Georgia - Training Educators for Excellence Component

Report generated on: February 6, 2017

Visit our data catalog at: https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY
Georgia

EVALUATION TITLE
Training Educators for Excellence Component

EVALUATION TYPE
Independent Evaluation

ID NUMBER
DDI-MCC-GEO-MPR-IGEQ-TEE-2017-v01

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION
Not applicable to this evaluation; no quantitative data to be shared

Overview

ABSTRACT
For the TEE evaluation, we propose a mixed-methods study design with two components: (1) a performance evaluation to assess the possible effects of the TEE activity on school management and classroom instructional practices, and (2) a matched comparison group design to assess the initial impacts of the activity's teacher training modules. The performance evaluation and the matched comparison group analysis are designed to answer research questions about the program's implementation and initial outcomes; we will use evidence from these analyses to assess whether the program had plausible effects on the practices of teachers, school directors, and school-based professional development facilitators (SPDFs) that could in turn produce gains in students' learning and longer-term labor market outcomes.

The performance evaluation will identify implementation successes and challenges and document key lessons learned about implementation of national-scale training programs in Georgia, as well as implications that could help inform implementation of similar programs in similar contexts. This study component will provide in-depth information about the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of program participants.

The impact evaluation will involve comparing outcomes for a group of beneficiaries to outcomes for a comparison or control group that does not receive the same activity in a given time period. To measure the impacts of the training program on teachers' knowledge and attitudes, the evaluation will apply a matched comparison group design using propensity-score matching. This design compares a group of teachers who will be trained during the 2016–2017 school year (Cohort 1) with a group of teachers who will not be trained until the 2017–2018 school year (Cohort 2). This design is well suited to estimate the initial impacts of the program on teachers' knowledge about the types of practices covered in the training intervention, along with teachers' attitudes toward those practices and reported willingness to use them in the future.

UNITS OF ANALYSIS
Individuals

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Education		
Gender		

KEYWORDS
Education, Teacher training, School director training

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
National coverage

UNIVERSE
The performance evaluation will focus on the first two cohorts of teachers and school directors to receive training activities in Georgian-language schools during the 2016-2017 school year and the 2017-2018 school year. Thus, the study population will include all Georgian-language school directors and teachers in Georgian-language schools.

The study's impact evaluation design will estimate the impacts of teacher training for the subset of Cohort 1 teachers who can be adequately matched to Cohort 2 teachers. Since the TEE activity has prioritized training more senior and experienced teachers in the first cohort, we anticipate that the impact evaluation will be limited to a population of more junior and less-experienced 'practitioner-level' teachers, since these teachers are more likely to be matched successfully to teachers in Cohort 2.

The evaluation will seek to identify a relevant sample of respondents that is geographically representative of this overall population, including a representative sample of school directors across relevant districts and a representative sample of teachers across the TEE activity's targeted set of grade levels and academic subjects.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Mathematica Policy Research	MPR

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Mathematica Policy Research	MPR		Independent Evaluator

DATE OF METADATA PRODUCTION
2017-01-25

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION
Version 1.0 (January 25, 2017)

DDI DOCUMENT ID
DDI-MCC-GEO-MPR-IGEQ-TEE-2017-v01

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD
Georgia Compact II

PROGRAM
The Training Educators for Excellence (TEE) activity aims to improve classroom instruction in the subjects of science, technology, English, geography, and math in grades 7–12, through a combination of professional development activities for teachers, school directors, and school-based professional development facilitators (SPDFs). Examples of these activities include an initial core set of teacher training modules related to general pedagogy, student-centered learning approaches, and formative assessment techniques; a second subject-specific set of training modules for teachers to adapt material from

the core modules to specific academic subjects; and a series of training modules for school directors focused on school management techniques, including structured approaches to teacher observation.

