

DEMOCRACY LEARNING AND  
ACTION:  
DEMOCRACY EDUCATION  
EXCHANGE PROJECT

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

*Draft for Review by  
DEEP project leaders  
5/19/03  
Not to be cited, quoted, or distributed.*



MAY, 2003

*May 2003*

*Prepared for  
The American Forum, Inc.  
120 Wall Street, Suite 2600  
New York, NY 10005  
212-624-1300*

*Prepared by  
InSites  
P.O. Box 4391  
306 W. Lodgepole, #9  
Dillon, CO 80435-4391  
970-668-0779*

*This document is part of the evaluation work being conducted by InSites, a Colorado-based non-profit 501(c)3 organization that conducts research and evaluation and provides technical assistance to schools, districts, states, and organizations engaged in major change within education systems.*

*The primary InSites evaluation team members for this project are Beverly Parsons (Executive Director of InSites), Carolyn Lupe (Evaluation Associate), and Viola Geinger (Writer/Editor).*

*The information and opinions provided herein are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not represent agreement or positions of The American Forum, the project participants, or funding agents.*

This draft does not have the section on the U.S. component. Also, information on this component is missing from the Executive Summary.

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction.....	2
An activity center for youth in the “city of youths and students” .....	2
Design of DEEP .....	3
The Consortium Members .....	3
DEEP Objectives .....	4
Operational Process .....	4
Time Frame.....	5
Evaluation Design and Process.....	5
CEE/NIS Component of DEEP .....	5
Context and Culture of CEE/NIS Countries.....	6
Team Members and Their Goals.....	8
Major Activities of CEE/NIS Teams .....	10
DEEP Team Results.....	12
DEEP Results for Students .....	15
DEEP Results for Teachers.....	17
DEEP Results for Team Members.....	19
DEEP Results for Policy.....	20
Key DEEP Features Contributing to Change .....	21
U. S. Component of DEEP .....	22
Conclusions and Lessons Learned from DEEP .....	22
Lessons Learned by CEE/NIS Participants .....	23
Lessons Learned by U. S. Participants .....	23
Appendix A. Role Groups of CEE/NIS Participants .....	25
Appendix B. Activities of DEEP Teams.....	26
Appendix C. Numbers of Participants in CEE/NIS DEEP Team Activities .....	31

## **Executive Summary**

The Democracy Education Exchange Project (DEEP) set out in October 2001 to support the efforts of educators, non-governmental organization (NGO) leaders and policymakers in 12 countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union to help their students gain the knowledge, skills and attitudes they need to participate more effectively in a democracy. A second goal was to provide counterparts in the U. S. with the experience and opportunities they need to improve knowledge about these emerging democracies in their schools and education systems.

In the course of just one year, DEEP demonstrated that the quality of democracy education can improve tangibly in the short term in the CEE/NIS countries and a base can be built for further strengthening in the long term. Thousands of students, teachers, NGO leaders and others in and around the participating schools and teams deepened their understanding of democratic principles and the responsibility and action that real democracy requires. They developed a more open climate for discussion and decision-making among themselves and with others. The level of practical knowledge improved about democratic structures such as local government and how citizens can have influence. Teachers and young people alike gained confidence to take action and raised their profile as constructive citizens in their communities. And democracy education more generally benefited from interactive teaching techniques, tailored instructional materials for teachers and students, and from significant institutional changes such as the nationwide adoption of new civic education standards in two of the 12 participating countries.

Key elements of the DEEP process led to the changes. First, student learning was the ultimate aim. Second, hands-on experience in the U. S. and in the CEE/NIS countries as well as relevant instructional materials and other information supported clear and careful planning for how to achieve that improved learning. Finally, democratic principles of open communication, collegial collaboration and community action suffused all phases of the project.

[Further information to be added once U. S. section is completed.]

# Introduction

## **An activity center for youth in the “city of youths and students”**

A web site from Cahul, Moldova, describes this hillside spa town 110 miles south of the capital of Chisinau as “a city of youths and students.” With a population of just 40,000, it nevertheless has two universities, three colleges, four college-prep high schools and ten general schools. And yet, as recently as last year, the city had no activity center for young people. “As a result, a lot of young people (were) spending time in an unhealthy and unuseful manner,” the Moldovan DEEP team wrote in its report.

So 26 students from three high schools made it the goal of their DEEP project to change that. Students and adults from their group along with members of six other local action groups received training from the DEEP Moldova trainers in team building, using the Internet and employing advocacy strategies such as writing letters and press releases. They established contacts with local media, an NGO center and the municipal department for youth. They used a DEEP stipend to pay for computer access at Internet clubs so they could exchange ideas among themselves and with other DEEP teams.

Once they felt prepared, they set out to meet the mayor. But their repeated efforts to arrange a meeting were rebuffed. So some of the students managed to get into a meeting that the mayor was having with another group of young people, requested the floor and asked the mayor to help them do something constructive for their community. The mayor agreed. But once again, when they went to see him at the appointed time, he wasn't there. The group didn't give up. It was already distributing leaflets and had organized a community roundtable to discuss the idea and build local support. The students also arranged discussions on local television and radio. Once again, the students addressed the mayor, this time in a letter that cited the local law on youth and the mayor's own public promises.

Their persistence paid off. By the end of the four-month project, the mayor signed a recommendation for the local council to consider the idea of converting a former “House of Culture,” a ubiquitous institution in most Soviet-era cities and towns, into a center for youth. But the project achieved more than a one-time victory. Students involved in DEEP in Moldova reported that they learned how to communicate and cooperate with each other and with others in

their community. They learned how their local government was structured and how to write letters and make phone calls and other basics of lobbying for a cause. And, despite their discouragement when the mayor snubbed them at first, the support they'd raised in the community kept them charging ahead. In the end, they'd gained one more thing: self-confidence.

*“I learned that the word ‘no’ does not exist,” one student wrote. “You have to persist to (accomplish) something.”*

The Moldovan students' accomplishments represent not only in a concrete result but, even more importantly, the entire learning process encapsulates the goal achieved in DEEP for students, teachers, and many others: a deeper understanding of the meaning and practice of active democracy and a newfound confidence in the possibilities for themselves and for their communities.

