Teachers as Human Capital or Human Beings? USAID's Perspective on Teachers

Mark Ginsburg
University of Maryland &
Universidad de Ciencias Pedagogigas Enrique José Varona (Visiting Professor)

This article analyzes three USAID education strategy documents (1998, 2005, and 2011) as well as USAID's requests for proposals for three projects to assess how teachers are represented. The main findings indicate that USAID education strategy documents a) treat teachers as human capital, a human resource input, rather than as human beings and b) characterize teachers as implementers of policy rather than as key stakeholders who should also be involved in dialogue and decision making about educational policy at various levels of the system. These findings are compared with those resulting from a similar analysis of World Bank education strategy documents.

Introduction
On 25 September 2015, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the 17 proposed Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). They included "Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all." Associated with Goal 4 were seven indicators and three means of implementation, including "4c: By 2030, substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries, especially least developed countries and small island developing states" (UN, 2015).

Among the many sources contributing to framing the SDGs was the document produced at the World Education Forum 2015, held in Incheon, Republic of Korea, 22-25 May 2015. This document, *Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action: Towards Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education and Lifeline Learning for All*, presents as target 4c the words that were included in the above-quoted SDG#4 means of implementation, elaborating that:

> Teachers are the key to achieving all of the Education 2030 agenda ... As teachers are a fundamental condition for guaranteeing quality education, teachers and educators should be empowered, adequately recruited and remunerated, motivated, professionally qualified, and supported within well-resourced, efficient and effectively governed systems. (UNESCO et al., 2015, p. 21)

Moreover, *Education 2030*, articulates that 'teachers and educators, and their organizations, are crucial partners in their own right and should be engaged at all stages

of policy-making, planning, implementation and monitoring" (UNESCO et al., 2015, p. 24).

This article explores what key strategy documents of the Government of the United States and, more specifically, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), focus on in terms of teacher policies. I report on a content analysis of the following documents, which present the Agencies' core strategies in the education sector from the late 1990s:

- USAID (1998): *U.S. Agency for International Development USAID's Strategic Framework for Basic Education in Africa*.
- USAID (2005): *Improving Lives through Learning: USAID Education Strategy; and*
- USAID (2011): *Education Opportunity through Learning: USAID Education Strategy*.

While the USAID documents analyzed in this article were published years before the SDGs were adopted in 2015, global discourses on teacher policies and teachers' role date back at least to the 1960s (e.g., ILO & UNESCO, 1966). Thus, it seems reasonable to analyze the teacher policies identified in USAID strategy documents.

Components of Teacher Policy
As stated in the *Teacher Policy Development Guide* (International Task Force on Teachers for Education for All, 2015, pp. 13-14), "a holistic, national teacher policy, adequately resourced and implemented with the necessary political will and administrative skill, is the best investment in learners' education that a country can make." According to this *Guide*, a comprehensive teacher policy should address nine key dimensions:

- Recruitment and retention,
- Education (initial and continuing),
- Deployment,
- Career structures/paths,
- Employment and working conditions,
- Rewards and Remuneration,
- Standards,
- School governance, and
- Accountability. (International Task Force on Teachers for Education for All, 2015, p. 20)

In the analysis presented in this article, I regroup some of these dimensions, in part to enable a comparison with findings based on an analysis of the following World Bank documents (Ginsburg, 2012): a) *Priorities and Strategies for Education: A World Bank Review* (World Bank, 1995), b) *Education Sector Strategy* (World Bank, 1999), and c) *Learning for All: Investing in People's knowledge and Skills to Promote Development* (World Bank, 2011). Thus, I categorized each reference to teacher and teaching in the three USAID documents into one of the following teacher policy-related areas:

- *Human resource for education/student learning* (input, recruitment, deployment, retention, attendance/absenteeism, student-teacher ratio, qualified in terms of possessing requisite knowledge and skills)
- *Employee* (issues of hiring/firing, salary, benefits, working conditions, career structure, standards, supervision, assessment/accountability)
- *Classroom-level actor* (i.e., engaged in instruction, lesson planning, student assessment, and other relations with students)
- *School staff member* (i.e., engaged in school governance and relations with the community)
- *Professional organization/union members* (i.e., engaged in education system governance, social/policy dialogue, collective bargaining, strike action)
- *Recipient of preservice education/training*
- *Recipient of inservice education/training*
- *Learner/Inquirer*

Teachers as Human Resource Input

The International Task Force on Teachers for Education for All (EFA) (2015, p. 13) suggests that one of the main reasons that "teachers and teaching should be at the top of policy-makers' concerns" is because "teachers are one of the largest components of a nation's labour force, the principal human resource in any education system, and the largest single financial component of any education authority's budget …" Indeed, based on my analysis of World Bank education sector strategy documents (World Bank, 1995, 1999, and 2011), I found a strong emphasis on teachers as human capital (i.e., "the belief that the role of workers in production is similar to the role of machinery and other forces of production" [Johnson, 2000, p. 46; see also Becker, 1993]) or as a human resource input that is required for the process of producing student learning outcomes (Ginsburg, 2012). For instance, in the excerpt below, note how policies related to teachers are listed along with financial capital and buildings (a form of fixed capital):

> An education system has several core policy domains that … include: a) … laws, rules, and regulations that determine how *teachers* are recruited, deployed, paid, and managed; b) how *fiscal resources* are allocated and spent; and c) how *schools* … are established and supervised ... (World Bank, 2011, p. 17, emphasis added).

Besides a general focus on teachers as a human resource input, this category includes attention to recruitment, deployment, and retention of teachers as a resource as well as the issue of whether the resource is present at or absent from work. In addition, this category gives attention to the "quality" of the human resource input, notably the qualifications or knowledge and skills that teachers possess.

Teachers as Employees

Closely connected to the notion of teachers as a human resource input is the idea of teachers as employees. That is, to insert this human resource into the education system

teachers have to be hired (and perhaps fired), generally be paid some salary, receive some fringe benefits, be provided with conditions of work. The employee category also includes attention to the possibility of a career structure, standards of practice, as well as supervision and assessment of their work. For instance, the International Task Force on Teachers for EFA (2015) explains that:

> in addition to base pay or basic salary, which may include retirement pension and social security provisions, other financial incentives forming part of teachers' reward packages include allowances for particular responsibilities, family benefits, housing provision or subsidies, transport subsidies and financial contributions towards further training and CPD (p. 24).

