully

11. If you were to repeat the experimental lessons, would you make any changes? If ‘yes’ please explain.

12. List the five most important qualities you think a teacher should have?

13. What do you think are the aims of Global Education?

UNICEF GLOBAL EDUCATION PROJECT
Lesson Observation Checklist

1. Name of Teacher __________________________

2. School _____________________

3. Location of school Urban _____
   Rural _____

4. Type of school: State school ____
   Private _____

5. Type of class: Mixed gender class ___
   All male class ___
   All female class ___

6. Name of Activity Observed ____________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Observation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is procedure clearly understood by all/most students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is necessary clarification provided?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are necessary resources (including classroom space) available and appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student abilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- do students have sufficient knowledge, skills and attitudinal abilities to carry out the activity successfully?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are all/most/some/few students actively involved in each part of the activity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students’ interest/motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are all/most/some/few students interested in or motivated by the activity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to the activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are modifications to the activity made, or stages omitted, or additional stages introduced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debriefing the activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- how well does the teacher draw out from, and expand upon, the students’ experience of the activity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are all/most/some/few students involved in the debriefing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how successfully does the activity meet the curriculum objectives for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this lesson?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is there not enough/enough/too much time to carry out all stages of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity (including debriefing)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Student Direction (summary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what percentage of the lesson has been teacher directed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what percentage has been student directed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of the lesson has been spent by students on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on individual tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in small groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other observations
UNICEF GLOBAL EDUCATION PROJECT
Student Feedback Sheet

1. What if anything did you like about the lesson? (give details)

2. What if anything did you dislike about this lesson? (give details)

3. What if anything surprised you about the lesson? (give details)

4. What if anything did you learn from the lesson? (give details)

5. If the lesson was to be taught again, would you like it changed? And if so, in what ways?

6. Rate the lesson on a 1-4 scale by circling one of the numbers

   1       2       3       4
   I liked the lesson  liked the  disliked the  disliked the
   Very much  lesson  lesson  lesson very much
UNICEF GLOBAL EDUCATION PROJECT
Teacher Feedback Sheet

1. Name of activity __________________________

2. Location of school
   Urban _____
   Rural _____

3. Type of school:
   State school ____
   Private ____

4. Type of class:
   Mixed gender class ___
   All male class ____
   All female class ___

5. Number of minutes activity took including discussion: _______ minutes

6. Was the activity, in your view, appropriate for realizing the goals of the particular curriculum topic (explain your answer)?

7. How was the activity received by the students (describe how they responded to separate parts of the activity, if necessary)?

8. In your view, were the objectives, as described under “potential” achieved? Explain your answer.

9. Were there positive gains other than those described under “potential”? if so, please give detail.
10. Was the description of the activity under “procedure” sufficiently clear?

Yes ___  No ___

11. Did you follow just the steps described under “procedure” and in the sequence suggested?

Yes ___  No ___

If “no” what did you leave out/amend/add (give details)

12. If you were to do the activity again, would you change it, and in what ways?