## **Design of DEEP**

### **The Consortium Members**

Five organizations primarily led DEEP:

- The American Forum (TAF) – organizes international exchanges for teachers and students as well as international conferences on global education.
- Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC) – promotes collaboration among social scientists and social studies educators by developing curricula and programs and conducting research on effective teaching.
- The Constitutional Rights Foundation: CRF – Chicago and CRF – Los Angeles develop curricula and conduct trainings and programs on teaching civics through interactive examinations of issues as well as local institutions and their practices.
- Street Law – promotes practical understanding of law through interactive teaching that values students' opinions. Conducts civic education programs worldwide.

The American Forum administered the grant. Each of the other four organizations coordinated the work with three CEE/NIS teams and U. S. teachers in their locale. These four primary organizations collaborated with five other organizations to accomplish the DEEP program: 1) International Educational and Resource Network (iEARN); 2) Close Up Foundation Inc.; 3) The

Institute for the Study of Russian Education at Indiana University (ISRE); 4) the National Council for the Social Studies; and 5) The Council of Chief State School Officers.

## **DEEP Objectives**

The project aimed to increase the capacity of teachers, teacher trainers, non-governmental organizations and students in selected transitional countries to understand, teach and spread democratic practices. The ultimate goal was to create ways to strengthen constitutional democracy by improving democracy education in schools. All training and interaction were to be participatory and practical and designed to model the open, democratic approaches that the project intended to foster in the participants and beyond.

## **Operational Process**

The DEEP process could be likened to the ripples that emanate from a stone thrown into a pond. It started, for example, with three participants from each of the 12 CEE/NIS countries and by the end actively involved hundreds of teachers, NGO members and students. DEEP project directors from the main consortium member organizations selected three participants by application from each of the 12 countries to attend a one-week launching conference organized in Budapest, Hungary, in February 2002. U. S. educators selected by the project directors also attended the conference and participated in the CEE/NIS teams' visits to the U. S.. In Budapest, the participants became familiar with the project's goals and philosophy, and the CEE/NIS teams began developing their plans of action for their own countries with materials and assistance from program directors.

Those teams then recruited seven more members for each team from their countries, selected a leader and prepared for a 21-day visit to the U. S.. Three country teams visited each of four host locations in successive visits in Spring 2002. They became more familiar with U. S. democratic practices and democracy education by discussing and comparing their systems with U. S. counterparts and experts and by visiting schools, governmental offices, local council meetings and education, law and policy organizations. All the while, they worked within their teams and with their U. S. colleagues and the program directors to amplify their plans for extending democracy education and practice in their home schools and countries. Overall, the plans were realistic and detailed and aimed at both short-term and sustainable long-term improvements in student learning about democracy.

In the next seven months of the grant period, the teams carried out their plans in their home countries, including adapting and preparing materials, training hundreds of teachers and students directly and advising and monitoring projects. Meanwhile, U. S. educators in each of the four U. S. locations carried out their own plans for improving instruction about emerging democracies in their own curricula.

### **Time Frame**

The U. S. Department of Education provided funding for one year.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the program was designed to allow for some small success during that time period while building a base of skills, knowledge, contacts and motivation that would help participants continue their work, either with existing funding or by finding additional financing.

### **Evaluation Design and Process**

Systematic monitoring and evaluation were built into every stage of the project. From the beginning, each team developed an “Action and Inquiry Map” (AIM) in graphic format tailored to its own plan that identified activities, results and indicators of achievement. Each team developed a detailed action plan that included structured evaluation of their progress. Participants completed surveys at every stage and kept journals of their work, and CEE/NIS team leaders submitted project reports. The U. S. program directors also reported on results after their visits to their partner countries. In addition to compiling and analyzing all evaluation materials, evaluators interviewed project directors at each location in the U. S. as well as U. S. educators and consultants who traveled to CEE/NIS countries in support of the team projects there. And evaluators conducted focus groups with U. S. educators to determine their progress in increasing information about CEE/NIS countries in their curricula. Each element of the evaluation process tested whether and how well the original goals were achieved, including program quality, sustainability and lessons learned.

This evaluation report focuses primarily on outcomes of the DEEP program for students, teachers, team participants, and policy. Reports from the four U. S. sites provide details of their activities and the response of DEEP teams working with their site.

## **CEE/NIS Component of DEEP**

## Context and Culture of CEE/NIS Countries

Authoritarianism was not just a system of government in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union; it was a way of life. So the profound change that is necessary to function democratically cannot be underestimated. Even now, the level of freedom and democracy varies greatly across the 12 countries involved in DEEP. Table 1, based on assessments in *Nations in Transit 2001* by the American non-profit democracy advocacy organization Freedom House, may be helpful in categorizing the countries somewhat based on six elements: political processes, civil society, independent media, governance and public administration, corruption and legal and judicial framework.

Level of Democracy	Country
Consolidated Democracies	Poland, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Estonia, Croatia
Transitional Governments	Moldova, Ukraine, Armenia, Russia, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan
Consolidated Autocracies	Uzbekistan

*Table 1 – Level of Democracy in CEE/NIS Countries*

“Consolidated democracies” have maintained, over time, a high standard of democratic practice, good governance, and respect for basic rights. “Transitional governments” are moving toward these standards, and “consolidated autocracies” are characterized by statism or repression. Poland, for example, scored high on a recent international study of 14-year-old students and their civic knowledge. Uzbekistan, on the other hand, is controlled by a single political party and a powerful president. Reports from the DEEP team in Croatia indicated that its placement in this chart as “consolidated” might be debatable because the country’s pervasive and rigid bureaucracy left over from the communist era when it was part of the former Yugoslavia.

Even in the other “consolidated democracies,” all of which are due to join the European Union next year, DEEP team members reported consistently that, even in 2002, a theoretical or academic understanding of democracy did not translate into the more consistent civic awareness and activism required to maintain a democratic system. And although education systems and schools required “civic education,” teaching and learning remained mostly theoretical, and surveys of participants at the beginning of DEEP showed that practical understanding was thin. Democratic practices were not the norm in the teams, schools or classrooms. The problem was

---

<sup>1</sup> The results reported here covered three additional months under a no-cost extension of the grant.

more acute in DEEP countries further east. Table 2 shows the status of democracy education in the DEEP countries, based on information from team members and site directors at the beginning of the project.

