education policy analysis archives

A peer-reviewed, independent, open access, multilingual journal

epaa aape

Arizona State University

Volume 19 Number 15 May 30th, 2011 ISSN 1068-2341

Globalization and the Reform of Faculties of Education in Egypt: The Roles of Individual and Organizational, National and International Actors

Mark Ginsburg
Academy for Educational Development

Nagwa Megahed
Ain Shams University in Egypt

Citation: Ginsburg, M., Megahed, N. (2011) Globalization and the reform of faculties of education in Egypt: The roles of individual and organizational, national and international actors. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 19* (15) Retrieved [date], from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/795

Abstract: In this manuscript we examine an example of globalization – the international organization-aided reform of faculties of education in Egypt. We first sketch the historical context during which secondary and primary-level teacher education became a part of Egyptian higher education. Then we draw on extensive documentary analysis and our own roles as observant participants to investigate the objectives, organization, and activities of two projects launched during the early years of the 21st century to achieve goals ascribed to the government of Egypt: a) the *Faculty of Education Enhancement Project*, which was a component of the Higher Education Enhancement Project funded by the World Bank, and b) the *Faculty of Education Reform Project*, which was part of the Education Reform Project funded by the United States Agency for International Development. We describe how the proposed policy and practice reform ideas reflected global discourses, while at the same time exploring the interplay between and among local and global actors and identifying

Manuscript received: 04/07/2010
Revisions received: 09/01/2011
Accepted: 08/02/2011

individual and organizational factors that enabled or constrained these efforts to improve the quality of pre-service teacher education in Egypt. In particular, we document how these two projects, with similar objectives, operated in a relatively separate manner during planning and implementation stages, limiting the impact that they might have had if their activities had been more fully coordinated. This study thus contributes to theoretical debates about globalization as well as provides insights for educators, national government officials, and international organization personnel who seek to champion or resist global educational reform initiatives.
Keywords: globalization; teacher education; international organizations; educational reform; Egypt.

Globalización y reforma de las Facultades de Educación en Egipto: El papel de los actores individuales, las organizaciones nacionales e internacionales

Resumen: En este manuscrito se examina un ejemplo de globalización - la reforma de las facultades de la educación en Egipto asistida por organizaciones internacionales. En primer lugar, esbozamos el contexto histórico en el cual la formación del profesorado de primaria y secundaria se convirtió en parte del sistema de educación superior en Egipto. A continuación, basados en un análisis documental extenso y nuestro propio papel como observadores participantes para investigar los objetivos, organización y actividades de dos proyectos puestos en marcha durante los primeros años del Siglo 21 para alcanzar los objetivos diseñados por el gobierno de Egipto: a) *El Proyecto de mejora de la Facultad de Educación* que era un componente de el Proyecto de mejora de la Educación Superior financiado por el Banco Mundial, y b) *El Proyecto de Reforma de la Facultad de Educación*, que formaba parte de Proyecto de reforma financiado por la Agencia de los Estados Unidos para el Desarrollo Internacional. Describimos cómo la propuesta de políticas y prácticas de reformas reflejan discursos globales, mientras que al mismo tiempo, exploramos la interacción entre los actores locales y globales e identificamos factores individuales y organizacionales que permitieron o limitaron los esfuerzos para mejorar la calidad de la formación continua del profesorado en Egipto. En particular, documentamos cómo estos dos proyectos, con objetivos similares, operaron en una manera relativamente independiente durante la planificación y fases de aplicación, limitando el impacto que podrían haber tenido si sus actividades se hubieran complementado coordinadamente. Este estudio contribuye a los debates teóricos sobre la globalización, así como proporciona una visión para educadores, funcionarios de gobierno, y personal de las organizaciones internacionales que apoyan o resisten la iniciativas globales de reforma educativa.
Palabras-clave: globalización; formación docente; organizaciones internacionales; reforma educativa; Egipto.

Globalização e reforma das Faculdades de Educação no Egito: O papel dos atores individuais, organizacionais nacionais e internacionais

Resumo: Este trabalho examina um exemplo de globalização - a reforma das Faculdades de Educação no Egito, assistidas por organizações internacionais. Em primeiro lugar, apresentamos o contexto histórico em que a formação de professores primários e secundários se tornou parte do sistema de Ensino Superior no Egito. Então, com base em uma extensiva análise da documentação e de nosso próprio papel como observadores participantes, investigamos os objetivos, a organização e as atividades de dois projetos lançados durante os primeiros anos do século 21 para atingir as metas atribuídas ao governo do Egito: a) O Projeto de Melhoria da Faculdade de Educação, que era parte integrante do Projeto de Reforma do Ensino Superior financiado pelo Banco Mundial, e b) Projeto de Reforma da Faculdade de Educação, que fazia parte do Projeto de Reforma da Educação financiado pela Agência dos Estados Unidos para o Desenvolvimento Internacional. Descrevemos

como as políticas propostas e as idéias de reformas práticas refletiram o discurso global, ao mesmo tempo em que exploraram a interação entre os atores locais e globais. Paralelamente, foi possível identificar os fatores individuais e organizacionais que possibilitam ou restringem os esforços para melhorar a qualidade da educação continuada de professores no Egito. Em particular, documentamos como esses dois projetos, com objetivos similares, operaram de forma relativamente independente durante as fases de planejamento e implementação, limitando o impacto que poderia ter resultado se suas atividades fossem plenamente coordenadas. Este estudo contribui para o debate teórico sobre a globalização e fornece informações para os educadores, funcionários do governo e equipes de organizações internacionais que buscam apoiar ou resistir às iniciativas de reforma global da educação.
Palavras-chave: globalização; docentes de formação; organizações internacionais; reforma educativa, Egito.

Introduction

In this manuscript we examine an example of globalization – the international organization-aided reform of faculties of education in Egypt. Our purpose is to understand globalization – and, more specifically, global educational reform dynamics – not as an inevitable, unidirectional process but one that depends on the ideas and actions of institutional and individual actors. We first sketch the historical context during which secondary and primary-level teacher education became a part of Egyptian higher education, but with continuing important links to basic education. We document previous criticisms of and proposed changes in teacher preparation programs, but note that concerted reform efforts occurred only after the Egyptian government in the 1990s focused on improving educational quality, including teacher preparation, and the World Bank and USAID also put the issue pre-service teacher education on their agendas – and committed funds for this purpose.

Then we draw on extensive documentary analysis and our own roles as observant participants to investigate the objectives, organization, and activities of two projects that were launched during the early years of the 21st century to achieve goals ascribed to the government of Egypt: a) the *Faculty of Education Enhancement Project*, which was a component of the Higher Education Enhancement Project funded by the World Bank, and b) the *Faculty of Education Reform Project*, which was part of the Education Reform Project funded by the United States Agency for International Development. We describe how the proposed reforms of policy and practice (e.g., improving assessments of entrants and graduates, increasing a focus on practice versus theory in coursework, expanding the amount of time devoted to field experiences, and organizing "induction" programs to support and guide new teachers) reflected global teacher education reform discourses characteristic of the 1990s and 2000s.

However, rather than treating globalization as a process without real actors, we trace how these ideas were promoted by many Egyptians and non-Egyptians (e.g., faculty of education staff and Ministry of Higher Education personnel, but also World Bank staff, USAID personnel, and members of the two international organization-funded project teams). As a part of this investigation, furthermore, we explore the interplay between and among local and global actors and identify individual and organizational factors that enabled or constrained these efforts to achieve significant and sustainable improvements in the quality of pre-service teacher education in Egypt. In particular, we document how these two projects, with similar objectives, operated in a relatively separate manner during planning and implementation stages, limiting the impact that they might have had if their activities had been more fully coordinated.

This study thus contributes to theoretical debates about globalization by illustrating how the worldwide transformation of higher education is a socially constructed process, one that is more or less successfully produced by real actors – two different international organizations, the government of Egypt as well as Egyptian and non-Egyptian individuals. This study also provides insights for educators, national government officials, and international organization personnel who seek to champion or resist global educational reform initiatives.

Theoretical Issues

In recent years comparative educators and other social scientists have engaged in extensive debates about "globalization" (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Carnoy & Rhoten, 2002; Clayton, 2004; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000). And while world-system or global-level dynamics are by no means new phenomena, these debates have helped to call attention to the ways in which economic, political, and cultural features of a given society – including *educational reform* – can be understood as being shaped by global, national, and/or local processes (Daun, 2002; Ginsburg, 1991).

Some have argued that globalization represents an *imposition* on nation-states and their citizens by dominant countries and elites who control the workings of international financial, trade and other organizations (Amin, 2001; Arnove, 1980; Berman, 1992; Brock-Utne, 2000; Carnoy, 1974; Frank, 1966; Ismael, 1999). This form of globalization is seen to reduce – or erase – local, provincial, and national governments' authority and capacity to determine educational and other social policies and practices given the role played by powerful nations, multinational corporations, and international (financial and trade) organizations (Brown & Lauder, 1996; Capella, 2000; Tabb, 2001).[1] Others have characterized the processes that have led to convergence of educational policies and practices in more positive terms, suggesting that local and national actors voluntarily *borrow or adapt* "good," though foreign, ideas to which they have been exposed through international interactions, including offers by other countries to *lend* such policies and practices (Coombs, 1968; Inkeles & Sirowy, 1984; Meyer & Hannan, 1979; Simmons, 1983; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004).