MCC SECTOR
Education (Edu)

PROGRAM LOGIC
The TEE inputs aim to improve the quality of classroom teaching and management of schools throughout the education system, leading to improvements in students' learning and higher educational attainment outcomes.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
The TEE activity plans to operate on a nationwide basis, including both Georgian-language schools and minority-language schools and reaching up to 18,000 Georgian-language teachers, 2,085 school directors, and 2,085 SPDFs during the rest of the Georgia II Compact (with trainings occurring mainly during the 2016–2017 and 2017–2018 school years).

Sampling

Study Population

The performance evaluation will focus on the first two cohorts of teachers and school directors to receive training activities in Georgian-language schools during the 2016-2017 school year and the 2017-2018 school year. Thus, the study population will include all Georgian-language school directors and teachers in Georgian-language schools. The study's impact evaluation design will estimate the impacts of teacher training for the subset of Cohort 1 teachers who can be adequately matched to Cohort 2 teachers. Since the TEE activity has prioritized training more senior and experienced teachers in the first cohort, we anticipate that the impact evaluation will be limited to a population of more junior and less-experienced 'practitioner-level' teachers, since these teachers are more likely to be matched successfully to teachers in Cohort 2. The evaluation will seek to identify a relevant sample of respondents that is geographically representative of this overall population, including a representative sample of school directors across relevant districts and a representative sample of teachers across the TEE activity's targeted set of grade levels and academic subjects.

Sampling Procedure

To conduct the matched comparison impact analysis of the teacher training modules, we will compare a geographically representative sample of Cohort 1 teachers who have recently completed the training sequence to a matched sample of teachers who are not yet eligible to begin the training (but will receive it eventually). For the comparison group sample, we will target data collection to all teachers in the second TEE cohort (those who are not eligible to receive the core teacher training until October 2017) who teach in the same set of schools as teachers in the treatment sample. To ensure the treatment and comparison groups are equivalent, the matching study will be limited to practitioner-level teachers. To increase the sample of Cohort 1 teachers in the matching study, we propose to oversample practitioner-level teachers in the first cohort: specifically, two- thirds of the surveyed teachers in the first cohort will be practitioner-level teachers (representing strong potential matches for the practitioner-level teachers in the second cohort) and the remaining third of the Cohort 1 survey sample will be senior teachers whose outcome data will be used for the performance evaluation.

We conducted power calculations for the matched comparison design, and based on our review of other teacher training evaluations in developing countries, we believe that the range of detectable effects shown in the matched comparison scenarios (0.14 to 0.20 standard devations) represents a level of statistical precision that is adequate to detect impacts comparable to those reported for teacher training in certain other contexts (for example, 0.12 to 0.25 standard deviations in student learning).

Questionnaires

Overview

For the impact evaluation will collect survey data from the study's sample of school directors, Cohort 1 teachers, and Cohort 2 teachers at two points in time: September 2017 (following completion of the first teacher cohort's training modules) and September 2018 (following completion of the full training sequence for Cohort 2). We will use five separate instruments for the impact evaluation: teacher survey, school director survey, SPDF survey, and classroom observation instrument.

· Teacher survey: A local survey firm will collect survey data on teachers' participation in training and study group activities, knowledge of and attitudes toward targeted pedagogical practices, perceptions regarding the value of training and study group activities, and self-reported pedagogical practices.

· School director survey: A local survey firm will collect survey data on school directors' participation in training activities, knowledge of and attitudes toward targeted school management practices, perceptions regarding the value of training activities, and self-reported school management practices.

· SPDF survey: A local survey firm will collect survey data on SPDF's participation in training activities, knowledge of and attitudes toward targeted teacher collaboration/management practices, perceptions regarding the value of training activities, and self-reported teacher collaboration/management practices.

The performance evaluation will analyze several different types of data, including program documentation, survey data, and qualitative research. The performance evaluation will use several key data sources:

· TEE design and implementation records: To document the design and implementation of the TEE activity, Mathematica will obtain any available training design reports, training materials, implementation records, and program cost data.