<b>Status of Democracy Education</b>	<b>Countries</b>
High (Democracy education in the school curriculum)	Poland, Czech Republic, Armenia, Estonia, Russia, Lithuania
Medium (Democracy education not in the curriculum but some content offered in school and after school)	Moldova, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Croatia
Low (awareness stage, few opportunities for democracy education)	Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan

*Table 2 – Status of Democracy Education in CEE/NIS Countries at Beginning of DEEP*

**[Site Directors. Please review the table above to check for accuracy of placement of the DEEP countries on level of democracy education.]**

In practice, such lingering authoritarian tendencies and institutions mean, for example, that communication within schools and communities remains rigid and governed by a pecking order rather than being open and constructive. Many citizens still think it is government’s job to initiate improvements, or at least they don’t believe that ordinary citizens can have influence, nor do they know how to try. In Ukraine, testing and questionnaires at the beginning of the project showed that a majority of students and teachers didn’t know how to address public officials effectively and constructively, including structuring a conversation, planning a solution, getting other citizens involved and persuading authorities. In Azerbaijan, even simple visits by DEEP teams of students and teachers to the Constitutional Court, museums and monuments to learn about these structures drew discouraging comments from students’ families and friends that the visits were a waste of time and just staged by local politicians interested in the publicity. Even in Estonia, considered to be the most advanced of the European Union-candidate countries, the DEEP team reported that students and citizens generally don’t recognize their responsibility to the state, society and government.

It became clear at the early stages of DEEP that part of the reason for the relatively low level of substantive democratic practice [*Program Director – is this overstated?*] was the little or at least largely theoretical exposure available to democracy education, whether in society or in schools. In Russia, for example, a DEEP team survey of 1,378 students in four administrative districts measured their democratic citizenship levels on a scale of high, medium or low. In the two districts where figures are available, the proportion of students scoring high ranged only

from 8.3 percent to 14 percent. The proportion scoring low ranged from 14 percent to a disturbing 47 percent.

Given the level of democracy, each of the teams faced different challenges and issues, but the DEEP process allowed them to design projects and methods based on their own conditions and make progress starting from wherever they, their schools, and their countries were in the democracy continuum.

## **Team Members and Their Goals**

As envisioned in DEEP's objectives, each country team and their projects reached and involved a variety of people who are directly responsible for democracy education and who influence the degree of understanding and active participation by citizens in the democratic process. Each CEE/NIS country team of about 10 members consisted of a range of relevant professionals, although the specific make-up varied from one country to another. The most common representation was teachers, NGO staff and teacher trainers. But, for example, the Kazakh team had more administrative and university representatives than K-12 educators and NGO staff. Croatia, Moldova and Uzbekistan had more K-12 educators and NGO staff than administrators and university representatives. Seven of the 12 teams had at least one representative from the country's education ministry who came for the U. S. visit, and the Ukraine team included four ministry staff. Their team projects, in turn, involved more participants representing each of these sectors, in addition to thousands of students. The result was substantive learning and action by people in a position to influence the perpetuation of democratic principles and democracy education. (Refer to Appendix A for details of team members roles.)

By consensus, each team set different aims and developed different activities to suit its country's needs, culture, and level of democracy. But all teams had the ultimate goal of achieving results for students both in the short term and the long term. Through the DEEP process, team members came to understand the need to work for systemic change, and all teams stressed at least two of the four main areas of emphasis: student learning, teacher learning, curriculum/materials development and policy/research.

The following summarizes each team's goals as developed during their visit to the U. S.. In general, teaching students to be active and responsible citizens was a strong theme, in addition to

interactive teaching, developing curricula and working on policy issues. Some teams aimed to gather basic information that was still lacking in their country and making civics education a priority. Teams from countries where civics education was more established concentrated on developing programs, training teachers, and integrating practical citizenship skills into teaching and learning.

<b>CEE/NIS Country Team</b>	<b>Overall Goal of Team Plan</b>
<b>Armenia</b>	Help educators create favorable conditions for development of democratic values through establishment of student government structures in schools and promotion of youth leadership. Encourage students to become active citizens.
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	Introduce interactive teaching methodology to civics teachers so that young people will be more active and capable of speaking out when necessary and achieve democracy in action and practice, not only in theory.
<b>Croatia</b>	Develop a critical mass of schools to participate in civics education, assess teaching of civics education in selected sample of schools, and develop training programs for nannies and teachers.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Teach students to be active, skilled, and responsible and to be involved in a community and aware of multicultural coexistence in the world. Teachers and future teachers understand the importance of civic and multicultural education and use interactive strategies.
<b>Estonia</b>	Develop and introduce a “Civic Engagement Guide” to teachers to address gaps in student achievement on the state civic education test and to develop Internet-based civic learning at schools.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Conduct a survey and analysis of the present state of civic education, to identify the priorities for civic education within the national system of education, and to design a draft of the civic education program for the Republic of Kazakhstan.
<b>Lithuania</b>	Develop the chapter of the national standards on the “Constitution” for curriculum development and establish teams of teachers for implementation of these standards.
<b>Moldova</b>	Build civic education competencies and capacity among teachers and students. Plan, implement, and evaluate a pilot Youth Act program built on the basics of advocacy and community problem solving for integration into the civics curriculum.
<b>Poland</b>	Prepare teachers to teach other teachers and youths to be able to live in a democratic society and to be active citizens. Train teachers, principals and students in democracy and active citizenship skills and increase awareness of civic education among the greater community.
<b>Russia</b>	Formulate policy recommendations for civic education in Russia, develop national standards and competencies in civic education, develop the content of civic education (curriculum materials to support the standards), and retrain teachers in the regional experimental schools.
<b>Ukraine</b>	Develop and pilot a model for community service that fosters development of active and competent citizens capable of addressing local community problems. Use technology to coordinate the national project and share information.
<b>Uzbekistan</b>	Promote Socially Active Schools where the environment and programs result in young people who know their government and institutions, know how law works and can participate and take action in the improvement of their communities. Focus on interactive teaching methods and student self-government.

*Table 3 – CEE/NIS DEEP Team Goals*

## **Major Activities of CEE/NIS Teams**

The DEEP teams completed all or most of the activities they planned. Often activities with students were conducted on a pilot basis either during the school day or, if there were no

appropriate classes, after school, to determine the project's effectiveness and to demonstrate practical approaches to colleagues, the community, and policy makers in an effort to win support for more long-term change. Teams offered teacher training in several schools, locations, or regions of their country to seed the process of widespread change.

Team activities in the area of student learning, for example, included community problem solving projects, visiting key government offices and conducting surveys of student civic consciousness. In the area of teacher learning, the teams conducted workshops on interactive teaching techniques, government structure and using the Internet for research and communication. In curriculum and materials development, the teams adapted and translated U. S. materials, created their own teacher manuals and designed interactive materials and evaluation tools. To move democracy education forward in the policy and research arena, they conducted surveys and published the results to bolster their arguments, organized interviews and discussions in local media, and reported to their education ministries with results of studies of democracy education in their countries. The teams also organized conferences, conducted workshops for administrators, and improved Internet communication among schools, students, and teachers.