There are at least two limitations to the way the issues are framed above. First, these portraits either diminish the role of nation-states or treat states as relatively autonomous, rational-choice actors. While viewing the state as autonomous is fraught with theoretical and political problems (see Carnoy, 1982; Dale, 1989; Ginsburg, Wallace, & Miller., 1988; Ginsburg, Cooper, Raghu, & Zegarra, 1990; Willinsky, 2002), there are similar problems with conceiving of globalization as "a process without a subject." That is, we need to avoid conceptualizations that reify "globalization … as a process with its own causal powers pitted against unwilling and unwitting states and their citizens … as a process that somehow plots behind our backs or over our heads" (Robertson, Bonal, & Dale, 2001, p. 1; see also Dale & Robertson, 2002; Weis, 1997). Thus, we need to keep in mind that nation-states differ with respect to political, economic, and military power – a point emphasized by world-system theorists in discussing core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral countries (Hopkins & Wallerstein, 1979; Wallerstein, 1984) – and that these differences have a bearing on how any given country experiences globalization.

Second, these portraits relegate to the shadows the full range of national and international actors. For example, Robertson et al. (2002) argue that "globalization is the outcome of processes that involve real [global organization] actors – economic and political – with real interests" (p. 472). And, in framing his study of the global spread of human rights education, Suarez (2007) indicates

[1] Still others have sought to analyze and promote what they term the praxis of "globalization from below," which involves exercising the "power of solidarity" among the masses (Brecher et al., 2000; see also Danaher & Burbach, 2000).

how intergovernmental organizations and international nongovernmental organizations serve as "receptor sites for transnational ideas … [and as] carriers of modern reform. … [They] promote and diffuse new ideas in education …[T]he more a country is linked to [such international organizations], the more likely the country will be to incorporate global models at the national level" (p. 52; see also McNeely, 1995). Thus, we need to consider international as well as local and national nongovernmental organizations, while recognizing that they have different orientations with respect to the issues they address, the ideologies on which they are based, and the strategies they tend to employ (see Ginsburg, 1998). We also have to keep in mind that various intergovernmental organizations, whether bilateral (e.g., the US Agency for International Development) or multilateral (e.g., the World Bank), may have different interests and assumptions, and thus the global reform agendas that these organizations seek to promote may not always be the same or, if similar, may not be pursued in ways that reinforce each other.

Methodology

This case study draws in part on our observations of events during the time we were staff members of one of the projects focused on the reform of faculties of education. Mark Ginsburg served as the director of the USAID-funded Faculty of Education Reform Project (from May 2004 through March 2006) and Nagwa Megahed was one of the FOER/ERP program specialists, with responsibilities for the policy/practice-oriented research component (from July 2004 through March 2006). Given our active role in the one project and our periodic interactions with key members of the other project, we consider ourselves as observant participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; LeCompte & Preissel, 1993). However, because at the time we only systematically recorded some of our observations and because we seek to balance the voices of the various organizational and individual actors, we mainly make use of the documentary sources, some of which we have easier access to because of our role as participants.

Thus, our analysis of the reform discourses and actions during the 1996-2006 period is based, primarily, on our collection and review of an extensive set of project, national government, and international organization documents and reports. Importantly, as a result of being observant participants we are better able to satisfy one of the general principles of discourse analysis, that it "should deal both with the properties of text … and with what is usually called the context, that is, the other characteristics of the social situation or the communicative event that may systematically influence text" (van Dijk, 1997, p. 2). That is, we are in a somewhat better position – though certainly one that is filtered through our own perspectives and memories – to appreciate how "discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive events and the situation(s), institution(s), and social structure(s) which frame it" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, pp. 258-259).

Our first step was to collect the international organization, government, and project documents. Some of these were on-line and others we had accumulated during the period of our involvement in one of the projects. We also identified published research and other materials, focusing on historical as well as contemporary developments, drawing in part on literature that each author had located as part of previous studies (e.g., Ginsburg & Megahed, 2006 and 2009; Megahed, 1996). We then sorted the various documents into categories, based on which organization or project they represented, as well as ordered them by time (year, month, and sometimes day). What we present below is a partial, though we believe representative, splicing of the words and ideas contained in the texts. We also seek to provide what Huckin (1997) terms as "framing," i.e., the perspective, the angle, slant, or point of view being presented. That is, we engaged mainly in a *micro-*

level textual analysis, seeking to understand the "form and meaning of the text," while considering the *meso-level* discourse practice, which "focuses on the discursive production and interpretation of the text," as well as the *macro-level* socio-cultural practice, which refers to the "context of situation, the institutional context, and the wider socio-cultural context" (Fairclough, 1995, p. 134).

Brief History of Teacher Education in Egypt

The first institution of higher education located in what is now the Arab Republic of Egypt was *Al-Azẖar* University, established in 975 as part of the well-known and respected (Islamic) religious educational system. While this university continues to play a prominent role in Egyptian society, the history of modern higher education in Egypt began in 1908, when the first secular (and private) National University of Egypt was opened in Cairo (*El-Magaales El-Qawmyiah El-Motakhasesah* [National Specialized Councils], 1980). The British colonial administration initially resisted the creation of an Egyptian university, but it came to support the idea, at least in part, to reduce the social and cultural impact of the (private) American University of Cairo – established in 1919 (Salamah, 1963; Williamson, 1987).

By 1925, when Egypt had attained semi-independence from Britain, the National Egyptian University (today called Cairo University) became part of the government system (*El-Shoábah El-Qawmyiah LelUNESCO* [UNESCO National Division], 1970). Subsequently, Faruk 1st University (renamed Alexandria University in 1952) and Ibraheem Basha University (renamed Ain Shams University in 1954) were established in 1942 and 1950, respectively.

Following the 1952 revolution, the new political leaders sought to expand provision of education, including at the post-secondary level, moving especially after 1969 toward having a university or a university branch campus in each governorate (province or state) (*El-Shoábah El-Qawmyiah LelUNESCO* [UNESCO National Division], 1970). In 2006 there were 15 secular state-funded and state-controlled universities in Egypt, in addition to *al-Azẖar* University, which in 1961 became part of the government system, but with a special status. And by 2010, there were 17 public universities, of which 11 were located in the Cairo, Alexandria, and the Delta region (in the north of Egypt), while only six universities were in the Upper Egypt regions (in the south). In addition, there were 15 private universities (Ministry of Higher Education, 2010, p. 12).

Initially, teacher education was organized in Egypt at the pre-university level – with separate institutions for male and female students (as was the case in other countries, (see Ginsburg & Lindsay, 1995). For males, *Dār al-Ulūm* (House of Sciences), established in 1872, and *Madrasset al-Muálemeen al-Markaziyya* (Central School of Male Teachers), founded in 1880, were the first specialized teacher training institutions (Ali & Hassan, 1983). For female teacher preparation, a higher section of the first government primary school for girls (*Madrasset al-Sania*) was opened in 1895, followed by the creation of a Teacher Training School for Girls (*Madrasset al-Muálemat al-Sania*) in 1900, both of which offered two-year programs to prepare primary school teachers (Ali, 1995). With Egypt's semi-independence from Britain in 1922, teacher preparation programs grew in number, so that by "1927, 25 training schools existed for men, and 18 for women" (Cochran, 1986, p. 33).

Institutions designed to prepare teachers remained at the pre-university level until after Egypt's 1952 revolution (Ginsburg & Megahed, 2006). This was accomplished by Ain Shams University, first by incorporating in 1956 the Institute of Education for Male Teachers (founded in

1929) as its Men's Faculty of Education[2] and second by incorporating in 1959 the Institute of Education for Female Teachers (founded in 1933) as its Women' College of Arts, Sciences and Education (Erlich, 1981; Megahed, 1996).

Through both units Ain Shams University offered four-year, pre-service, secondary teacher education programs for undergraduate students as well as one- or two-year programs for graduates of arts and sciences departments (*Saheefat El-Tarbia* [Education Journal], 1968).[3] The curriculum for undergraduates included the following "professional education" requirements as well as course work in arts and sciences, depending on their teaching subject area:

Educational Foundations and Education and Problems of Egyptian Society
History of Education, History of Education in Egypt, and Education System in Egypt
Learning Psychology and Psychology of Childhood, Individuals, and Society
Psychological Hygiene and Mental Abilities
Health Education
General Principles of Curriculum and Teaching Methods
Teaching Methods
Field Experience (one day per week throughout the program plus three weeks during the final two years) (*El-Laèha ElTanfeezia Leqanoon Tanzeem El-Gamáat El-Misriah* [Executive Regulation of the Egyptian Universities Law], Presidential Decision No. 216 in 1956)

This curricular framework at Ain Shams University and a similar one used for post-graduate, pre-service, secondary teacher education were adopted by other faculties of education established in other government universities in Egypt.