Teachers as Classroom-Level Actors

A primary role of teachers involves their activities undertaken in classrooms or other learning spaces in relation to students. These activities include curriculum decision-making and lesson planning, instructional materials development or selection, pedagogy or instruction, class organization or discipline, and student evaluation or assessment (Ginsburg et al., 1995). For instance, in its Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS), OECD (2014, p. 28) "defines a teacher as one whose primary or major activity in the school is student instruction, involving the delivery of lessons to students." And certainly, such classroom roles are critical. For instance, the 1966 ILO/UNESCO Recommendations Concerning the Status of Teachers argues that the, "advance in education depends on … the human, pedagogical, and technical qualities of individual teachers" (ILO & UNESCO, 1966, p. 6; see also Craig et al., 1998; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Good et al., 2009; Leu & Ginsburg, 2011; Leu & Price-Rom, 2006; Mulkeen, 2010; OECD, 2005; Schwille & Dembélé, 2007; UNESCO, 2004; World Bank Education Team, 2011).

Teachers as School Staff Members

One can also identify broader, leadership functions that teachers perform in their schools. For instance, Harrison and Killion (2007, pp. 74-77) note the following ten "ways teachers can contribute to their schools' success," working in relation to colleagues: resource provider, instructional specialist, curriculum specialist, classroom supporter, learning facilitator, mentor, school leader, data coach, catalyst for change, and learner. And, according to OECD (2011, p. 56), "it is also important that teacher engagement occurs at the school level, with "teachers taking responsibility for local change as members of 'learning communities.'"

Teachers as Professional Association/Union Members

Furthermore, teachers' roles also include functions beyond the school. To illustrate, the 1966 *ILO/UNESCO Recommendations Concerning the Status of Teachers* notes, "teachers' organizations should be recognized as a force which can contribute greatly to education advance and which therefore should be associated with the determination of educational policy" (ILO & UNESCO, 1966, ¶9). And the World Bank Education Team explains, "teacher organizations may influence not only teachers' working conditions, but also

important education policy decisions about the curriculum, length of compulsory education, classroom sizes, school finances and organization, etc" (2011, p. 12). Additionally, according to survey research conducted in Denmark, Hong Kong, Macedonia, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the United States, teachers "indicate overwhelmingly that to have influence on the direction of policy at the level of the system is of the utmost importance" (Bangs & Frost, 2012, p. 15; see also Bangs & MacBeath, 2012; Bascia and Rottman, 2011; Bourgonje, undated; Day et al., 2007; Education International, 2007; Ginsburg, 2016; OECD, 2005 and 2011; Robertson, 2013; Williams and Cummings, 2008) [1][2]. Teachers' involvement in policy or social dialogue is not only important because of the professional practice-based insights they can bring to the table, but also because such participation will heighten teachers' commitment to implementing the reforms. As explained in an OECD (2005, p. 51) document, "only reforms that are successfully implemented in classrooms can be expected to be effective. Teacher engagement in the development and implementation of educational reform is therefore crucial, and school reform will not work unless it is supported from the bottom up" (see also Altinyelken and Verger, 2013; Ginsburg, 2016; International Taskforce on Teachers for Education For All, 2014).

Teachers as Recipients of Preservice and Inservice Education
Learning to be a teacher is a long-term process, which includes different stages: a) the apprenticeship of observation, b) formal preservice education, c) induction, and d) continuing professional development or inservice education. According to Schwille and Dembélé (2007):

> The continuum of teacher learning begins with *apprenticeship of observation* … [Lortie, 1975], which refers to what teachers learn about teaching from observing their earlier teachers during their own schooling at primary, secondary or general higher education levels. … The next phase … is the *formal preservice* phase – the initial phase that we ordinarily think of first when we think of teacher education. … [The next phase is] *induction*, the formal or informal process by which beginning practicing teachers adapt to and learn about their roles as teachers. … [The last] phase of teacher learning follows and continues to the end of the teaching career. This is the phase of *continuing professional development* [or inservice education] (pp. 29-33). (see also Ginsburg, 2013; Hardman et al., 2011; International Taskforce on Teachers for Education For All, 2014; Leu & Ginsburg, 2011; OECD, 2005)

While the main focus of preservice and inservice teacher education programs tends to be on preparing teachers for the classroom roles, it is also possible for such programs to focus on developing teachers' knowledge, skills, and commitment to perform roles at the school level as well as to carry out their roles as members of a professional association or union, including participating in policy or social dialogue (Ginsburg, 2016). In my analysis of USAID strategy documents in this article distinguish references to teachers receiving or needing to receive preservice versus inservice education. I did

not anticipate any references to the apprenticeship of observation stage, and I opted to categorize any references to induction processes as part of inservice teacher education.

Teachers as Learners/Inquirers
My analysis of World Bank education strategy documents revealed that there were very few references to teachers as learners/inquirers in the 1995 and 1999 documents and not a single reference to teachers as learners/inquirers in the 2011 strategy (see Ginsburg, 2012). This is despite the fact that the 2011 document is entitled *Learning for All* (World Bank, 2011). In my analysis of World Bank documents as well as in my analysis of USAID documents here I distinguish the category of teachers as learners/inquirers from the categories of teachers as recipients of preservice education and teachers as recipients of inservice education, even though those participating in such programs likely learn things. I coded text from documents in one of the two teacher education categories when the text referred to the need to or efforts to organize preservice or inservice programs, without any explicit attention to how teachers would engage in learning/inquiring activities. To clarify, the following is one of the few statements in a World Bank document that was categorized as identifying teachers as learners/inquirers: "Clusters of schools, sometimes called nucleos or school learning cells, facilitate professional interaction among teachers and decision-making about instruction, … [which] may be more important than decision-making authority for [teacher] motivation and learning" (World Bank, 1995, pp. 129-30).

I decided to retain the learner/inquirer category for the analysis of USAID strategy documents in part because two of these documents included "learning" in their titles: *Improving Lives through Learning* (USAID, 2005) and *Education Opportunity through Learning* (USAID, 2011). I also included the learner/inquirer category because considerable attention has been paid to such issues in the education and teacher education literature.