In the Czech Republic, for example, the DEEP team invited four experts to help design two new interactive lessons drawing on their specialty areas – local government, politics, and journalism – to demonstrate active democracy education. That meant incorporating techniques for leading student discussions, handling controversial issues, and encouraging participation. The experts then helped teach two of the lessons at four schools, involving four other teachers and 184 students. The team also provided training in interactive methods for 21 teachers who then piloted seven other new lessons with 170 students and 42 university students. In addition, the team organized a program of six seminars on teaching Romany children for 19 education students at St. Charles University in Prague.

In Kazakhstan, which is about one-third the size of the U. S., the DEEP team organized the first ever survey of the civic consciousness of Kazakh students to form the basis for a civic education program and strategic plan for the country. The team designed the survey and got feedback on the draft during a roundtable of civic education experts in the capital, Almaty, an event that also served to bring more educators into the process. The team surveyed 1,350 students in 20 schools in Almaty in the southeast corner of the country and in Kokchetav in the

north on their knowledge and attitudes. Although more than half of the respondents in Almaty and more than 75 percent in Kokchetav “have more or less good knowledge of school subjects forming civic consciousness” (either civics or a topic like government and law), 50 percent were not aware of issues of free press and labor rights in their country, and most underestimated the role of critical thinking and political and social activity.

*“It was my impression that our students are as well-prepared in terms of education as their American peers, but they think much less about their rights and have still fewer possibilities to speak openly about them.” – Elena Burova, DEEP team member and professor of philosophy and methodology of science, Kazakhstan.*

A separate survey of 62 educators, NGO staff, government officials, and others on the status of democracy education in Kazakhstan found that there is no policy or systematic approach to the subject and that the relevant organizations, such as schools, universities and NGO’s don’t coordinated adequately on the issue. The Kazakh DEEP team then presented the results of these surveys during its final conference in December 2002, which included government officials, and to smaller groups, including representatives of the ruling political party. The team also published 500 copies of the results to promote public discussion and have made dozens of presentations to university students, educators, NGO staff, and others.

These examples of activities in the Czech Republic and Kazakhstan show how the DEEP process can be tailored to varying conditions in different countries and still produce useful results. Please see the table in Appendix B for a complete list of each country team’s activities in each area.

## **DEEP Team Results**

In their planning, DEEP teams agreed to pursue results for a variety of participants who could affect the ultimate goal of achieving meaningful results for students, not only within the timeframe of the project but also in the long term. The twelve teams involved hundreds of teachers and reached thousands of students as well as administrators, officials, and NGO staff (see Appendix C for detailed numbers of participants for each team). Most of the teams achieved the specific objectives they had set out.

In general, across the 12 country projects, DEEP produced the following overall results:

- **The project exposed thousands** of participants in and around the education system in a substantive way to democracy in practice and created a constituency for democracy education among the adults involved and the young people who worked with them. They felt the possibilities of ordinary citizens having power and influence in a constructive way. *“... citizenship, government, participation. These were mere words we usually heard from TV. These words were familiar but we did not understand their real meaning. Now we are gradually getting it.” – College student Lousine Melkonyan in Armenia.*
- **School staffs and students developed more open, democratic communication** and interaction among themselves as well as with NGO’s, authorities, and others in the community. The result was a more open climate for discussion and decision-making. *“Openness is a great achievement. A little change is big.” – Muborak Tashpulatova, Director, Tashkent Center of Public Education, Uzbekistan.*
- **From students to education ministers**, key participants came to understand that the way they work together on their projects and in teams reflects their understanding and practice of democracy and vice versa. *“The teachers are thinking that if they push for (new interactive techniques), if we keep showing them what we’re doing and showing them what the kids are getting out of it ... that will make some impact at the top.” – U. S. teacher Janet Croon on consulting visit to Azerbaijan.*
- **The level of practical knowledge** about democracy and its application improved significantly regarding government structures, for example, and how citizens can influence them. Of the students and teachers participating in a DEEP workshop in Ukraine, for instance, 100 percent said they learned about appealing to a government agency and how to argue a point, and 95 percent said they learned about the structure and functions of local government.
- **The effects of the project were widespread** beyond the immediate participants. Some schools in Uzbekistan, for example, changed the way they conduct their teacher council meetings and parent meetings. And most country teams promoted their democracy education projects and their community projects widely through local media and the Internet. Several schools set up multiple web sites. *“We have been able to break through*

*the skeptical, hesitant, pessimistic nature of schools, families, (and) students a little.” – DEEP team report from Azerbaijan.*

- **DEEP raised the profile of youths** in their schools and communities. Teachers felt and showed more respect for their pupils when they saw their initiative and creativity. Other adults learned that young people could be constructive members of their community who have the ability to think critically and can make a tangible contribution. The community of Grozesti, Moldova, rallied to the cause of their youth, contributing money or materials for upgrading a local stadium and constantly asked them about their progress.
- **DEEP raised the level of knowledge from theoretical to practical**, even where democratic principles were more established. *“The Estonian team has taken an institutionalized process and is showing people how it can be done better.” – Charlotte Anderson, DEEP program director, CRFC. [What process is being referred to?]*
- **The project produced volumes [Can we give numbers?] of new teaching materials** in the field of democracy education for use in the 12 countries. Teams and other participants translated, adapted and created their own guides to local government, lesson plans, evaluation forms, sample surveys and teaching manuals.
- **Participants achieved concrete results**, even though the emphasis of the project was to improve the process of teaching and practicing democratic principles. A Moldovan community project resulted in a new activity center for youth. Research and lobbying by students in Uzbekistan won a moratorium on liquor stores near schools [*Verify.*]. [*Charlotte, is this accurate?*]
- **Serious institutional changes** came about, even within the short timeframe of the project. Both the Russian and Lithuanian DEEP teams, for example, developed standards on areas of civic education that were adopted by their governments and now are required in the curriculum nationwide.