Initially, these included the (female) Faculty of Education at Minia University and the (male) Faculty of Education at Assuit University (both opened in 1957) as well as the coeducational faculties of education at the following universities (in the years noted): Alexandria (1966), Alexandria-Tanta (1969),[4] Assiut-Minia (1970),[5] Mansoura (1973),[6] Menoufia (1976), Zagazig (1974), Zagazig-Benha (1976),[7] Helwan (1982), and Cairo-Bani-Suef (1988).[8] With more dispersed institutions offering programs and with the growing demand for teachers as access to primary and secondary schools expanded, the number students enrolled in their undergraduate and post-graduate teacher education programs increased dramatically throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Thus, by 2003 there were 26 faculties of education associated with the then existing 13 universities and enrolling

---

[2] Furthermore, in 1966, when a governmental decree called for co-educational teacher education programs, Ain Shams University's non-university-level College for Male Teachers became a co-educational teacher education college and, in 1970, it was integrated into the Faculty of Education (AUTHOR2, 1996).

[3] In 1983 faculties of education were assigned responsibilities for pre-service primary school teacher preparation (Wilcox, 1988), though until the beginning of the 21st century the programs were mainly staffed by faculty responsible for the secondary teacher education program.

[4] Tanta's faculty of education was established when the institution, which became a separate university in 1972 (initially named Delta University and renamed Tanta University in 1973), was a branch campus of Alexandria University.

[5] Minia's faculty of education was established when the institution, which became a separate university in 1976, was a branch campus of Assiut University.

[6] In 1972 East Delta University was created out of a branch campus of Cairo University and renamed Mansoura University in 1973.

[7] Benha's faculty of education was created when this institution, which became a separate university in 2005, was a branch campus of Zagazig University.

[8] Bani-Suef's faculty of education was established when this institution, which became a separate university in 2005, was a branch campus of Cairo University.

71,677 male and 113,976 female students (Central Agency for Public Mobilisation and Statistics, 2004). Given this expansion, but with little change in organization, curriculum, etc., there were increasing calls for reform of faculties of education, especially beginning in the mid-1990s, by Egyptian educators and government officials as well as, perhaps more significantly, by representatives of bi-lateral and multi-lateral organizations (Ginsburg & Megahed, 2006).

Calls for Reforming Faculties of Education

For example, a World Bank "Staff Appraisal Report" (October 21, 1996, p. 8), leading to the creation of the Egypt Education Enhancement Program, emphasized the need to "improve the quality of pre-service programs, focus[ing] on inputs (including the quality of students who enter these programs), processes, and outputs." The report highlighted the following problems: "low or uneven faculty quality, inadequate facilities …, weak instructional resources …, and uneven management;…quality controls on organizational entry into the provision of pre-service training are weak;…standards that prevail informally in the pre-service system have not been updated;…lack of incentives for institutions to improve the quality of their programs" (World Bank, 1996, Annex 6, p. 2).

Just weeks after the World Bank "Staff Appraisal Report" was released, the Egyptian government convened a "National Conference on Developing Teachers' Preparation, Training, and Welfare" on 9 November 1996. This conference, attended by Egyptian and international experts, was stimulated by the fact that the teaching "profession as a whole ha[d] received strong criticism from the media, parents and the academics," focusing on four interrelated issues: 1) the unsatisfactory standard of teachers' subject knowledge…; 2) current teaching methodologies … provide little if any opportunity for active student learning;… 3) the theoretical component of teacher education courses…do not attend to [practical] elements of teacher knowledge; … [and] 4) practical training … is also under criticism. … How the student teachers are to be evaluated remains an important issue" (Dyab et al., 1998, pp. 5-7; see also El-Mofty, 1996; Galal, 1996; Heggi, 1996).

The issue of reforming faculties of education remained on the agenda in Egypt. For instance, in February 2000 the Egyptian government convened a National Conference on Higher Education Reform, an event culminating three years of expert committee meetings and public hearings. The "Declaration for Action" adopted at the end of this conference proposed 25 sub-projects to be undertaken, including "a sub-project to improve the quality of Faculties of Education (pre-service teacher training) which is supported with a [World Bank] credit of $13 million from the ongoing [Education Enhancement Project]" (World Bank, 2002, p. 3).

In 2002, the Mission of the US Agency for International Development in Egypt (USAID/Egypt), which had been funding education sector activities since the mid-1970s and especially from 1981, commissioned an "Education Sector Strategy Proposal." This document noted that the Ministry of Higher Education and education deans and professors acknowledged the need for reforms, and stated that "pre-service teacher training [should be] radically reformed in the faculties of education to meet new professional standards, …[including instituting] new admissions, screening, basic skills testing, and graduation requirements" (Aguirre International, 2002, p. iii). The document also argued that "the massive numbers of students lead the [faculties of education] to offer large lecture classes, with a heavy emphasis on theory rather than practice. There is a totally inadequate amount of time spent in school classrooms for observation, assisting or student teaching" (Aguirre International, 2002, p. 9). And in its "Program Description," which it developed the following year to guide applications for implementing the Education Reform Program, USAID/Egypt claimed that "there has been no attempt to review or upgrade teacher preparation

programs at teachers' colleges since the first college…was established in the 1950s" (USAID/Egypt, 2003a, pp. 32-33).

Clearly, there appeared to be a consensus among various national and international actors about the need to reform faculties of education in Egypt. Moreover, the various actors seemed to appropriate the global discourse on such reforms, calling for less theory, more practice-related content, more field-based experiences, and the use of active-learning methods by professors and student teachers (see Ginsburg & Lindsay, 1995; Ginsburg & Megahed, 2009; Schwille & Dembélé, 2006). Nevertheless, two *separate*, major reform initiatives were launched in the early years of the 21st century: a) the Faculty of Education Enhancement Project, organized as a component of the Ministry of Higher Education's Higher Education Enhancement Project and funded through a loan from the World Bank, and b) the Faculties of Education Reform "project," organized as a component of the Education Reform Program and funded by USAID.

Case Study

Overview of World Bank-Funded Initiative

In March, 2002 the World Bank issued a "Project Appraisal Document," setting in motion a loan to the Government of Egypt in support of a "Higher Education Enhancement Project" (HEEP). The document states that the "Government acknowledges that it is confronting a crisis in the higher education system. … [and] that there are real challenges to be faced in the sector, [including] … the quality and relevance of higher education programs" (World Bank 2002, p. 3). After further discussion, the "25 specific reform initiatives" included in the 2000 Conference "Declaration for Action" (see above), the World Bank and the Egyptian government agreed in April 2002 to embark on six loan-funded projects (Draft Protocol of Cooperation, September 2004, p. 1). Overall, HEEP was designed to "create the conditions fundamental to improving the quality and efficiency of the higher education system in Egypt through legislative reform, institutional restructuring, and establishment of independent quality assurance mechanisms and monitoring systems" (World Bank, 2002, p. 2).

It is important to note that HEEP was to focus through its various projects on all faculties (e.g., Engineering, Humanities, Social Sciences) in all universities and technical colleges. Besides the Faculty of Education Enhancement Project (FOEP), the other five initiatives were the Egyptian Technical Colleges Project, Faculty and Leadership Development Project, the Higher Education Enhancement Project Fund, the Information and Communications Technology Project, and the Quality Assurance and Accreditation Project. However, as noted the faculties of education (as well as technical colleges) were singled out for special attention in a separate project, addressing issues of faculty and leadership development, information and computer technology, and quality assurance and accreditation. The Faculties of Education Enhancement Project (FOEP) was initially a part of the (Basic) Education Enhancement Project, but beginning in December 2003 began functioning under HEEP. Of the US $13 million included in the World Bank's loan for FOEP, US $10 million was designated for equipment (e.g., labs, computers, other resources) and US $ 3 million for training. According to the "Staff Appraisal Document," the goal of the training was to "enhance course offerings and faculty skill in using and teaching about new methods and educational resources" (World Bank, 1996, Section 3, p. 1).[9]

[9] In addition to the (basic) Education Enhancement Project (World Bank, 1996) and the Higher Education Enhancement Project (World Bank, 2002a), during this period a World Bank loan was also used to support a Secondary Education Enhancement Project (World Bank, 1999).

During the tenure of FOEP's first director (2002-2004), his main efforts were directed towards publicizing the project, soliciting plans from the various faculties of education, and submitting orders for the equipment associated with the labs mentioned above. In addition, the project mobilized hundreds of faculty of education academic staff to participate in short courses to qualify for the UNESCO-developed International Computer Drivers License.

When a new director was appointed in late-2004, he drafted a "Strategy for Enhancing Faculties of Education" and an accompanying "Action Plan, November 2004-September 2005." In the document he articulated a set of goals and objectives, signaling a significantly expanded focus for FOEP/HEEP,[10] including: "define a broad vision and mission of faculties of education; …define qualifications and standards of the final output of the faculties; …set up a new system of selecting candidates and built up a test battery; …create a new system of practicum and internship year; …create a system for evaluation in faculties of education; …set up standards for all specializations; define programs of study in each specialization; describe all the courses of all programs; …implement programs of staff development; …[and] assure quality of the system of teacher education" (Heggi, 2004, p. 2). Assisted by members of the Faculties of Education Reform Committee, the new director set about work to achieve these ambitious goals, at the time not knowing if World Bank funding would be available beyond August 2006.