For example, the ideas Peter Senge presented in his book, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* (Senge, 1990), caught the imagination of leaders in education as well as business and other professional fields. And Senge's subsequent publication, *Schools that Learn: A Fifth Discipline Fieldbook* (2000), only increased the influence of his ideas on educators and teacher educators. As Westheimer (2008) recounts, Senge initially "urged corporate America to consider developing 'learning organizations'" (p. 768) and then encouraged education reformers to "imagine a successful school-based learning community … [as] a meeting ground for learning – dedicated to the idea that all those involved with it, individually and together, will be continually enhancing and expanding their awareness and capabilities" (p. 762). Furthermore, in his chapter on "Learning among Colleagues" in the *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, Westheimer (2008, p. 756) argues – and provides evidence to support the claim –that "teachers cannot possibly create and sustain productive learning environments for students when no such conditions exist for teachers." And Cochran-Smith and Demers (2010) elaborate the issues in their chapter on "Research and Teacher Learning: Taking an Inquiry Stance" in *Teachers as Learners: Critical Discourse on Challenges and Opportunities*:

A central aspect of teacher learning from an inquiry stance is learning in the company of … new and experienced teachers as well as teacher educators and other partners …. In inquiry communities, everybody is regarded as a learner and a researcher rather than some people designated as the experts with all of the knowledge and others designated as being in need of that knowledge. Inquiry communities are designed to pose questions, gather and analyse data in order to make decisions about instruction and practice (p. 34).

USAID as the Source of Teacher Policy Ideas of the U.S. Government
The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) was established by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, legislation which was passed by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and based on proposals by John F. Kennedy's administration. The Act "brought together several existing foreign assistance organizations and programs. Until then, there had never been a single agency charged with foreign economic [etc.] development" (USAID, 2017). Prior to the creation of USAID, the U.S.'s international develop programs had been overseen by the Office of Inter-American Affairs, created in 1940 to "provide technical assistance across Central and South America for economic stabilization, food supply, health, and sanitation;" the Technical Cooperation Administration, established within Department of State in 1950 to "provide technical knowledge to aid the growth of underdeveloped countries around the world;" and the International Cooperation Agency was created within State Department in 1955 to "deploy foreign aid and contain communism" (USAID, 2017).

As noted on the U.S. Diplomacy (2017) website:
USAID operates programs in nearly 100 countries divided into five geographic regions: Europe and Eurasia, Latin American and the Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, and the Near East. From its headquarters in Washington, D.C., USAID works with more than 3,500 American companies and over 300 U.S.-based private voluntary organizations. USAID also partners closely with indigenous organizations, universities, international agencies, other U.S. agencies, and other governments. A trend towards heavy reliance on contractors to implement programs has been reversed [since 2008, during Barak Obama's administration] as USAID has increased the relative size of its direct-hire staff.

According to McNiff (undated, p. 1), "USAID's creation was based on two foreign assistance discourses: first, that economic development was a necessary step to alleviate poverty, spread democracy, solve gender issues, and expand markets …, and second, that protecting national security interests during the 1960s Cold War tensions required greater foreign assistance dollars to defeat the Soviets in a battle for the developing world …" It is also important to note, as a former USAID administrator, Natsios (2010) explains, USAID has been challenged to pursue its overall goals in the context of

accountability within a set of federal laws and regulations, which are monitored by compliance officers:

> The compliance officers often clash with the technical program specialists over attempts to measure and account for everything and avoid risk. ... In practice, this means compromising good development practices, such as local ownership, a focus on institution building, decentralized decision making and long-term program planning horizons, to assure sustainability in order to reduce risk, improve efficiency (at least as it is defined by federal administrative practice), and ensure proper recordkeeping and documentation for every transaction (p. 3).

And, with respect to "international educational development," according to *A Sector Report on Lessons Learned*, USAID:

> has been a major contributor … The Agency has … constructed schools, helped strengthen managerial capabilities, donated equipment, and introduced reforms that have profoundly changed the character of formal education in some countries. It assisted both in expanding enrollment and in solving some of the problems inadvertently created by that expansion (Warren, 1984, pp. 1-2).

The analysis in this article focuses on three documents published by USAID: a) USAID's *Strategic Framework for Basic Education in Africa* (USAID, 1998), b) I*mproving Lives through Learning: USAID Education Strategy.* (USAID, 2005), and c) *Education Opportunity through Learning: USAID Education Strategy* (USAID, 2011) [3][4].

The *Strategic Framework for Basic Education in Africa* focuses on:

> a group of countries where there is good news, where we see a transition of political systems towards more pluralistic and open societies, and where economic reforms are leading to growth … The *Framework* … is [also] applicable to countries emerging from crisis – when there is a reasonable expectation that they will move into [this] group" (USAID, 1998, p. 3).

The Strategic Framework, moreover, announces that:

> USAID's mission is to promote sustainable development, which the Agency defines as 'economic and social growth that protects the resources of a host country; respects and safeguards the economic, cultural, and natural environment; creates opportunities for enterprises and incomes to grow; is nurtured by an enabling policy environment; and builds indigenous institutions that involve and empower the citizenry' (USAID, 1995). Implicit in this mission is the need to provide the poorest countries and their neglected majorities (women, rural inhabitants, the

disadvantaged, and the vulnerable) the opportunity to participate in the process and enjoy the benefits of sustainable development. (USAID, 1998, p. 11)

The *Strategic Framework* then emphasizes that:

a vital strategy to accomplish this purpose is to assist host countries to provide, sustainably and with their own resources, quality basic education that ultimately reaches all children. Increasing equitable access to quality primary education and basic education skills is the central objective of USAID's goal for human capacity development." (USAID, 1998, p. 11)

USAID's (2005) *Education Strategy* explains that the:

spotlight on development has illuminated the critical role of education. ... USAID thus includes education and training as part of its strategic efforts to promote economic prosperity and security; improve health, education, the environment, and other conditions for the global population; advance the growth of democracy and good governance; and minimize the human costs of displacement, conflict, and natural disaster (p. 1).