Ukraine provides a snapshot of the kind of change that occurred through the project. The DEEP team there created before-and-after questionnaires to survey about 30 students, teachers, and public officials who participated in a workshop the team conducted called “Youth Choose Action.” Before the workshop, the survey showed, for example, that “an overwhelming majority of students and teachers did not know how to address public officials effectively and to structure

a conversation. An overwhelming majority of students had no experience communicating and having business contacts with the authorities. Teachers noted that they had had only sporadic contacts with the local self-government bodies, and the experience of this communication when tackling social issues had been negative.” The pre-survey also showed that an overwhelming majority of the participants in the workshop did not know how to raise and formulate community issues, to plan a solution and to lobby for support in the community and among public officials. Nearly two-thirds didn’t know how to use e-mail and 80 percent didn’t know how to use on-line forums.

After the five-day workshop, 72 percent of participants said they had gained skills in communication, 68 percent said they had learned how to design, carry out, and evaluate social projects and 90 percent said they had gained “excellent” knowledge about the structure and function of local government. The training also provided 75 percent with skills in using e-mail and Internet forums. Nearly all the students said they’d gained skills in working in a group, doing research and planning a project. Perhaps the most poignant result is the simple belief in the power of community action. Participants in the workshop were skeptical at first that they could ever get a meeting with a government official. In the process of organizing teams of students in their school to address a community problem, they were encouraged as they saw little signs of progress. By the end of DEEP, another survey showed that participants “believe social projects can influence the life of the community, and they plan to engage in social projects after the completion of the (DEEP) project.”

A more detailed look at specific results follows with an examination of the effect of DEEP in four target areas – students, teachers, DEEP team members and policy.

### **DEEP Results for Students**

Hands-on, real-life projects and new kinds of classroom lessons guided by teachers trained in interactive techniques allowed students to learn about democracy by practicing its principles in a way that produced new knowledge and skills as well as concrete results.

The specific results for students were the following:

- New and/or deeper understanding of democratic rights and responsibilities of citizens.
- Knowledge about government structures and how citizens can influence decisions.

- Confidence in their own role and potential influence and improved relations with adults around them, from teachers to public officials.
- Practical skills in project planning, research, working in teams, constructive communication, Internet use, letter-writing, and lobbying. Work on group projects demonstrated students' abilities to cooperate and respect each other and to engage in cooperative problem solving.
- More open and democratic classrooms that resulted in students being more actively and effectively involved in classroom activities.

In Armenia, for example, 75 teachers received three days of training in new interactive techniques for developing active citizenship skills, using nine new lessons that the DEEP team had created. The teachers then used those lessons and their new techniques in after-school projects in which mostly 8<sup>th</sup> - and 9<sup>th</sup>-graders in 12 pilot schools elected student councils and created a school constitution. Students in the pilot classes as well as from other schools participated in DEEP Armenia online discussions of issues that were raised in the class lessons. The message board racked up more than 800 visits and 100 messages in two months.

Students experienced a distinct shift in attitude during the project, from skeptical (“Teachers won’t listen to us.” “Who cares about our opinion?”) to being very involved, according to the DEEP team’s report. As the course progressed, teachers and team members observed students actively and freely participating in discussions on issues; expressing their viewpoints about democracy, rights and responsibilities, etc.; and supporting their opinions. The classes created a “culture of debating and learning from peers.”

*“Even the most passive students participated in group work and were able to formulate their ideas without fear of being wrong.” – Armenia DEEP team report.*

*“My son has become interested in politics ... He talks about the future.” – Parent of student participant in Armenia.*

*“DEEP made our students so active that they currently help adults in preparation of presidential elections. They participate in the real pre-election activities and it*

*results from their previous experience with the DEEP project. This is a fact that speaks for itself.” – Principal of a regional school in Armenia.*

*“Our generation is growing without any awareness of our rights and responsibilities for each other and the state. This course proved to be very useful for me since it filled in that gap in my knowledge.” – 8<sup>th</sup> grade participant in Armenia.*

*“The students started to believe in their strength and ability to make changes.” -- Gayane Zargaryan, Project Advisor and DEEP team member.*

In the Czech Republic, students in pilot classes provided useful feedback on new interactive lessons. For example, they rated the interest level and usefulness of a lesson with a social worker as 3.8 to 4.4 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being highest. On a different scale, a lesson on reading newspapers with an informed, critical eye, taught by a journalist, received equally high marks.

### **DEEP Results for Teachers**

Teachers gained a greater understanding of democracy in practice, perhaps most importantly in the way they can make it work for themselves and their students in the classroom. Through many hands-on, interactive workshops conducted by DEEP teams that modeled an open classroom environment, teachers and prospective teachers learned and practiced new techniques. In most countries, the lessons were then used in classrooms, some with collegial observation to provide feedback.

Specific results for teachers were:

- **Teaching Techniques:** New teaching techniques to engage their students and convey the principles of democracy and citizen participation in a more meaningful way.
- **Valuing of democratic practices:** An appreciation for the value of civic education and democratic interaction at all levels.
- **Relationships:** More constructive relationships with their students, their peers and their administrators. Often this included a shift from the authoritarian style of management in schools to a more democratic model.

- **Confidence:** The confidence to handle more active classes, take risks with new approaches, and advocate for changes in their schools and beyond.
- **Data:** Results of surveys and other research that determined the needs of teachers and democracy education and provided support for future lobbying for change.
- **Contacts:** Contacts with colleagues in their country and in the U. S. that will help them broaden their horizons and exchange information and ideas to further their work.

At the beginning of the Armenia projects on school governance, for example, teachers were tentative and students were not talking much; energy lagged. This changed as both teachers and students gained confidence and became more comfortable working in a cooperative mode. More than 60 percent of teachers who participated said the training dramatically increased their interest in implementing student government at their schools.

*“I became a better teacher. Working with such an effective methodology I could learn more about my students. I understood that we should be more patient and listen to students as much as possible.” – Teacher in Armenia.*

In Azerbaijan, 22 teachers who were nervous during the first three-day DEEP training because they realized how much they still needed to learn about democracy were handling the material and process very well by the time U.S. colleagues observed them several months later after a follow-up workshop. Teachers had gained an understanding, for example, that content matters as much as the process rather than going to the extreme of focusing entirely on the interactive process to the detriment of content. Experimenting teachers who received negative comments from non-participating teachers for their initiative became more determined to defend their new techniques. In the end, their projects’ successes raised their status among colleagues and in professional development institutes.

In Croatia, where some teachers already used democratic and student-centered practices, the DEEP team conducted face-to-face surveys with 60 teachers in 15 schools to document the status of civic education. The research found that the most prevalent content was learning about the political system and Constitution of Croatia, the methods used most were discussion and conversation and the most common materials were textbooks and “blackboard and chalk.” The

results helped the team design materials and seminars for teachers that focused on critical thinking, role-playing, problem solving, and interactive learning.