Their efforts were duly recognized by the World Bank mission team conducting the Mid-Term Evaluation of HEEP (18-30 June 2005), which concluded that "the FOEP is now on track to meet many [donor objectives] and implement many of the recommendations of previous supervision missions" (IRB, 2005, Annex 2, p. 24). However, the mission team also called attention to the need for "bottom-up reform," noting that "while the Project Director has involved hundreds of colleagues in the process over the past six months, it is now critical for each [faculty of education] to develop its own strategic plan" (IRBD, 2005, Annex 2, p. 24).

Nine months later the World Bank's "Supervision Mission" (1-26 March 2006) team noted what had been accomplished to date through FOEP. The mission team highlighted that 50% of the faculty members and administrators in 26 faculties of education has participated in professional development programs, including "evaluation and training, (ii) effective teaching, and (iii) school leadership." The mission team also commended the fact that "fifty-four competitively funded projects are currently in progress, …[including:] establishing vision and mission for [a faculty of education]; …establishing a faculty development system; …and improving relations between faculties of education and the [Ministry of Education] through internships for undergraduates. Moreover, the mission team noted positively that "a conceptual framework and document detailing academic standards corresponding with the [school] teacher competencies specified by the [Ministry of Education] has been developed…[and that] four faculties of education have revised their respective curricula and courses to correspond with the conceptual framework." However, this report cautioned that although "'College Councils' of 12 other faculties of education have agreed to adopt the new framework, … there is no guarantee that all faculties will adopt the new standards to revise their curriculum" (IBRD, 2006, pp. 14-15).

[10] Indeed, the new director appears to have been responding to a World Bank recommendation in this regard. As noted in the 2005 Mid-Term Evaluation of HEEP, "previous supervision missions in 2003 and 2004 found the progress of the FOEP to be slow and not targeting the [donor objectives]. Recommendations were made for … an expansion of the program emphasis from hardware and computer literacy to a broader range of goals" (IRBD, 2005, Annex 2, p. 23).

Overview of USAID-Funded Initiative

Building on its previous efforts (since 1975, and especially since 1981),[11] the USAID Mission in Egypt decided to fund a major Educational Reform Program (ERP). This program was designed initially to run from 2004 to 2009 and was funded through two separate cooperative agreements with the U.S.-based, nongovernmental organization consortia responsible for the USAID/Washington-established Educational Quality Improvement Program (EQUIP1 and EQUIP2) mechanisms.[12] These included the Academy for Education Development as the lead organization for EQUIP2 and the American Institutes for Research as the lead organization of EQUIP1, along with a subset of organizations in their respective consortia). Although funded through two separate cooperative agreements, ERP was to be "implemented in an integrated fashion…as a single program working through common procedures, project operational structures, and educational philosophy" (AED et al., 2004a, p. 7; AIR et al., 2004a, pp. 3-4).

Organizational and philosophical integration between EQUIP1 and EQUIP2, across consortia organizations within each EQUIP, and among different components and activities of the program presented sizeable challenges during the implementation of this ambitious reform-support program. For example, EQUIP1's first annual work plan (AIR et al., 2004b) was structured around the following divisions: a) Educational Quality, b) Nonformal Education and School Governance, and c) Community Organization and Development, while EQUIP2's first annual work plan (AED et al., 2004b) identified the following organizational divisions: d) Decentralized Governance and Management, e) Education System Support, f) Monitoring and Evaluation, and g) Faculties of Education Reform.

In July 2005, when ERP submitted a single annual work plan – for year 2 (ERP, 2005), including components associated with EQUIP1 and EQUIP2, it was organized around the following "theme groups" (incorporating the noted divisions): a) *Community Participation* (Community Organization and Development, Nonformal Education), b) *Decentralization* (Decentralized Governance and Management), c) *Monitoring and Evaluation* (Monitoring and Evaluation), d) *Professional Development* (Educational Quality, Education System Support, Faculties of Education Reform), and e) *Standards* (Nonformal Education, Educational Quality, Education Systems Support, Faculties of Education Reform). There were also significant challenges to achieving organizational and philosophical integration between staff in the "headquarters" office (in Cairo) and those in the seven governorate- (state- or province-) level offices, where, particularly for EQUIP1, a large majority of the managerial, technical, and support staff were based.[13]

---

[11] According to USAID/Egypt (2003b), "since 1975 USAID/EGYPT has provided over $700 million in support of the government's improvements in education and training" (p. 7).

[12] In 2003 USAID (in Washington, DC) funded these EQUIP "Leader with Associates Awards." In negotiation with USAID missions in a range of "developing" countries, each EQUIP was to address a related set of concerns. EQUIP1 was designed to focus on classroom- and school-level educational interventions that improve student learning and closely involve the local community, while EQUIP2 was conceived to target policy and systems development, management, and education finance at the cross-community, district and national levels.

[13] ERP was designed to work mainly in 7 (of 26) governorates: Aswan, Alexandria, Bani-Suef, Cairo, Fayoum, Minia, and Qena. Within each governorate ERP worked with educators and community members associated with a "family of schools," including all levels of formal and nonformal education (preschool, primary, preparatory, general/academic secondary, vocational/technical secondary, university-based teacher preparation, and adult). Complementing this decentralized focus on schooling and teacher education in the governorates, ERP was also tasked with supporting policy dialogues at the national level, involving educators, government officials, and representatives of the private sector.

In its Program Description, developed to request an application for ERP from the EQUIP2 consortium, USAID/Egypt identifies the goal of ensuring "that Egypt's future teachers have the academic and practical preparation to provide quality teaching and promote active learning," specifying that FOER/ERP should work on reforming "the curriculum and assessment system;" developing "pre-service teacher performance standards;" preparing "FOE senior staff … for … supporting reform;" and creating "internship programs, parameters for teacher licensure, and … accreditation bodies" (USAID/Egypt, 2003b, p. 32).[14] Additionally, the Program Description highlights the use of a bottom-up as well as top-down strategy, moving from decisions by the national Faculties of Education Reform Committee to actions by individual faculties of education and then back decisions by the Faculties of Education Reform Committee and other units in the Ministry of Higher Education (USAID/Egypt, 2003b, p. 33).

The Technical Application submitted by the Academy for Educational Development, Michigan State University, and others to USAID/Egypt on behalf of the EQUIP2 consortium reiterates what was stated in the Program Description (and excerpted above), but also includes a few new foci: faculty research and service learning (AED et al., 2004a, pp. 44-45). It also highlights a plan to "develop key relationships between Egyptian and U.S. educators (university leadership, deans, vice-deans, department chair, faculty) to assess reform issues and develop solutions … [through] exchanges and study tours … [and e-strategy-based] paired mentoring" (AED et al., 2004a, pp. 40-41).

FOER's section of EQUIP2/ERP's first annual work plan, submitted in October 2004, identifies its mission as contributing to achieving USAID's strategic objectives and being "aligned with the strategic plan of the Ministry of Education" (AED et al., 2004b, p. 57). At the same time, FOER/ERP's mission focuses on aiding "in the more general process of reforming faculties of education (in line with directives and initiatives of the Ministry of Higher Education, … the Faculties of Education Reform Committee and other components of the Higher Education Enhancement Project)" (AED et al., 2004b, p. 57). Moreover, FOER/ERP's goals are listed as follows: "a) enhance the quality of pre-service teacher education programs to better enable FOE graduates to meet or exceed established teacher standards and b) strengthen the impact of research conducted by FOE academic staff and graduate students on decisions about policy and practice in schools and universities" (AED et al., 2004b, p. 57).

More specifically, FOER/ERP's work plan lists ten objectives, to provide support to faculty of education staff (in collaboration with Ministry of Education personnel) in 1) "developing and implementing performance and content standards for…FOE pre-service teacher education programs…; 2) [refining] the curriculum and curricular materials…; 3) reorient[ing] pedagogy … used in classes toward more student-centered, active-learning, and technology-enhanced approaches; 4) utilizing a range of approaches to assess student knowledge and skills...; 5) improv[ing] and expand[ing] field experiences (including school-community service-learning activities … and teaching practice); 6) undertaking action (decision-oriented) research and participat[ing] in policy/practice dialogues…; 7) deepening the[ir] involvement…in collaborative, international research on education and (pre-service and in-service) teacher education…; 8) lead[ing], manag[ing], and facilitate[ing] the change process…; 9) [changing or establishing] policies…[to] facilitate the desired reforms…; and 10) utilizing e-strategies to facilitate…[broader and more frequent] participation" (AED et al., 2004b, pp. 57-58).

---

[14] The Program Description mentions the importance of "link[ing] FOEs and MOE training entities … to reform in-service training," noting that Ministry of Education—Ministry of Higher Education "collaboration is needed not only to ensure the hiring of trained teachers, but also to prepare teacher education candidates to teach in a less didactic fashion" (USAID/Egypt, 2003, pp. 32-33).

FOER/ERP's activities began with visits (including observations and meetings) to each of the focal faculties of education and a National Seminar, 29-30 September 2004, involving representatives from these faculties of education as well as key personnel from the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Higher Education, USAID, and the World Bank. However, as activities informed by the visits and the National Seminar were being initiated, issues arose regarding the relationship between FOER/ERP and FOEP/HEEP. As a result, from late-December 2004 through early-May 2005, FOER/ERP curtailed its direct activities with faculties of education and devoted time to developing alternative scenarios and working out – with the assistance of key staff from the Ministry of Higher Education, the Ministry of Education, ERP, and USAID – a collaboration and coordination agreement with FOEP/HEEP (see discussion in next section).