Thus, USAID's overall goal in education is to help citizens of developing and transition countries gain the skills and knowledge they need to build and live in free and prosperous societies. USAID will focus its education programs on two broad but complementary objectives:

- Promoting equitable access to quality basic education. ... Basic education will continue to represent USAID's main priority within education, in terms of resources and program effort.
- Beyond basic education: enhancing knowledge and skills for productivity. USAID will also invest in selected areas of education beyond basic education, including focused efforts in workforce development and in higher education. (USAID, 2005, p. 7)

USAID's (2011) *Education Strategy*:
is premised on the development hypothesis that education is both foundational to human development and critically linked to broad based economic growth and democratic governance. ... Education helps ensure that growth is broad based and reaches the poorest. Through its impact on economic growth, education helps catalyze transitions to democracy and helps preserve robust democratic governance. Education also helps improve health outcomes. Access to education is a crucial precondition to educational impact, but what matters most thereafter is the quality of education (p. 1).

The 2011 Education Strategy goes on to state that:

> Based on projected resource availability, and on the policy principles above, USAID will pursue three global education goals:
>
> > Goal One: Improved *reading skills* for 100 million children in primary grades by 2015;
> >
> > Goal Two: Improved ability of *tertiary and workforce development* programs to generate workforce skills relevant to a country's development goals; and
> >
> > Goal Three: Increased equitable *access to education in crisis and conflict* environments for 15 million learners by 2015. (p. 1)

Findings from the Content Analysis of Three USAID Strategy Documents

In this section, I first present the findings from the content analysis of the three USAID strategy documents (1998, 2005, 2011) and then present the findings from the content analysis of the teacher-focused objectives of three USAID programs (in Egypt, Pakistan, and Liberia).

While none of the three USAID education strategy documents mention teachers or teaching in the core statements presented above, I analyzed the full documents to see how frequently these two words were referenced and how such references could be categorized.

Table 1 presents the results of the quantitative content analysis of the three USAID documents. Overall, one notes that the words "teacher" or "teaching" appear on average approximately one time per page in the 1998 and 2005 documents (.985 and 1.16, respectively), but closer to two times per page in the 2011 document (1.85). This indicates that teachers and teaching receive an appreciable focus in all documents, but for our purposes, the question is the nature of the focus in the three documents.

Table 1 also shows that between 45.9% and 63.6% of the references to teacher and teaching in these documents focused on issues concerned with teachers as a human resource for education (mainly as an input to be recruited, deployed, and retained) or with teachers as employees (mainly in terms of supervising and assessing their practice) [5]. For example, the following excerpts were categorized as being focused on teachers as a human resource for education:

> Informed expansion of the education system with **teachers** adequately trained, reasonable class sizes, available materials, and sufficient facilities is fundamental to an education system's effectiveness. (USAID, 1998, p. 56)

The HIV/AIDS pandemic … has taken a horrific toll on the **teaching force** and educational administrators at all levels … (USAID, 2005, p. 5)

The period following natural disaster, manmade instability or outright conflict … presents critical opportunities to restore (or build for the first time) the system conditions ... This often involves the restoration of educational systems and **teacher** cadres to enable the return of services. (USAID, 2011, p. 15)

And the following excerpts were categorized as focused on the employment status of teachers:

Improved classroom instruction requires better in-service teacher training and reinforcement by appropriate **teacher** terms of service, teacher support supervision, and instructional materials. (USAID, 1998, p. 22)
[V]arious forms of petty corruption operate at the school level, including charging families for publicly provided textbooks, imposing ad-hoc fees for school attendance, and **teacher** absenteeism. (USAID, 2005, p. 5)

[I]n many countries, **teacher** salaries absorb the great majority of education spending, leaving little for books and other learning materials. (USAID, 2005, p. 5)

Improving the quality of education requires incentivizing certain types of behaviors among policymakers, administrators, **teachers**, students, and parents. (USAID, 2011, p. 2)

Studies have shown that, in many developing countries, **teacher** absenteeism and lack of standards and assessment result in low learning outcomes. (USAID, 2011, p. 11)

As shown in Table 1, a sizeable percentage of the mentions of teacher and teaching focused on the training of teachers. Interestingly, the 1998 and 2011 documents devote more attention to in-service training (12.5% and 21.6%, respectively) compared to pre-service training (3.1% and 2.7%, respectively), while the 2005 document gives more attention to preservice training (18.2%) compared to inservice training (4.5%). The following excerpts illustrate how the documents discussed inservice and preservice training:

USAID' s support for basic education should, where appropriate, link to the country and Mission's population, health, nutrition, and natural resources objectives through school curricula, instructional materials, and **teacher** training. (USAID, 1998, p. 40)

Improving instruction is a complex task that entails a wide range of interventions [including:] …   supporting improved teacher training,

> along with technical assistance to strengthen local **teacher** training institutions and [**teacher**] in-service training options … (USAID, 2005, p. 9)

> The following activities are illustrative of actions that could be taken to improve reading delivery systems at the primary level: … support professional development for **teachers** and administrators … (USAID, 2011, p. 11)

Furthermore, Table 1 indicates, not surprisingly, that a relatively high percentage of mentions of teachers and teaching focused on teachers' role in the classroom, mainly concerned with instructional activities. For the 1998 and, especially, the 2011 documents, this category received the next highest percentage (15.6% and 27.0%, respectively, after human resource and employee categories, while for the 2005 document this category received the second highest percentage after the human resource and employee categories. Examples of excerpts that were categorized as focused on teachers' classroom role include:

> USAID's support for reforming basic education systems occurs [includes:] … steps to promote community participation in school governance, changing classroom **teaching** methodologies to encourage pupil questioning rather than repetition, and promoting a policy dialogue process … (USAID, 1998, p. 40)

> Improving instruction is a complex task that entails a wide range of interventions [including:] … promoting the adoption of appropriate **teaching** methods that involve students in the learning process … (USAID, 2005, p. 9).

> There is also widespread agreement that improving learning outcomes on a national scale, particularly in reading, requires simultaneous interventions at four levels: (1) **teaching** and learning in the classroom … (USAID, 2011, p. 10).