In the Czech Republic, 19 students at St. Charles University in Prague who were studying to become elementary school teachers took a one-semester course on teaching Romany children. The six sessions included historical context, structure, traditions, and values of the family; specific difficulties of Romany children in school; and teaching controversial topics and cultural diversity at the elementary level. Nearly all the participants in the course were able to answer practical knowledge questions about Romany after the course, compared to almost none before the course.

### **DEEP Results for Team Members**

The combination of working on several fronts (teacher training and materials, policy advocacy, and community support building) and seeing the connections helped build an understanding of systemic change among DEEP team members. The team visits to the U. S. in Spring 2002 and the challenge of working together to plan and carry out their objectives gave them a deeper understanding of democratic behavior and the need for democracy education, even in the most advanced of their countries.

*“From participation in the DEEP program I understood that democracy is a discussion and I saw a model of a civil society marked by freedom and responsibility, respect for diversity, a passion for human dignity, a striving for justice and equality”. (Rima Tarbuniene, English teacher in Lithuania)*

*“Participation in the DEEP project allowed me to significantly expand my understanding of the possibilities of democracy education. Alexander Anikeyev, Principal in Kaluga, Russia*

### **Specific results for team members were:**

- First-hand observation of democracy in practice and interactive teaching and learning during U. S. site visits to schools, local council meetings, and government offices.

- New partnerships with U. S. organizations.
- New contacts and constructive relationships with teachers, administrators, and public officials, as well as with students.
- Interactive training techniques that will be useful not only for the educators on the teams but also for the NGO leaders who often train in their advocacy area.

The features of the program that resulted in these benefits were seeing examples of democracy in action in U. S. classrooms; seeing improved learning about democracy among students in their countries; engaging in interactive, project-based professional development; taking action to change education policy; and experiencing more democratic administrator-teacher relationships. Teacher Polina Verbytska, a member of the Ukraine team and president of Nova Doba, a Ukraine-wide association of history, social studies, and civics teachers, said she came to understand the definition of a good citizen as personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented.

However, some teams are still struggling with developing collaborative relationships. In one case, political tensions and recent civil war contributed to problems among team members. In another case, leadership style hindered the functioning of the team. Members of some teams did not know each other before coming together for the DEEP project and this inhibited cohesion on two of the teams. The following table shows levels of cooperation within the DEEP teams. Cohesiveness of the teams, leadership capacity, and shared vision among team members and others will effect whether the DEEP work continues.

Level of Cooperation	CEE/NIS Countries
High level of collaboration and cooperation	Armenia, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine
Medium	Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan
Low	Croatia, Estonia, Poland

*Table 4 – Levels of Cooperation within DEEP Country Teams*

*[Site Directors. Please note that in the final version of the report, we’ll take out the names of countries and only note the numbers in each category. Are these categories accurate in your estimation?]*

### **DEEP Results for Policy**

Most DEEP teams were engaged actively in lobbying for changes in policy, either directly or indirectly, and in a few countries, they succeeded with significant changes even within the

short timeframe of the project. In most other countries, policymakers became engaged in support of democracy education.

- In Russia, where 70 percent of the curriculum is imposed by the state and 25 percent is determined by the region, the Russian Duma in December 2002 approved new civics education standards for grades 5-8, as developed by members of the DEEP team and participants of the special DEEP Russian component that was operated by Indiana University.
- The Lithuanian Ministry of Education added standards on the country's Constitution that were devised by the DEEP team. The team had distributed a draft to teachers for comment and then revised them accordingly before submission. They now are required for all schools in Lithuania, and 1,500 copies of the final version were printed and disseminated among teachers.
- In Kazakhstan, a DEEP team member presented its ideas about civics education to the annual conference of the ruling political party, Otan. Subsequently, the party leader said that when the team develops recommendations to make civic education part of the state curriculum, he will hold parliamentary hearings on the plan. The team now is organizing a Central Asian collaborative group to develop such recommendations.
- The DEEP team in Ukraine sent recommendations from a roundtable on education and social problems conducted during the team's final conference to the country's education ministry.

## **Key DEEP Features Contributing to Change**

Certain elements of DEEP appear to have made a particular impact on the capacity for DEEP teams, teachers, students, and other participants to succeed in their efforts to improve the quality of democracy education in their schools and countries.

- **Systemic, student-learning-focused view:** Project guidance that promoted a systemic view, realistic objectives, and an emphasis on more than one area but with each area clearly linked to the ultimate goal of improved learning by students.
- **Democratic dialogue:** A philosophical framework and expectations for democratic, equal dialogue and learning within the CEE/NIS teams, between them and the U. S. partners, as well as with and among all participants.
- **Instructional best practice.** Research and examples of instructional best practices for learning democratic principles that could be adapted easily to their culture and context while focusing on constructive handling of controversial issues.
- **Substantive, relevant experience:** Substantive and relevant experiences during the U. S. visits by the CEE/NIS teams to demonstrate how democratic principles operate in schools and in local government and to show the importance of active youth involvement in communities.
- **Application:** A program design from start to finish that required practical application and exercises in democratic practices, whether in team planning, routine communication, or real-life projects.
- **Continuous contact:** Continuity of contact between CEE/NIS teams and their U. S. partners through the initial conference, the team’s visit to the U. S., the U. S. colleagues’ consulting visits to the CEE/NIS countries and communication in between visits via e-mail.

*“I value above all our meetings with experts (journalists, instructors, teachers at various levels), and in particular the ensuing debates in which we were able to compare our own experience with what we have seen in the U.S., and discuss our perceptions with colleagues from other countries. This was both an encouragement and an inspiration for us.” (Dana Rabinakova, team leader, Czech Republic)*

## **U. S. Component of DEEP**

[To be written after Spring data collection and analysis is completed.]

## **Conclusions and Lessons Learned from DEEP**

Overall, DEEP demonstrated that the quality of democracy education can improve tangibly in the short term and a base can be built for further strengthening in the long term if the project leaders and participants focus on three key elements: student learning as the ultimate aim; clear and careful planning with that aim in mind; and determined application of democratic principles of openness and active citizenship in all phases, including any instruction for teachers and students.