· In-depth interviews with implementers: We will conduct qualitative, in-depth interviews with implementers, including key TPDC program managers, training providers, and MCA-G staff.

· Survey data: Three surveys described above.

· Teacher focus groups, school director qualitative interviews, SPDF qualitative interviews, and classroom observations: A local survey firm will collect qualitative data in a subsample of about 22 schools. The sample will consist of teachers, professional development facilitators and school directors in the first TEE cohort (all of whom are scheduled to complete the full training sequence in summer 2017). Qualitative data collection will include in-depth interviews with school directors to investigate how training has affected school management practices; indepth interviews with SPDFs to assess whether they are actively observing classrooms and providing feedback; focus groups with teachers to investigate how training has affected classroom instruction practices; and classroom observations designed to gather descriptive data on teachers' use of instructional time, use of materials, and core pedagogical practices, and to triangulate findings on self-reported pedagogical practices from the teacher survey.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2017-09	2017-09	Teacher Cohort 1: Initial outcomes, Teacher Cohort 2: Baseline, SD/SPDF: Initial outcomes
2018-09	2018-09	Teacher Cohort 1: Final outcomes, Teacher Cohort 2: Initial outcomes, SD/SPDF: Final outcomes
2017-09	2018-05	Qualitative data collection

Data Collection Notes

If the TEE implementation plan changes, the study team will consider appropriate revisions to the data collection schedule.

The study team recommends the use of a year-by-year contract with the local survey firm. This approach will provide an opportunity to assess whether the existing data collection plan is still advisable following each data collection round, because the contract structure facilitates making adjustments on an annual basis.

Questionnaires

For the impact evaluation will collect survey data from the study's sample of school directors, Cohort 1 teachers, and Cohort 2 teachers at two points in time: September 2017 (following completion of the first teacher cohort's training modules) and September 2018 (following completion of the full training sequence for Cohort 2). We will use five separate instruments for the impact evaluation: teacher survey, school director survey, SPDF survey, and classroom observation instrument.

· Teacher survey: A local survey firm will collect survey data on teachers' participation in training and study group activities, knowledge of and attitudes toward targeted pedagogical practices, perceptions regarding the value of training and study group activities, and self-reported pedagogical practices.

· School director survey: A local survey firm will collect survey data on school directors' participation in training activities, knowledge of and attitudes toward targeted school management practices, perceptions regarding the value of training activities, and self-reported school management practices.

· SPDF survey: A local survey firm will collect survey data on SPDF's participation in training activities, knowledge of and attitudes toward targeted teacher collaboration/management practices, perceptions regarding the value of training activities, and self-reported teacher collaboration/management practices.

The performance evaluation will analyze several different types of data, including program documentation, survey data, and qualitative research. The performance evaluation will use several key data sources:

· TEE design and implementation records: To document the design and implementation of the TEE activity, Mathematica will obtain any available training design reports, training materials, implementation records, and program cost data.

· In-depth interviews with implementers: We will conduct qualitative, in-depth interviews with implementers, including key TPDC program managers, training providers, and MCA-G staff.

· Survey data: Three surveys described above.

· Teacher focus groups, school director qualitative interviews, SPDF qualitative interviews, and classroom observations: A local survey firm will collect qualitative data in a subsample of about 22 schools. The sample will consist of teachers, professional development facilitators and school directors in the first TEE cohort (all of whom are scheduled to complete the full training sequence in summer 2017). Qualitative data collection will include in-depth interviews with school directors to investigate how training has affected school management practices; indepth interviews with SPDFs to assess whether they are actively observing classrooms and providing feedback; focus groups with teachers to investigate how training has affected classroom instruction practices; and classroom observations designed to gather descriptive data on teachers' use of instructional time, use of materials, and core pedagogical practices, and to triangulate findings on self-reported pedagogical practices from the teacher survey.

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
IPM Research		

Data Processing

No content available

Data Appraisal

No content available