Besides the finding that none (0%) of the mentions of teacher and teaching focused attention on teachers as learners/inquirers, it is noteworthy that only the 1998 document gives much attention to teachers' extra-classroom roles. That is, 7.8% of the mentions of teacher or teaching were categorized as focused on their role as school staff members (e.g., as part of the PTA) and 10.9% of the mentions were categorized as focusing on their role as professional organization/union members (participating as stakeholders in governance, policy dialogue, or collective action at the local authority or national level). In the 2005 document, none (0%) of the mentions were assigned to either of these categories, and in the 2011 document, only one mention (2.7%) was categorized as focusing on teachers' role as school staff members. Relevant examples from the 1998 document focused on teachers as school staff members include:

It is within the school itself that all the components of the system come together, through the actions of the school head and **teachers** in their interactions with each other and the students, to determine the quality of teaching and learning. (USAID, 1998, p. 18)

[S]chool-based programs … include one or more of the following components: … school environmental improvement, whereby the community, in partnership with **teachers** and students, seeks to improve the quality of water, latrines, and school cleanliness so that the school compound conveys a message of good health and sanitation practice … (USAID, 1998, p. 62)

Beyond parental engagement, improving reading for millions of children will also require widespread public support and engagement from communities, civil society organizations, … including parent **teacher** associations … (USAID, 2011, p. 11).

And the following excerpts represent statements that focused on teachers' role as professional association/union member:

Within a country, the fora and mechanisms for participation, dialogue, and negotiation are often absent or deficient. The lines of communication are tenuous so that parents – and even **teachers** –-are often not aware of education policy decisions, nor are they able to transmit their concerns and opinions back to policymakers. (USAID, 1998, p. 27)

[E]ffective decentralization takes time, is complex, and requires significant efforts at the outset to achieve understanding and consensus from all participating parties (national and municipal governments, NGOs, **teachers and teachers' unions**, parents, community groups, and civil society). (USAID, 1998, p. 61)

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Various Categories of References to Teachers

	Framework for Basic Education in Africa (1998)	*Improving Lives through Learning (2005)*	*Education Opportunity through Learning (2011)*
Teacher as:	Number of specific references (% of total references) to teachers or teaching		
Human resource for education/student learning (input, recruitment, deployment,	19 (29.7%)	9 (40.9%)	8 (21.6%)

retention, attendance/absenteeism, student-teacher ratio, knowledge/skills)			
Employees (issues of hiring/firing, salary, conditions/benefits, career structure, standards, selection, supervision, assessment/accountability)	13 (20.3%)	5 (22.7%)	9 (24.3%)
Classroom-level actors (instruction, lesson planning, student assessment, relations with students)	10 (15.6%)	3 (13.6%)	10 (27.0%)
School staff members (governance, decision making, relating to community)	5 (7.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.7%)
Professional organization/union members (participation in system governance, engagement in social/policy dialogue, collective bargaining, strike action)	7 (10.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Recipients of pre-service education/training	2 (3.1%)	4 (18.2%)	1 (2.7%)
Recipients of in-service education/training	8 (12.5%)	1 (4.5%)	8 (21.6%)
Learners/inquirers	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
TOTAL *references* to teacher or teaching (Number of references per page)	64 (0.985)	22 (1.16)	37 (1.85)
TOTAL *pages* analyzed in document	**65**	**19**	**20**

Note. The statistics presented in this table were calculated based on the author's content analysis of the three USAID strategy documents (USAID 1998, 2005, and 2011).

Findings from Analysis of Teacher-Focused Objectives of Three USAID Programs
In order to provide additional insights about USAID's focus on teachers, I examined the objectives or expected results of three USAID-funded programs that had major emphases on teachers and teacher education. In all three I reviewed the Program Description that the USAID Mission in the specific country developed to request proposals for implementing the program:

1. In 2003 USAID/Egypt released its Program Description for the *Education Reform Program* (ERP). Included in this program were two major activities focusing on teachers: a) the Integrated English Language Program-III (later renamed Education System Support) and b) the Faculties of Education Reform (USAID/Egypt, 2003). The program was implemented between 2004 and 2009.

2. In 2008 USAID/Pakistan released its Program Description for the *Preservice Teacher Education Program* (Pre-STEP) (USAID/Pakistan, 2008). The program was implemented between 2008 and 2013.

3. In 2010 USAID/Liberia released its Program Description for the second phase of the *Liberia Teacher Education Program* (LTTP II). Included in this program were two major components focusing on teachers: a) Improved Teacher Professional Development: Policy, Management and Supervision and b) MOE Performance in Improving Teacher Skills and Implementing Teacher Training Standards (USAID/Liberia, 2010). The program was implemented between 2010 and 2015.

Table 2 lists the main objectives or expected results from these three programs that focused on teachers or teacher education. As can be observed in Table 2, these programs devoted attention to developing policies (e.g., teacher standards), strengthening systems (at the national or institutional level), and designing and implementing preservice and/or inservice teacher education programs. Implicit in the latter aspect (designing and implementing programs) is the program's focus on supporting efforts so that teachers receive preservice and/or inservice teacher education. And, for the Education Reform Program in Egypt this is stated explicitly as an objective of the program: "Teachers receive pre-service education and in-service training in learner-focused teaching and assessment methods" (USAID/*Egypt*, 2003, p. 9).

Table 2

Selected Objectives of Teacher-Focused Objectives of Three USAID Education Programs

Education Reform Program (USAID/Egypt, 2003)
• [Teacher] performance standards are developed, monitored, and applied;
• Faculties [of Education assisted] … to reform the curriculum and assessment system of pre-service education so that teaching methods and instructional materials are improved to match the needs for learner-centered approaches;
• [Inservice Educational Training Centers strengthened] in undertaking local training design, delivery, monitoring and evaluation and playing a greater role in supporting school-based training units; and
• Teachers receive pre-service education and in-service training in learner-focused teaching and assessment methods.
Preservice Teacher Education Program (USAID/Pakistan, 2008)
• Improve systems and policies that support teachers, teacher educators and educational managers;
• Support [Higher Education Commission and Ministry of Education] teacher institutes to develop/revise, evaluate and finalize standards, curricula and

> modules for pre-service teacher education degrees;
> - Develop a plan for implementing the new curricula for [educating] new and existing teachers
>
> *Liberia Teacher Training Program II (USAID/Liberia, 2010)*
> - Strengthened MOE capacity to plan and manage teacher training and professional development activities;
> - Increased capacity of [Rural Teacher Training Institutes] to plan effectively and deliver quality teacher training;
> - Preservice and inservice teacher preparation programs are implemented with new and enhanced content and training strategies that meet requirements for quality education and direct experience with schools and classroom level reforms;
> - Inservice "C" Certificate teacher training continued
>
> *Note.* The information presented in this table is drawn from the "program descriptions" (i.e., requests for proposals) for the three USAID programs: USAID/Egypt (2003), USAID/Pakistan (2008), and USAID/Liberia (2010).