### **Lessons Learned by CEE/NIS Participants**

- Democracy education needs to include not only new knowledge but also practice and development of skills in communication, initiative, and action that are the basis for democratic citizenship. This in turn requires educators to gain a new perspective and understanding of democratic principles and the skills to convey them in a way that responds to their own context and culture.
- Participants learned how to involve community groups, administrators, and policymakers, not just students and teachers, in the process of improving democracy education. This also means educating adults beyond the schools either by including them in training or involving them in projects or by public relations activities such as media coverage.
- Seeing and experiencing democracy in practice and democracy education during their visits to the U. S. gave CEE/NIS teams an appreciation for the complexity and pervasiveness of democratic principles throughout such a society. Observing and discussing interactive lessons, local government meetings, and NGO activities provided models that they could adapt for their own countries' needs.
- The discipline of using democratic practices and hands-on learning in teacher training deepened the understanding of the value of openness and interactive learning.

### **Lessons Learned by U. S. Participants**

- The passionate dedication to improving democracy education in the CEE/NIS countries provided an example to U. S. educators and their students who tend to take democracy for granted. It highlighted the still relatively weak emphasis on civic education in the U. S. in relation to the high level of demand for democratic activity.

- The degree of collaboration on the teams correlated directly with results achieved. Because it is important that teams are made up of diverse skills, interests, and viewpoints, it becomes that much more necessary to provide them with the skills of team work and communication.
- Consistency of personal relationships and connections throughout the project between U. S. and CEE/NIS counterparts was necessary for providing adequate support for both sides. U. S. site directors learned that in future programs it would be important for them to visit the CEE/NIS countries early in the project to understand the context and help guide formation of teams.
- CEE/NIS participants particularly needed support to gain expertise in the processes of change, such as action planning, developing standards, systemic approaches, and open communication.
- More balance in terms of project benefits for U. S. educators would be helpful both in providing U. S. participants more useful tools for their work but also in ensuring a balanced measure of mutual respect and growth.
- Extensive opportunities exist for continued work by the consortium organizations individually or collectively with the CEE/NIS teams. Additionally, the processes used could readily be adapted for work with other countries.

***[Site Directors. Please suggest other lessons learned by CEE/NIS and/or U.S. participants you would add to these lists of points.]***

## Appendix A

### Role Groups of CEE/NIS Participants

Role Group	Number of Participants in Role Group <sup>2</sup>													Total
	All	Round 1				Round 2				Round 3				
		Az <sup>3</sup>	Cz	Ka	Po	Cr	Mo	Ru	Uz	Ar	Es	Li	Uk	
Teacher trainer	33	2	2	0	2	4	1	9	5	2	2	1	3	33
School director	11	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	11
NGO staff	34	3	2	2	3	2	4	5	4	4	3	0	2	34
Teacher	35	4	3	0	4	4	4	5	2	1	4	2	2	35
University professor	21	4	2	2	0	0	1	5	0	4	2	0	1	21
Administrator	20	2	0	4	2	0	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	20
Ministry staff	13	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	4	13
Other	16	1	1	2	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	16
<b>Total</b>		17	13	12	14	18	10	33	15	14	16	10	13	185

*Table 5. Role Groups of CEE/NIS Participants*

<sup>2</sup> On the questionnaire CEE/NIS participants reported all the different professional roles that they plan in their country. Table 5 has the total of various role groups represented and the role groups by teams. Some participants have more than one role.

<sup>3</sup> Country codes in the tables are: Armenia (Ar), Azerbaijan (Az), Croatia (Cr), Czech Republic (Cz), Estonia (Es), Kazakhstan (Ka), Lithuania (Li), Moldova (Mo), Poland (Po), Russian (Ru), Ukraine (Uk), and Uzbekistan (Uz).

## Appendix B

### Activities of DEEP Teams

CEE/NIS Team	Student Learning	Teacher Learning	Curriculum/Materials	Policy/Research	Other (Admin., Res., Internet, Comm., Etc.)
<b>Armenia</b>	After school classes for 8 <sup>th</sup> , 9 <sup>th</sup> , and other students in 12 pilot schools - student self-government.  On-line discussions of issues (800 visits and 100 messages in 2 months).	3-day workshops for 75 teachers and administrators - cooperative, interactive methods.  1-day training for school on-line coordinators.	Teacher training materials.  Lesson plans (9) - interactive methods, citizenship skills.  Draft of Civic Competencies Handbook.		Administrators. <i>3-day workshops for 75 teachers and administrators - cooperative, interactive methods<sup>4</sup>.</i>  Communication. Network of organizations. <i>Student Internet discussions.</i>
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	Lessons - interactive, cooperative learning.  Experiential learning program for 30 students in Baku (visit municipal offices, constitutional court, museums, etc.).	3-day introductory and 5-day follow up workshops for 23 teachers - interactive methods, controversial issues, conflict resolution, computer skills.	Model lessons translated.  Teachers developing Azeri-language handbook of lessons.	Survey and analytical report on state of democracy education; recommendations to ministry.  Lobby for mandatory democracy education curriculum.	Administrators. Workshop for 10 school administrators - awareness.  Communication. Conferences, articles, TV.  Final DEEP Conference.
<b>Croatia</b>			Materials and seminar design for teacher training developed for K-4, 5-8, and secondary levels.  Civic education resource guide.	Needs assessment of democracy education in 15 selected schools (5 each kindergarten, elementary, and secondary); 60 teachers interviewed.  Research published.	Communication. Gain participation and support in the 15 schools.

**Table 6. Activities of DEEP Teams**

4 Where an activity was conducted for two groups or fits under two categories, it is entered in both columns and the duplicate entry is italicized.