As a result of these deliberations, when FOER re-launched its activities with a Forum on "Building School-University Partnerships to Improve Educational Quality" on 11 May 2005, its focus had shifted. The shift involved a) reducing FOER's direct involvement in assisting in reforms in education faculties' curriculum, pedagogy, student assessment, and management/organization and b) emphasizing school-university partnerships as a mechanism for promoting reforms in the school system and the faculties of education.[15]

By July 2005, when ERP's annual work plan for year 2 was submitted to USAID/Egypt, FOER staff had elaborated on its new approach and strategy, seeking to follow the "Agreement on Collaboration and Coordination" with FOEP/HEEP, while also trying to operate effectively as part of ERP's refined arrangement (i.e., theme groups) for promoting integration across divisions and between the EQUIPs (see above). In particular, the latter point meant that FOER/ERP's work and implementation plans were organized under the heading of "Professional Development" and in relation to the work and activity plans of the Educational Quality and Education System Support divisions (ERP, 2005).

Between July 2005 and March 2006, FOER accomplished several things. First, the five FOE-MOE taskforces finalized the development of performance *standards* and indicators for student teachers (and began work on rubrics and tools) for pre-service primary teachers as well as pre-service secondary teachers of Arabic, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. Second, thirty-threeFOE-MOE teams (representing the seven focal governorates) submitted proposals for *action and decision-oriented research* projects. Third, the seven governorate-based FOE-MOE working teams conducted SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, obstacles, and threats) analyses and developed strategic plans for improving *teaching practice* (including mentoring) and instituting community-based learning activities for student teachers. Fourth, the seven FOE-MOE working teams conducted SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, obstacles, and threats) analyses and developed strategic plans for introducing *induction programs* (including mentoring) for new teachers. Fifth, a national "Professional Development Working Group" (involving MOE and MOHE personnel) and seven governorate-based "Professional Development Advisory Groups" (involving personnel from education faculties as well as the school system, training system, and supervisory support system) had been initiated and were providing feedback to ERP staff as well as engaging in discussions toward deepening reforms of the professional development system.

Nevertheless, at the end of March 2006, FOER/ERP's activities were again halted. In communicating its decision to "terminate" FOER/ERP's activities, USAID/Egypt requested a plan

---

[15] As indicated in the "Final Report of the FOER Forum," FOER/ERP would focus on: "a) School-University Partnership Reform Teams, b) Reform Catalyst Networks, c) Performance Standards Task Forces, d) Teaching Practice Task Forces and Partnership Teams, e) Induction Program Task Forces and Partnership Teams, f) Action and Decision-Oriented Research Projects, and g) On-line/Off-line Courses and Study Tours" (FOER, 2005, p. 1).

for realigning activities and the costs to other divisions of ERP, with a focus on serving the needs of the Ministry of Education (and not the Ministry of Higher Education).[16]

Relations between the USAID and World Bank Projects

As noted above, although there were two distinct initiatives to reform faculties of education (organized as part of two separate projects and funded by different mechanisms by two international organizations), these initiatives did not occur in total isolation of each other. For instance, the Strategy Proposal (Aguirre, 2002), commissioned by USAID/Egypt to inform it plans for what became ERP, suggests that FOER/ERP would "work with" the Ministry of Higher Education, the Ministry of Education, USAID, and the World Bank, "and other projects in coordinating teacher pre- and in-service training" (Aguirre International, 2002, p. 19). More specifically, it states that:

> USAID, through the new [FOER Project], provide technical assistance, international study tours, support for conferences and workshops, publication assistance, and possibly scholarships for advanced study in critical fields to the [Faculties of Education Reform Committee] and its staff. They have requested this assistance and welcome USAID as a partner in the daunting task of reforming the whole pre-service teacher education system and graduate education programs. (Aguirre International, 2002, p. 18)

Nevertheless, the Strategy Proposal does not frame what became FOER/ERP as merely filling gaps in a reform plan directed by the Faculties of Education Reform Committee. Indeed, Aguirre International (2002) expressed that "USAID [c]ould *leverage* approximately $13.0 million in under-utilized [World Bank] … earmarked for [faculty of education] reform" (Aguirre International, 2002, p. 27).

Similarly, the Program Description (USAID/Egypt, 2003b, p. 7), developed by USAID/Egypt to guide EQUIP2's proposal for its role in ERP, also mentions that "the Ministry of Higher Education has developed and funded a multidimensional reform program for the tertiary sector [HEEP,] including a Faculties of Education project." Note, however, that when repeating the above-mentioned "welcome" by the Faculties of Education Reform Committee (and the World Bank) to additional reform support, USAID/Egypt (2003b, p. 33) described the relationship as one of "partnership" and reiterated that the US $13 million World Bank loan funds represented a "window of opportunity for USAID to leverage assistance with another major donor."

EQUIP2's technical proposal for ERP adopts the language of the Program Description. The proposal calls attention to the "ambitious reform project under the leadership of a Faculties of Education Reform Committee," mentions that the "Committee and the World Bank welcome USAID as a partner in the daunting task of reforming the pre-service teacher education system," and observes that the "US $13 million in World Bank funds" creates a "window of opportunity for USAID to leverage assistance with another major donor" (AED et al., 2004a, p. 43).

---

[16] Initially, the remaining FOER staff developed a reconfiguration plan, but full consideration of this plan was delayed when it became clear that USAID/Egypt and the Ministry of Higher Education would re-engage in negotiations toward identifying some ERP activities to serve the needs of the Ministry of Higher Education. Eventually, in June 2007 – 15 months after FOER/ERP had been closed down, USAID/Egypt and the Ministry of Higher Education signed a cooperation protocol emphasizing technical assistance and training support for faculties of kindergarten teacher education and faculties of specific education (university faculties that prepare teachers for subjects, such as home economics, art, and music) in conducting self-assessments and developing institutional improvement plans toward achieving accreditation.

Even before ERP was officially operating in July 2004, informal interactions took place between staff of the FOER/ERP division and key personnel of the HEEP. Not only was a key FOER/ERP staff member (Nadia Touba) serving as a MOHE-appointed member of the Faculties of Education Reform Committee, but soon after his arrival in Egypt, the FOER/ERP Director (Mark Ginsburg) began to arrange informal meetings in June, followed by formal meetings starting in July, with the overall director of HEEP and the directors of the other HEEP projects, including FOEP. In addition, FOER/ERP staff, sometimes facilitated by USAID/Egypt personnel, engaged in interactions with the Executive Director of the Foreign Projects Coordination Unit of the Supreme Council of Universities who was designated as FOER/ERP's key contact person from the Ministry of Higher Education. These and other inter-project interactions and discussions led to the drafting of a "Protocol of Cooperation."

Although this draft "Protocol" was never finalized and signed, it reflected a move toward clarifying inter-project relations as well as indicated a division of labor ("roles and responsibilities") and an approach for collaboration between the two projects. The draft "Protocol" was conceived to promote "cooperation" and "avoid duplication of efforts" by outlining "the reform areas and appropriate strategies to be adopted by each of the projects" (Draft "Protocol of Cooperation," September 2004, p. 1). The draft "Protocol" specifies that FOER/ERP would support efforts to develop "performance standards" and FOEP/HEEP would help organize task forces to develop "content standards."[17] With regard to curriculum and materials development, pedagogy, and student assessment, it states that FOER/ERP would "fund, organize, and monitor national-level workshops for training a number of master trainers/faculty developers," while FOEP/HEEP would "hire the master trainers/faculty developers trained in the FOER-organized, national workshops and use them to conduct institutional-level workshops in all [faculties of education, which] FOEP [would] fund, organize, and monitor" (Draft Protocol, September 2004, pp. 2-3). In addition, it notes that FOER/ERP would support "task forces that lead to the identification of policy issues and strategic approaches for improving the quality of teaching-related field experiences … [and] micro-teaching" (Draft Protocol, September 2004, p. 2).

When the new Director of FOEP/HEEP was appointed in November 2004, he wrote in his above-mentioned document ("Strategy for Reforming Faculties of Education" and "Action Plan)" that part of his committee's mission would involve "[b]uilding up linkages with sector committee [of deans of faculties of education], MOE, and [FOER] and coordinating with them" (Heggi, 2004, p. 2). However, such inter-project linkages and coordination could not be based on the draft "Protocol," in part because, as noted above, the new FOEP/HEEP Director's plan reflected a much more comprehensive approach than had been communicated to FOER/ERP by FOEP/HEEP's previous director. A series of meeting took place in December to develop a new plan for coordination and collaboration, including one held on 22 December 2004, which appeared to result in consensus about a framework for inter-project relations. This plans was referenced in the meeting draft minutes:

> Agreed Upon Actions: 1. *Collaboration*: All the different components that are covered by both projects were tabulated and discussed and agreements were reached on the nature of collaboration on each item… 2. *Avoiding Overlap and Duplication*: Both projects address the reform of faculties of education using different approaches. …[I]t was agreed that in any faculties where either the [World Bank] or the USAID-funded projects…work intensively

[17] Performance standards specify relevant knowledge and skills of student teachers during the teaching practice phase of pre-service teacher education, while content standards identify the relevant knowledge and skills to be the focus of various courses students would take prior to teaching practice.