Conclusion

In conclusion I want to emphasize two general points. The first is that the USAID education strategy documents treat teachers as human capital, a human resource input, rather than as human beings. The second is that the USAID education strategy documents characterize teachers as implementers of policy rather than as key stakeholders who should also be involved in dialogue and decision making about educational policy at various levels of the system.

Teachers as Human Capital or Human Beings?

I noted in my analysis of World Bank education strategy documents (Ginsburg, 2012) that is was not surprising that such documents highlighted the view that education contributes to human capital development (e.g., see Psacharopoulos, 1995; World Bank, 1995; World Bank, 1999; World Bank, 2011). Similarly, one would anticipate that USAID education strategy documents would devote substantial attention to the role played by formal education in developing the human capital of students as future workers, which is the main focus on education within human capital theory (e.g., Levinson, 2002; Woodhall, 1997) [6]. For example, the following excerpts from the three USAID education strategy documents analyzed in this article illustrate this focus:

> Increasing equitable access to quality primary education and basic education skills is the central objective of USAID's goal for human capacity development. (USAID, 1998, p. 11)
>
> [E]nhancing knowledge and skills for productivity …, including focused efforts in workforce development and in higher education. (USAID, 2005, p. 7)
>
> [E]ducation is both foundational to human development and critically linked to broad based economic growth … Goal Two: Improved ability of

tertiary and workforce development programs to generate workforce skills relevant to a country's development goals … (USAID, 2011, p. 1)

However, as noted above, these three USAID education strategy documents also highlight that teacher should be considered as human capital or human resources potentially contributing to the "production" process in schooling. The percentage of references to "teacher" or "teaching" that were so categorized ranged from 36% (1998) to 34% (1999) to 27% (2011), with an additional 16% to 44% of the references assigned a related category, "employee." Moreover, the attention that the USAID education strategy documents give to teachers as recipients of preservice and inservice teacher training (combined: 15.6% in 1998, 22.7% in 2005, and 24.3% in 2011) can also be seen as an extension of the view of teachers as human capital, that is, providing training as a means of enhancing the development of human capital. This view of teachers as human capital, to be managed and to be trained also is evident in the Program Descriptions released by the USAID Missions in Egypt, Liberia, and Pakistan.

As discussed in my analysis of World Bank education strategy documents (Ginsburg, 2012), the framing of teachers as human capital rather than human beings in the USAID education strategy documents and the USAID Missions' Program Descriptions seems likely to explain why the latter documents did not devote any attention to teachers as learners (0% in 1998, 2005, and 2011). That is, because the USAID education strategy documents present a view that commodifies teachers' labor (and, indeed, of teachers themselves). Attention to teachers' learning (a process that is core to existence of human beings) might be considered as tangential to an education sector strategy document as the processes of enhancing financial capital (e.g., collecting taxes) or enhancing fixed capital (constructing buildings).

Teachers as Implementers and/or Developers of Educational Policy
An analysis of USAID education strategy documents showed that teachers are mainly presented as classroom actors, implementing curricular and other educational policies. The percentage of references to "teachers" and "teaching" categorized as focused on teachers' classroom roles ranged from 15.6% (1998) to 13.6% (2005) to 27.0% (2011). However, while the 1998 document gave some attention to the role of teachers as school staff members (9.4%) and professional association/union members (9.4%), these extra-classroom roles for teachers are almost absent in the 2005 document (0% and 0%, respectively) and the 2011 documents (2.7% and 0%, respectively). Note also that while the three Program Descriptions released by USAID Missions in Egypt, Liberia, and Pakistan gave attention to developing policies and strengthening systems, their teacher capacity development efforts focused only on enhancing teachers' knowledge and skills for performing their classroom roles.

In some cases, there may be space for teachers to develop practice or even local policy through the decisions they make on a day-to-day basis in classrooms. However, to develop broader policies teachers need to be active as individuals or members of organizations at the school-, district-, province-, and national levels. The USAID education strategy documents and the USAID Mission Program Description

downplaying or ignoring these extra-classroom roles signals that USAID's perspective is not aligned with global educational policy statements such as:

> The 1966 *ILO/UNESCO Recommendations Concerning the Status of Teachers* states that "teachers' organizations should be recognized as a force which can contribute greatly to education advance and which therefore should be associated with the determination of educational policy." (ILO & UNESCO, 1966, ¶9)

> *Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action* articulates that 'teachers and educators, and their organizations, are crucial partners in their own right and should be engaged at all stages of policy-making, planning, implementation and monitoring" (UNESCO et al., 2015, p. 24).

It seems likely that USAID's focus on teacher as a human resource input, especially in its 2005 and 2011 education strategy documents and the USAID Missions Program Descriptions, contributes to the agency's limited attention to teachers as participants in policy dialogue and decision-making. If teachers are mainly perceived as human capital to be invested in to produce learning outcomes, then perhaps the logic is that they are not key stakeholders, sources of insights, and critical contributors to analyzing and developing policies – either at the school, district, provincial, or national level.

Mark Ginsburg retired in 2016 from [FHI360](). He is visiting professor at University of Maryland (USA) and Universidad de Ciencias Pedagogicas (Cuba), and was a faculty member at other universities: Aston (England), Houston, Pittsburgh, and Columbia (USA). He was President of C.I.ES (1991) and Coeditor of Comparative Education Review (2003-2013).

Notes
[1] Nevertheless, based on a study conducted in Bulgaria, Denmark, Egypt, Greece, Hong Kong, Macedonia, the Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the United States, Bangs and Frost (2012, p. 1) claim that "when it comes to policy making at both national and international levels, teachers themselves remain the ghost at the feast" (see also ILO/UNESCO, 2012; Villegas-Reimers and Reimers, 1996).
[2] As Cochran-Smith and Demers (2010, p. 28) explain, an inquiry stance offers a challenge to the dominant discourse during the current "era of accountability" in which emphasis is given to "scripted curricula and teacher-proof materials designed to compensate for a weak teaching force. On the contrary, inquiry-centered teaching and teacher preparation are based on the twin premises that teaching and teacher preparation are intellectual rather than technical activities and that most educators are capable of inquiring into practice, posing and answering questions, generating local knowledge within learning communities, and making complex decisions about teaching and learning."
[3] While the 2011 Education Strategy was initially focused only on the 2011-2015 period, in 2015 the Agency reported that "USAID's next *Education Strategy* (2016-2020) will maintain the goals and focus that our Agency introduced over the last four years of education programming. … An updated Education Strategy will be issued in early 2016,

[but, in fact, was not]. Until then, the USAID Education Strategy 2011-2015 will remain in full effect" (USAID, 2015a, pp. 1-2). This was announced at the USAID Global Education Summit, held in November 2015, at which USAID presented its *Education Strategy Progress Report, 2011-2015* (USAID, 2015b). This Powerpoint presentation highlighted that USAID had "supported activities central to achieving the education goals of our partner countries, including improved pedagogy through *training* for an average of 450,000 teachers annually, increased parental and community engagement through support for an average of 26,000 parent *teacher* associations or community-based school governance structures annually" (USAID, 2015b, p. 4).

[4] It is noteworthy that, within the category of human resources, teacher absenteeism was the focus in 2 of the 9 (22%) references in the 2005 document and 4 of 8 (50%) in the 2011 document, but none of the 19 (0%) in the 1998 document. This likely reflects the critical attention given in various World Bank publications to teacher absenteeism as a major explanation of low student learning outcomes (e.g., Abadzi, 2007; Bruns et al., 2011).

[5] As discussed in Ginsburg (2012), while earlier World Bank strategy documents devote limited attention the teachers' role as learner/inquirer (i.e., 2% in 1995 strategy and 4% in 1999 strategy), no discussion of the teacher as learner/inquirer was included in the World Bank's (2011) strategy document, despite the fact that it is entitled *Learning for All*.

[6] Human capital may be defined as "the concept based on the belief that the role of workers in production is similar to the role of machinery and other forces of production" (Johnson, 2000, p. 46; see also Becker, 1993). And as Schultz (1961, p. 3) argues, "human beings are incontestably capital from an abstract and mathematical point of view," In workers are commodified, treated—at least conceptually—as things to be bought, sold, traded, or invested in (see Marx, 1859). However, even Schultz (1961, p. 2) recognized the potential problem of the concept of human capital, in that "it seems to reduce man [i.e., human beings] … to a mere material component, to something akin to property."

References

Abadzi, H. (2007). *Absenteeism and beyond: Instructional time loss and consequences*. Policy Research Working Paper No. 4376. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Altinyelken, H, & Verger, A. (2013). The Recontextualisation of global education reforms: Insights from the case studies. In A. Verger, H. Altinyelken, and M. de Koning (eds.), *Global managerial education Reforms and teachers: Emerging policies, controversies and issues in developing context* (pp. 141-155). Brussels: Education International and Education & International Development, IS Academie Programme.

Bangs, J. & Frost, D. (2012). *Teacher self-efficacy, voice and leadership: Towards a policy framework for Education International*. Brussels: Education International Research Institute.

Bangs, J. & MacBeath, J. (2012) Collective leadership: the role of teacher unions in encouraging teachers to take the lead in their own learning and in teacher policy. *Professional Development in Education.* 38 (2), 331-343.

Bascia, N. & Rottman, C. (2011). What's so important about teachers' working conditions? The fatal flaw in North American educational reform. *Journal of Education Policy* 26 (6), 787-802.

Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education.* 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourgonje, P. (undated). *Research matters: Research as a union tool to improve educational policy.* Brussels: Education International. Available at: http://download.ei-ie.org/docs/IRISDocuments/EI%20Campaigns/EFAIDS%20Programme/2007-00167-01-E.pdf.

Bruns, B., Filmer, D., & Patrinos, H. (2011). *Making schools work: New evidence on accountability reforms.* Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at: http://site.ebrary.com/id/10453806?ppg=19.

Chapman, D. & Jester Quijada, J. (2009). An analysis of USAID assistance to basic education in the developing world, 1990–2005. *International Journal of Educational Development* 29, 268–280.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Demers, K. (2010). Research and teacher learning: Taking an inquiry stance. In O. Kwo (Ed.), *Teachers as learners: Critical discourse on challenges and opportunities* (pp. 14-43). Hong Kong: CERC and Springer.

Craig, H., Kraft, R., & duPlessis, J. (1998). *Teacher development: Making an impact.* Washington, D.C.: USAID and World Bank.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *51* (3), 166-173.

Day, C.; Sammons, P.; Stobart, G.; Kingston, A.; and Gu, Q. (2007). Why teachers matter: Policy agenda and social trends. In C. Day (Ed.), *Teachers matter: Connecting lives, work, and effectiveness* (pp. 1-18). Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Education International (2007). *Teacher union and civil society involvement in education policy dialogue on the EFA process: A perspective from the teachers, their unions and Education International.* Contribution to the 4th Collective Consultation on NGOs, Dakar, 3-5 September.

Ginsburg, M. (2012). Teachers as learners: A missing focus in 'Learning for All.' In S. Klees, J. Samoff, *%* N. Stromquist (Eds.), *The World Bank and education: Critiques and alternatives* (pp. 83-94). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Ginsburg, M. (2013). System and policy dimensions of professional development. In Ian R. Haslam, Myint Swe Khine & Issa M. Saleh (Eds.), *Large scale reform and social capital building: The professional development imperative* (pp. 157-179). London: Routledge.

Ginsburg, M. (2016). *Increasing and improving teacher participation in Local Education Groups (LEGs): Designing in-service professional development programs to facilitate teachers' engagement in social dialogue.* Final draft of literature review report for UNESCO-Education International project funded by the Global Partnership for Education.

Ginsburg, M., Kamat, S., Raghu, R., & Weaver, J. (1995). Educators and politics: Interpretations, involvement, and implications. In M. Ginsburg (Ed.), *The politics of educators' work and lives* (pp 3-54). New York: Garland.

Good, T., Wiley, C. & Florez, I. R. (2009). Effective teaching: An emerging synthesis. In L. Saha & A. G. Dworkin (Eds.), *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching* (pp. 803-816). New York: Springer.