> with training and workshops … that the other project will not overlap in those faculties. (Draft minutes by the World Bank/Egypt staff member, 23 December)

The plan was also noted in the draft "Statement of Coordination and Collaboration:"

> The purpose of this statement is to clarify the division of labor between the two projects, and thus to avoid confusion and duplication of effort. …Through coordination and collaboration of the two projects, Egypt's faculties of education will benefit from these two different, yet complementary strategies. The lessons learned from each project will…inform on-going efforts as well as enable a synthesis of ideas and practices developed within both of the projects. (FOER/ERP Director, 25 December)

As with the previously drafted "Protocol", this draft "Statement" assigns primary responsibility for developing performance standards to FOER/ERP and content standards to FOEP/HEEP. It also "identify[ies] certain [faculties of education] with each project for purposes of intensive work at the level of the institution (e.g., professional development, technical assistance, campus visits and seminars, etc.)…, [clarifying that] this division of responsibility…does not restrict faculty members from any FOE from participating on national committees or task forces (e.g., those related to standards) organized by either project, nor does it preclude ideas developed from one project being shared with colleagues in other FOE's" (Draft Statement of Collaboration and Coordination, 25 December 2004, pp. 2-3).

Furthermore, the draft "Statement" describes the strategies of the two projects as follows: "*FOEP/HEEP*'s general approach involves: a) convening national committees to develop frameworks, models, concepts, etc., which are then disseminated to individual faculties of education for their information and adoption (especially during a subsequent piloting phase) and b) using a training-of-trainers strategy, through which certain centrally-determined knowledge and skills will be diffused to staff in faculties of education. *FOER/ERP*'s general approach involves assisting individual faculties of education to develop and implement "[Faculty of Education] Improvement Plans by a) facilitating the efforts of representatives of faculties of education to gather information (current situation, desired alternatives, potential obstacles, change strategies) with respect to leadership/decision-making structure, curriculum/materials development, pedagogy, student assessment, and teaching practice; b) arranging for campus visits and campus-based seminars to provide technical assistance; c) organizing e-conferences; d) conducting participant training study tours to the U.S.; and e) offering other professional development activities" (Draft "Statement of Coordination and Collaboration," 25 December 2004, p. 1).

However, if consensus was reached during the 22 December meeting, key points of that agreement seemed to evaporate soon thereafter. In any case, a series of meetings took place in January and March 2005, involving representatives from the Supreme Council of Universities, the Ministry of Higher Education, the Ministry of Education, USAID, World Bank, HEEP, ERP, FOEP, and FOER. Eventually, a "Statement of Agreement for Coordination and Collaboration between FOEP/HEEP and FOER/ERP" was finalized and orally agreed to at a meeting on 7 March 2005, which was attended by all the key stakeholders. Although this "Statement" was never formally signed by all parties and placed on file, the document came to be seen as the framework within which the two projects would operate:

> The purpose of this statement is to clarify the responsibilities of the two projects, and thus to avoid confusion/duplication as well as to create a synergistic effort. ...This

> statement…identifies the areas in which FOEP/HEEP and FOER/ERP will coordinate activities, discusses the areas in which FOEP/HEEP and FOER/ERP will collaborate, and outlines an organizational structure for enabling the two projects to achieve their common goal of improving the quality of teaching in Egypt. …
>
> Personnel associated with both projects will seek to coordinate activities in areas in which one of the projects has primary responsibility. …FOER/ERP will have primary responsibility for engaging FOE and MOE personnel in a standards-based, decentralization-oriented reform of the following components of the school system: a) in-service training system, b) supervisory system, and c) schools within the families of schools. …FOEP/HEEP will have primary responsibility for undertaking activities designed to reform faculties of education and pre-service teacher education programs in the following areas: a) curriculum development, b) pedagogy, and c) assessment and evaluation. …
>
> Personnel associated with both FOEP/HEEP and FOER/ERP would jointly take responsibilities for the following areas, which constitute key points of intersection between the reform efforts in faculties of education and in the school system: a) [performance and content] standards for faculty of education pre-service teacher education programs, b) teaching practice (and other field experiences), and c) new teacher induction programs …

The Statement also refers to the responsibilities and the membership of a Policy Committee, an Executive Committee, and three standing subcommittees (focused on standards, teaching practice, and induction programs). These committees were identified as formal mechanisms for communication as well as coordination and collaboration.

After the Agreement was written and orally agreed to, some interactions between representatives of the two projects occurred. These included: a) meetings between project directors, sometimes with other staff members; b) attendance and participation of key personnel from one project at activities organized by the other project; c) continued involvement in the Faculty of Education Reform Committee by an FOER/ERP staff member, though not as a project representative, d) exchange of some project documents with individuals associated with the other project, and e) meetings of the subcommittees held jointly (on both 8 June 2005 and 26 February 2006) and separately (one each on 14, 15, and 16 June 2005).

One might conclude that, although the World Bank Mid-Term Evaluation of HEEP (18-30 June 2005) encouraged that "[s]ynergies must be maintained and further developed between the [Ministry of Education] and Ministry of Higher Education, FOEP and [FOER/ERP]" (IRBD, 2005, p. 24), for the most part the two project staffs and their respective donor agencies engaged in their separate activities, with only periodic communication and even more limited coordination and collaboration across projects. Indeed, the subcommittees did not formally meet between June 2005 and February 2006, with this February meeting being convened after a new Minister of Higher Education (appointed in November 2005) expressed concerns about the coordination and collaboration between the two projects and the HEEP Director was encouraged to arrange a meeting involving the FOER/ERP Director, the FOEP/HEEP Director, and the ERP Chief of Party, which occurred on 20 February 2006.

Conclusion

The case of reforming faculties of education in Egypt during a ten-year period from the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s can be understood as a part of a process of globalization, more specifically a global reform of teacher education. One-hundred years after the first secular university was founded in Egypt (now Cairo University), when Egypt was a British colony, and 40 years after the first university-based faculty of education was established (in Ain Shams University), after Egypt's 1952 revolution achieved political independence from Britain, teacher education reform was put on the agenda. We believe this occurred in the late-1990s and early 2000s because of the interventions of a multilateral and a bilateral, intergovernmental organization, respectively, the World Bank and USAID. While these two international organizations cannot be seen as the only engines of the reform, they certainly played a key role in starting the engines and keeping the gas tanks (relatively) full.

Moreover, the proposed reforms (e.g., improving assessments of entrants and graduates, increasing a focus on practice versus theory in coursework, expanding the amount of time devoted to field experiences, and organizing "induction" programs to support and guide new teachers) were clearly in line with the global teacher education reform discourses characteristic of the last decade of the 20th century and the first decade of the 21st century (Ginsburg and Lindsay, 1995; Schwille and Dembélé, 2006). This is not to argue that these were "foreign" ideas imposed on Egypt (e.g., see Arnove, 1980; Berman, 1992; Carnoy, 1974). Indeed, some of these ideas had been articulated previously by educators and government officials in this country, and the Egyptian government played a role in promoting and shaping the reforms. Thus, the process might be viewed as a form of receptive borrowing (e.g., see Coombs, 1968; Simmons, 1983; Steiner-Khamsi, 2004).

However, not all possible (Egyptian or non-Egyptian) ideas for reforming faculties of education were promoted through the World Bank- and USAID-funded projects. In effect, the World Bank and USAID – through fiscal and technical assistance mechanisms – channeled certain globally-taken-for-granted ideas and not others. Thus, the case of reforming faculties of education in Egypt cannot be understood as "a process without a subject … [or] as a process with its own causal powers pitted against unwilling and unwitting states" (Robertson et al., 2001, p. 1). Relevant here are international organizational actors, such as the World Bank and USAID, but also the Academy for Educational Development (a nongovernmental organization) and Michigan State University (a US-based state university), which served as "receptor sites" for global ideas (see Suarez, 2007). Furthermore, the case study highlighted the roles of individual actors, both non-Egyptian and Egyptian, with the latter being involved as Ministry of Higher Education and university personnel as well as staff members of the World Bank, USAID, and the two project teams.

The case study not only documented how – through the words and actions of organizational and individual actors – global ideas influenced developments in Egypt. It also illustrated how the influence of these global ideas was weakened because of some of these actors' words and actions. In particular, we focused on how the relationships between the two international organizations and the two project teams limited the effect that these two reform initiatives had on Egyptian faculties of education. Certainly, the fact that FOER/ERP's activities were twice halted during a two-year period, in part due to problems arising from inter-project relations, testifies that its mission, goals, and objectives were not fully realized. And, it seems likely that both FOER/ERP and FOEP/HEEP would have been able to accomplish more had the two projects been able to coordinate and collaborate more effectively.