Hardman, F., Ackers, J., Abrishamian, N., & O'Sullivan, M. (2011). Developing a systemic approach to teacher education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Emerging lessons from Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* (First published on 16 May 2011), 1-15.

Harrison, C. & Killion, J. (2007). Ten roles for teacher leaders. *Educational Leadership* 65 (1), 74-77.

International Labor Organization (ILO) & United Nations Education, Science, and Culture Organization (UNESCO) (1966). *Recommendation concerning the status of teachers*. Paris: UNESCO. Available at: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001604/160495e.pdf.

International Labor Organization (ILO) & United Nations Education, Science, and Culture Organization (UNESCO) (2012). *Final report: Eleventh session of the Joint ILO-UNESCO Committee of Experts on the application of the recommendations concerning teaching personnel*. Geneva, ILO. Available at: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002216/221601e.pdf.

International Task Force on Teachers for Education for All. (2015). *Teacher policy development guide*. Paris: UNESCO. Available at: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002352/235272e.pdf.

Johnson, A. (2000). *The Blackwell dictionary of sociology*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Leu, E. & Ginsburg, M. (2011). *Designing effective programs for in-service teacher professional development: First principles compendium*. Washington, DC: EQUP1 and American Institutes for Research. Available at: http://www.equip123.net/docs/E1-FP_In-Svc_TPD_Compendium.pdf.

Leu, E., & Price-Rom, A. (2006). *Quality of education and teacher learning: A review of the literature.* Washington DC: EQUIP1 and USAID. Available at: http://www.equip123.net/docs/E1-QualityEdLitReview.pdf.

Levinson, D. (2002). Human capital theory. In D. Levinson, P. Cookson, & A. Sadovnik (Eds.), *Education and sociology: An encyclopedia* (pp. 377-379). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marx, K. (1859, 1977). *Contribution to a critique of political economy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

McNiff, M. *A Review of USAID's educational approach from 2000 to 2015: Structural constraints to understanding a dynamic education: Thesis abstract*. Available at: http://www.academia.edu/9145090/A_Review_of_USAID_s_Educational_Approach_from_2000_to_2015_Structural_Constraints_to_Understanding_a_Dynamic_Education.

Mulkeen, A. (2010). *Teachers in Anglophone Africa: Issues in teacher supply, training, and management*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/Teachers_Anglophone_Africa.pdf.

Natsios, A. (2010). *The clash of the counter-bureaucracy and development*. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development. *Available at:* www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/1424271.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing, and retaining effective teachers. Pointers for policy development*. Paris: OECD. Available at: http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/education/teachers-matter-attracting-developing-and-retaining-effective-teachers_9789264018044-en#page1.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2011). *Building a high quality teaching profession - Lessons from around the world*. Background Report for the International Summit on the Teaching Profession. Paris: OECD.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2014). *TALIS 2013 Results: An international perspective on teaching and learning.* Available at: http://www.oecd.org/edu/a-teachers-guide-to-talis-2013-9789264216075-en.htm.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1995). *Building human capital for better lives.* Series: Directions in Development. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Robertson, S. (2013): 'Placing' teachers in global governance agendas. *Comparative Education Review* 56 (4), 584-607.

Schultz, T. (1961). Investment in human capital. *American Economic Review* 51 (1), 1-17.

Schwille, J. & Dembélé, M. (2007). *Global perspectives on teacher learning: Improving policy and practice*. Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Senge, P. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York: Doubleday.

United Nations (2015). *UN Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform: Report of the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators* (E/CN.3/2016/2/Rev.1). Available at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg4.

UNESCO. (2004). *EFA global monitoring report 2005: The quality imperative.* Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNWOMEN, World Bank Group (2015). *Education 2030: Incheon declaration and framework for action: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifeline learning for all (Final Draft for Adoption).* Paris: UNESCO.

USAID (1998). *U.S. Agency for International Development's strategic framework for basic education in Africa*. Washington, DC: Human Resources and Democracy Division, Office of Sustainable Development, Bureau for Africa, USAID.

USAID (2005). *Improving lives through learning: USAID education strategy.* Washington, DC: USAID.

USAID (2011). *Education opportunity through learning: USAID education strategy*. Washington, DC: USAID.

USAID (2015a). *Continuation of the USAID education strategy*. Agency Notice 08304 August 24, 2015. Available at: https://notices.usaid.gov/notice/32629.

USAID (2015b). *USAID education strategy progress report, 2011-2015*. Powerpoint presentation at the USAID Global Education Summit, 2-4 November 2015, Silver Spring, Maryland.

USAID (2017). *USAID history*. Available at: https://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/usaid-history.

USAID/Egypt (2003). *Program description for EQUIP2: Education reform program*. Cairo: USAID/Egypt.

USAID/Liberia (2010). *Program description for Liberia Teacher Training Program II*. Monrovia: USAID/Liberia.

USAID/Pakistan (2008). *Program description for Pre-Service Teacher Education Program (Pre-STEP)*. Islamabad: USAID/Pakistan.

U.S. Diplomacy (2017). *Agency for International Development (USAID).* Available at: http://www.usdiplomacy.org/state/abroad/usaid.php.

Villegas-Reimers, E. & Reimers, F. (1996). Where are 60 million teachers? The missing voice in educational reforms around the world. *Prospects*, 26 (3), 469-492.

Warren, M. (1984). *AID and education: A sector report on lessons learned*. A.I.D. Program Evaluation Report No. 12. Washington, DC: USAID.

Westheimer, J. (2008). Learning among colleagues: Teacher community and the shared enterprise of education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feinman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education*, 3rd edition (pp. 756-783). New York: Routledge and Association of Teacher Education.

Williams, J. & Cummings, W. (2008). *Policy-making for education reform in developing countries: contexts and processes, volume 1*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.

Woodhall, M. (1997). Human capital concepts. In A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. S. Wells (Eds.), *Education, culture, economy and society* (pp. 219-223). New York: Oxford University Press.

World Bank (1995). *Priorities and strategies in education: A World Bank review*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank. (1999). *Education sector strategy*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank. (2011). *Learning for all: Investing in people's knowledge and skills to promote development. World Bank Group education strategy 2020.*Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

World Bank Education Team (2011). *SABER – TEACHERS: Objectives, Rationale, Methodological Approach, and Products*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1290520949227/7575842-1290520985992/SABER-Teachers_Framework.pdf