The case study illuminated instances, during the planning and implementation stages, of moves toward inter-project cooperation, collaboration, and even integration. Nevertheless, more

often the dominant form of interaction between the projects resembles what has been labeled *parallel play*, "a form of social participation … in which [one] plays near other[s] with similar materials but does not really interact with them,' let alone engages in "associative play" or "cooperative play" (quotes from Berk, 2000, p. 374; concepts from Parten, 1932). Without a doubt more time and effort could have been devoted by various individuals, including ourselves, toward realizing cooperative, collaborative, and integrative activities. We certainly acknowledge that individual and project team egos and competitiveness entered into the mix, as did the encouragement of "clients" – administrators and professors in the faculties of education – who expressed preferences for the approaches being used by one or the other project.

In addition, one needs to consider the roles played by international organizations – the World Bank and USAID – and not just the individuals serving as staff members. For instance, the two organizations, through different forms and different extents of dialogue with the Government of Egypt, developed two faculty of education reform projects which differed in important ways. First, each faculty of education "project" was actually a subproject of a larger, complex reform initiative. *FOEP/HEEP* was linked to the five other HEEP projects (and initially with other components of the Education Enhancement Project), while *FOER/ERP* was connected with six other ERP divisions (particularly the two other divisions of the Professional Development theme group). Second, each project had somewhat different philosophical underpinnings and strategies for implementation. FOEP/HEEP operated primarily as a centralized project with a top-down reform strategy, while FOER/ERP functioned primarily as a more decentralized project with a bottom-up reform strategy. Third, each project was organized differently for implementation. FOEP/HEEP was set up through a World Bank-Egyptian Government loan agreement, and was implemented by Egyptian personnel reporting to the Ministry of Higher Education, while World Bank employees monitored the activities. In contrast, FOER/ERP was set up as a cooperative agreement between USAID/Egypt and a consortium of U.S.-based organizations (notably, the Academy for Educational Development and Michigan State University), which hired U.S. and Egyptian staff and consultants to implement the project, while USAID/Egypt monitored the work and budgets.

This case study offers lessons to be learned regarding planning and implementing educational reform in global contexts for those who work in international organizations, national/local governments, and educational institutions. For international organization personnel (both intergovernmental and nongovernmental) one may understand better the opportunities and limitations of separate versus joint efforts. Assuming shared goals, better coordination in planning and implementation is advised, in relation to projects being supported by each organization, across projects (or perhaps better joint activities) organized by multiple organizations, and between the international organizations and the key national government units.

For government officials and educators, how these lessons are applied would likely depend not only on one's institutional affiliation but also one's perspectives on the value and appropriateness of specified globally circulated educational reforms. Certainly, those subscribing to the "conspiracy theory" of international development assistance – that is, "the conviction that foreign or local agents are engineering episodes, events, and public or foreign policies to advance their own strategic interests against those of the country in question" (Sayed, 2006, p. 91 – would be more likely to draw on these lessons to block such reforms, while the lessons may help others to more successfully achieve their designed ends. While the financial and technical resources made available by international organization can carry considerable weight in shaping reform initiatives in a given country, this study makes clear that government officials and educators are not just pawns in some internal chess game. There are spaces to influence the directions of the reform, either

reinforcing or deflecting – at least for a time – the globally circulating ideas for educational policy and practice.

References

Academy for Educational Development (AED), Michigan State University, the Research Triangle Institute, Macro International, & the University of Pittsburgh (2004a, 21 January). *Program Description for EQUIP2: Basic Education Project, USAID/EGYPT*. Technical application for assistance in response to Request for Applications through Leader with Associates Cooperative Agreement No. GDG-A-00-03-00008-00.

Academy for Educational Development (AED), Michigan State University, the Research Triangle Institute, Macro International, & the University of Pittsburgh (2004b, 27 July). *Egypt Education Reform Program annual work plan (preliminary): EQUIP2, 1 JUL 2004 – 30 JUN 2005*. Submitted to USAID/EGYPT in relation to Cooperative Agreement No. 263-A-00-04-00008-00.

Aguirre International (2002, December). *Quality basic education for all: Strategy proposal*, Volume I. Submitted to USAID/Egypt.

Ali, S. (1995). *Dor al-Taáleem al-Missrey fi el-Nedal Elwataney (Zaman al-Ehtelal)* [The role of Egyptian education in the national struggle (during British colonialism)]. Cairo, Egypt: El-Hayaah El-Misria El-ámaa Lelketab (Arabic).

Ali, S. & Hassan, Z. (1983). *Tatawur Eádad al-Málem fi Misr (The development of teacher preparation in Egypt)*. Cairo, Egypt: Dar al-Thakafa Liltebaáh wa Al-Nasher (Arabic).

American Institutes for Research (AIR), Education Development Center, & World Education (2004a) *EQUIP1 Program Description: Education Reform Program, USAID/Egypt*. Technical application for assistance in response to Request for Applications through Leader with Associates Cooperative Agreement No. 263-A-00-04-00005-00.

American Institutes for Research (AIR), Education Development Center, & World Education (2004b) *Egypt Education Reform Program aAnnual work plan (preliminary): EQUIP2, 1 JUL 2004 – 30 JUN 2005*. Submitted to USAID/EGYPT in relation to Cooperative Agreement No. 263-A-00-04-00005-00.

Amin, S. (2001). Imperialism and globalization. *Monthly Review* 53 (June): 6-24.

Arnove, R. (1980). *Philanthropy and cultural imperialism: The foundations at home and abroad*. Boston: G. K. Hall.

Berk, L. (2000). *Child development*, 5th edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Berman, E. (1992). Donor agencies and third world educational development, 1945-85. In R. Arnove, P. Altbach, & G. Kelly (Eds.), *Emergent issues in education: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 57-74). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods*, 3rd edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brecher, J., Costello, T., & Smith, B. (2000). *Globalization from below: The power of solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Brock-Utne, B. (2000). Whose education for all? In B. Brock-Utne, *Whose education for all? The recolonization of the African mind* (pp. 3-34). New York: Falmer Press.

Brown, P. & Lauder, H. (1996). Education, globalization, and economic development. In A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, & A. S. Wells (Eds.), *Education, culture, economy, and society* (pp. 172-92). New York: Oxford University Press.

Burbules, N. & Torres, C. A. (Eds.) (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York:

Routledge.
Capella, J.-R. (2000). Globalization: A fading citizenship. In N. Burbules and C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 227-51). New York: Routledge.
Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as cultural imperialism*. New York: McKay.
Carnoy, M. (1982). Education, economy and the state. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Cultural and economic reproduction in education: Essays on class, ideology and the state* (pp. 79-126). Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Carnoy, M. and Rhoten, D. (Eds.) (2002). *Comparative Education Review* 46 (1): Special issue on the meaning of globalization for educational change.
Central Agency for Public Mobilisation and Statistics. (2004). *The statistical year book, 1995-2003*. Cairo: Arab Republic of Egypt.
Clayton, T. (2004). Competing conceptions of globalization revisited: Relocating the tension between world-systems analysis and globalization analysis. *Comparative Education Review* 48 (3): 274-94.
Cochran, J. (1986). *Education in Egypt*. London: Croom Helm.
Coombs, P. (1968). *The world educational crisis: A systems analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Dale, R. (1989). *The state and education policy*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
Dale, R. & Robertson, S. (2002). The varying effects of regional organizations as subjects of globalization of education." *Comparative Education Review* 46 (1): 10-36.
Danaher, K. & Burbach, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Globalize this!* Boston, MA: Common Courage Press.
Daun, H. (2002). Globalization and national educational systems. In H. Daun (Ed.), *Educational restructuring in the context of gGlobalization and national policy* (pp. 1-31). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
Dyab, M., Gamal El-Din, N., & Leach, J. (1998). Teacher education and modernisation: Egypt's project for the new millennium. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association conference, San Diego, California, 12-17 April.
El-Laèha ElTanfeezia Leqanoon Tanzeem El-Gamáat El-Misriah [Executive Regulation of the Egyptian Universities Law], Presidential Decision No. 216 in 1956, Cairo University.
El-Magaales El-Qawmyiah El-Motakhasesah [National Specialized Councils]. (1980). *Hayakel wa Anmat El-Taáleem El-Gamáey wa Tatawer El-Taáleem El-Gamáey Fi Misr* [The structures and types of university education and the development of university education in Egypt]. Cairo, Egypt: El-Markez El-áraby Leltabeá wa El-Nasher.
El-Mofty, M. A. (1996). Preparation of mathematics teachers for secondary level. *Proceedings of the national conference on developing teacher preparation, training, and welfare*, *9 November 1996*. Cairo: Ministry of Education. (in Arabic).
El-Shoábah El-Qawmyiah LelUNESCO [UNESCO National Division]. (1970). *El-Taáleem El-Gamáey wa El-áaley Fi El-Gomhoria El-árabia El-Motaheda Khelal El-Khamseen Sanah El-Akheerah* [University and higher eEducation in the United Arab Republic during the last fifty years 1920–1970]. Cairo, Egypt: Matabeá El-Hayaah El-ámaa Lelketab.
Erlich, H. (1989). *Students and university in 20th century Egyptian politics*. Totowa, NJ: Frank Cass & Co.
Education Reform Program (ERP) (2005). *Annual work plan year 2*. Cairo: ERP.
Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
Faculties of Education Reform (FOER) Component (2005). *Final report on the FOER forum: Building school-university partnerships to improve educational quality, 11 May 2005*. Cairo: Education Reform Program.

Frank, A. G. (1966). The development of Underdevelopment. *Monthly Review* 41 (June): 37-51.

Galal, A. F. (1996). Towards a new policy for the development of the preparation, training, and welfare of the Egyptian teacher. *Proceedings of the national conference on developing teacher's preparation, training, and welfare, 9 November 1996*. Cairo: Ministry of Education. (in Arabic).

Ginsburg, M. (Ed.) (1991). *Understanding educational reform in global context: Economy, ideology, and the state*. New York: Garland.

Ginsburg, M. (1998). "NGOs: What's in an acronym?" *Current Issues in Comparative Education* [Online] 1 (1) [November 20]. Available at: www.tc.columbia.edu/cice/vol01nr1/mbgart1.htm

Ginsburg, M., Cooper, S., Raghu, R., & Zegarra, H. (1990). National and world system explanations of educational reform." *Comparative Education Review 34*(4): 474-499.

Ginsburg, M., & Linday, B. (Eds.) (1995). *The political dimension in teacher education: Policy formation, teacher socialization, and society*. London: Falmer.

Ginsburg, M., & Megahed, N. (2006). Teacher education and the construction of worker-citizens in Egypt: Historical analysis of curricular goals in national/international political economic context." In N. Popov, C. Wolhuter, C. Heller, & M. Kysilka (Eds.) *Comparative education and teacher training*, Volume 4. Sofia, Bulgaria: Bureau for Educational Services & Bulgarian Comparative Education Society.

Ginsburg, M., & Megahed, N. (2009). Global discourses and educational Reform in Egypt: The case of active-learning pedagogies. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies* 13 (2): 91-115.

Ginsburg, M., Wallace, G., & Miller, H. (1988). Teachers, economy and the state: An English example. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 4(4): 317-37.

Heggi, A. (1996). Teacher preparation in Egypt: Reality and prospects. *Proceedings of the national conference on developing teacher's preparation, training, and welfare, 9 November 1996*. Cairo: Ministry of Education. (in Arabic)

Heggi, A. (2004, November). "Strategy for enhancing the faculties of education" and "Action plan." Draft documents. Cairo: Faculty of Education Enhancement Project.

Heggi, A. (2005). "FOEP/R: 2 projects for one goal: Developing Egyptian education through enhancing faculties of education." Powerpoint presentation slides prepared for meeting on 3 March.

Hopkins, T. & Wallerstein, I. (1979). *World-systems analysis: Theory and methodology,* Volume 1. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Huckin, T. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Miller (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text* (pp. 78-92). Washington, DC: English Language Programs, US Information Agency.

Inkeles, A., & Sirowy, L. (1984). Convergent and divergent trends in national educational systems." In G. Lenski (Ed.) *Current issues and research in macrosociology* (pp. 137-165). Leiden: E. J. Brill.

International Bank for Reconstruction & Development (IBRD) (2005, 18-30 June). *Aide-memoire: Mid-term review mission: Higher Education Enhancement Project, Arab Republic of Egypt* (Loan No. 4658-EGT). Washington, DC: World Bank.

International Bank for Reconstruction & Development (IBRD) (2006, 1-26 March) *Aide-memoire: Supervision mission: Higher Education Enhancement Project, Arab Republic of Egypt* (Loan No. 4658-EGT). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Ismael, S. (Ed.) (1999). *Globalization: Policies, challenges and responses*. Calgary: Detselig.

LeCompte, M., & Preissel, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*, 2nd edition. New York: Academic Press.

McNeely, C. (1995). Prescribing national education policies: The role of international organizations. *Comparative Education Review 39*(4): 483-507.

Megahed, N. (1996). An evaluative study of special diploma in education program. Master Thesis, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.

Meyer, J., & Hannan, M. (1979). National development in a changing world system: An overview. In J. Meyer & M. Hannan (Ed.) *National development and the world system: Educational, economic and political change, 1950-70* (pp. 3-16). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parten, M. (1932). Social participation among pre-school children." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 32*(3): 243-69.

Robertson, S., Bonal, X., & Dale, R. (2001). GATS and the education service industry: The politics of scale and global re-territorialization. Draft manuscript submitted to the *Comparative Education Review*.

Robertson, S., Bonal, X., & Dale, R. (2002). GATS and the education service industry: The politics of scale and global re-territorialization. *Comparative Education Review 46(*4): 72-96.

Saheefat El-Tarbia [*Education Journal*], (1968). Cairo, Egypt: Ain Shams University.

Salamah, G. (1963). *Tārīkh al-tálīm al-ajnabi fi Miser fi al-qarnayyn al-taseά άasher wa al-άashreen* [*The history of foreign education in Egypt in the nineteenth and twentieth venturies*]. Cairo: The Supreme Council of Arts, Literature, and Social Sciences Press.

Sayed, F. (2006). *Transforming education in Egypt: Western influence and domestic policy reform*. Cairo: American University of Cairo Press.

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

Simmons, J. (1983). Reforming education and society: The enduring quest. In J. Simmons (Ed.) *Better schools: International lessons for reform* (pp. 3-19). New York: Praeger.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (Ed.) (2004). *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ministry of Higher Education (2010). *Higher Education in Egypt: Country Background Report*. Cairo, Egypt: Strategic Planning Unit, Ministry of Higher Education.

Stromquist, N. & Monkman, K. (Eds.) (2000). *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Suarez, D. (2007) Education professionals and the construction of human rights education. *Comparative Education Review 51*(1): 48-70.

Tabb, W. (2001). State power in the world economy: From national keynesianism to neoliberalism. In *The amoral elephant* (pp. 51-78). New York: Monthly Review Press.

USAID/Egypt (2003a, 4 September). *Program description for EQUIP1, Basic education.* request for applications through Leader with Associates Cooperative Agreement No. 263-A-00-04-00005-00.

USAID/Egypt (2003b, 4 September). *EQUIP2 program description for EQUIP2, Basic education.* request for applications through Leader with Associates Cooperative Agreement No. GDG-A-00-03-00008-00.

van Dijk, T. (1997). The study of discourse." In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process. Discourse studies 1: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 1-34). London: Sage Publication.

Wallerstein, E. (1984). *The capitalist world-economy*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Weiss, L. (1997). Globalization and the myth of the powerless state. *New Left Review* 225: 3-32.

Wilcox, L. E. (1988). *Arab Republic of Egypt: A study of the educational system of the Arab Republic of Egypt and a guide to the academic placement of students in educational institutions in the United States.* Washington, DC: International Education Activities Group of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

Williamson, B. L. (1987). *Education and social change in Egypt and Turkey: A study in historical sociology.*

London: Macmillan.
Willinsky, J. N. (2002). The nation-state after globalism." *Educational Studies 33*(1): 35-53.
World Bank (1996, 21 October). *Staff appraisal report: The Arab Republic of Egypt Education Enhancement Program*. Report No. 15750-EGT. Washington, DC: World Bank, Human Development Group, Middle East and North Africa Region.
World Bank (1999, 22 March) *Project appraisal document on a proposed credit of SDR 38.5 million (US$50 million equivalent) to the Arab Republic of Egypt for a Secondary Education Enhancement Project [SEEP]*. Report No. 18923-EGT. Washington, DC: World Bank, Human Development Group, Middle East and North Africa Region.
World Bank (2002, 7 March) *Project appraisal document on a proposed loan in the amount of SDR 38.5 million (US$50 million equivalent) to the Arab Republic of Egypt for a Higher Education Enhancement Project [HEEP]*. Report No. 23332-EGT. Washington, DC: World Bank, Human Development Group, Middle East and North Africa Region.

About the Authors

Mark Ginsburg
Academy for Educational Development (AED, USA)
Email: mginsburg49@yahoo.com.

Mark Ginsburg is a senior advisor for research, evaluation, and teacher education at the Academy for Educational Development (AED, USA); visiting professor in the International Education Program at the University of Maryland; and coeditor of the *Comparative Education Review*. He previously was a faculty member at the University of Aston in Birmingham (England, 1976-78), the University of Houston (Texas, USA, 1978-87), and the University of Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania, USA, 1987-2004). He directed the Faculties of Education Reform project of the USAID-funded Educational Reform Program in Egypt (2004-2006). He has published extensively on topics of policy/institutional reform, teachers/teacher education, and policy/practice-oriented research and evaluation.

Nagwa Megahed
Ain Shams University in Egypt
Email: nagwa_megahed@yahoo.com.

Nagwa Megahed is an Assistant Professor at Ain Shams University in Egypt, and is currently a Fulbright "Scholar-in-Residence" for Middle Eastern Cultural and Language Studies at the University of Southern Mississippi. Prior to that, she worked as a Senior Technical Advisor for Research and Evaluation at USAID-Funded Education Reform Program in Egypt in cooperation with Michigan State University and the Academy for Educational Development. During her Ph.D. studies at the University of Pittsburgh she worked in the Institute for International Studies in Education on projects related to educational reform and teacher education. She has published articles and book chapters on the reform of educational policy and practices, teacher education and work, gender inequality, and Islam and education.

education policy analysis archives

Volume 19 Number 15 May 30th, 2011 ISSN 1068-2341