CEE/NIS Team	Student Learning	Teacher Learning	Curriculum/Materials	Policy/Research	Other (Admin., Res., Internet, Comm., Etc.)
<b>Czech Republic</b>	354 students in 4 schools participated in new lessons - practical citizenship skills and attitudes. Students evaluated lessons. 38 students at 2 schools in iEARN program.	25 teachers piloted and evaluated 9 new interactive lessons. 2-day train the trainers workshop for 21 teachers - new methods, resource people. 2-day training for 12 teachers at elementary school - interactive methods.	Team members and 4 community resource people designed 9 new interactive lessons. Extensive evaluation and refinement. Training materials. Survey of existing teaching materials and projects the use new approaches.		Communication. Web, media, print, presentations reached 5,000 educators. <i>iEARN at 2 schools.</i> Community Expert Resources. <i>4 people helped design and teach lessons.</i> University/Pre-Service. 42 students piloted lessons. 19 students took seminar on teaching Roma children. 5 new topics for Masters theses.
<b>Estonia</b>	Piloted Guide and gave feedback.	6 teachers piloted Guide with students and gave feedback. Meetings/workshops for teachers to introduce the Guide, web site, and iEARN (64 teachers, 6 principals).	“Civic Engagement Guide” for students to help prepare for state exam (questions, exercises, worksheets) - critical thinking, discuss issues, analyze graphs/figures.	Contacted 6 education officials about Guide.	Round Table. Reviewed data on 2001 State Examination in Civics. Communication. Web page for educators, students - materials and resource links.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Baseline survey of level of civic consciousness of Kazakh students (600 students surveyed) - knowledge and attitudes.	<i>10-15 teachers surveyed 600 students.</i>		Survey on status of civic education. (62 faculty, educators, NGO, officials) <i>Baseline survey of the level of civic consciousness of Kazakh students.</i> Report of study results and conference proceedings published (500 copies).	Round Table. 20 experts in democracy education - status of curriculum/materials. Final DEEP Conference. Discuss results of study. Government officials, faculty, NGOs, principals. Communication. Web site.

CEE/NIS Team	Student Learning	Teacher Learning	Curriculum/Materials	Policy/Research	Other (Admin., Res., Internet, Comm., Etc.)
<b>Lithuania</b>	Students at 7 schools - on-line discussions with US students on controversial issues.	Workshop for 7 school teams (3 teachers, administrator, English/civics teacher, computer teacher) - feedback on Constitution standards, active teaching methods.  2 regional trainings - active methods.		Developed national standards on the Constitution. Approved by ministry, required of schools, sent to all teachers (1,500 copies).	Administration. <i>Workshop for 7 school teams includes administrators, civic education experts.</i>  Communication. Teacher discussion via web site; on-line review of standards. <i>On-line network - US and Lithuanian schools.</i>
<b>Moldova</b>	Youth in Action Project. 61 students on 3 teams (plus 4 other teams) designed and implemented action plans to solve community problem.  2-day seminar for adults and students.  Internet exchange with US students.	3-day training for 6 local teams, 29 (most are teachers plus NGO staff, local authorities - on project, communication, conflict resolution, advocacy.  <i>2-day seminar for adults and students.</i>	Adapted and translated training materials packet into Romanian - community action. Adapted from Street Law's "Youth Act!"		NGO and Local Authorities. <i>3-day training for 6 local teams; 2-day seminar.</i>  Final Conference. 10 students and 1 adult per team; students presented projects.  Communication. <i>Internet exchange with US students.</i>
<b>Poland</b>	Students involved in 26 community action projects.  <i>30 students attended 1-day workshop - service learning, law, iEARN.</i>	130 teachers (civic education, others), principals, guests, and 30 students attended 1-day workshops in 4 towns - service learning, law, iEARN.	In process of developing teacher manual.		Administrators. <i>Principals attended 1-day workshops - service learning, law, iEARN.</i>  Communication. Web site {English/Polish}, pamphlet, radio, newspapers.

*Table 6. Activities of DEEP Teams (Cont.)*

CEE/NIS Team	Student Learning	Teacher Learning	Curriculum/Materials	Policy/Research	Other (Admin., Res., Internet, Comm., Etc.)
<b>Russia</b>	3 pilot sites, 15 schools field tested program with 5 <sup>th</sup> , 9 <sup>th</sup> , and secondary students. Pre-test data collected, (post-test data later).  iEARN projects.	2 2-day regional workshops for 92 teachers, principals, administrators, officials, and NGO - standards, competencies, methods.	Teacher training materials.  Translated and adapted lessons.  Student pre-post tests.	Methodic Letter on democracy education for ministry.  Policy workshop for ministry, teachers, university faculty, textbook writers, standards developers.  Paper on democracy education.  <b>Developed civic education standards for grades 5-8. Approved by Russian Duma.*</b>	Administrators. 2 2-day regional workshops.  Final Conference. "The Russian Way" 128 people from all regions (university chairs, experts, officials, NGOs, teachers, media).  Communication. Teacher and student iEARN projects - tolerance, distance learning.  <b>Bekasovo Planning Conference. 17 Russian education leaders met with US directors for 3 days - status of, obstacles to democracy education.</b>  <b>Bloomington, IN Seminar. 20 Russian civic education specialists met for 3 weeks in US.</b>  <b>St. Petersburg Conference. Team of 20 presented to 30 other Russian educators.</b>
<b>Ukraine</b>	5-day workshop for community service teams (32 students, teachers, administrators) -	5-day workshop for community service teams (32 students, teachers, administrators) -	Teaching Manual for community service projects (70 pages) printed and on-line. Adapted from Street	Recommendations from conference round table on education and social problems sent to ministry.	Administrators. 5-day workshop for community service teams.  Communication. Web

\*Bold items are activities led by the Russian team that worked with Indiana University.  
DE.03.rd.FinRpt.DFR.5-21.doc

Table 6. Activities of DEEP Teams (Cont.)

CEE/NIS Team	Student Learning	Teacher Learning	Curriculum/Materials	Policy/Research	Other (Admin., Res., Internet, Comm., Etc.)
	hands-on training. 7 school teams (320 students, 33 adults) designed/implemented community service/local problem projects.	<i>hands-on training.</i>	Law's "Youth Act!"		site and iEARN network for participating schools. Final Conference. Students presented and discussed projects.
<b>Uzbekistan</b>	3 1-day seminars for 107 6 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> grade students on student government. Teams at 4 pilot "Socially Active Schools" planned and implemented community projects.	5-day teacher workshops (1 in Russian, 1 in Uzbek) - interactive methods, democracy knowledge and skills. 12-15 teachers from each school. Training on iEARN.			Roundtable. 40 administrators, teachers, students, parents, local/state officials, community committees. Administrators. 5-day workshop for 30 principals, deputies of academics, local officials - plan to democratize, socially active schools.

*Table 6. Activities of DEEP Teams (Cont.)*

Activity Area	Number of Teams	Countries with Emphasis
Students	8	Ar, Az, Cz, Mo, Po, Ru, Uk, Uz
Teachers	10	Ar, Az, Cz, Es, Li, Mo, Po, Ru, Uk, Uz
Curriculum/Materials	8	Ar, Az, Cr, Cz, Es, Mo, Ru, Uk
Policy/Research	6	Az, Cr, Ka, Li, Ru, Ru/Bl
Administration	7	Ar, Az, Li, Po, Ru, Uk, Uz
Communication	11	Ar, Az, Cz, Es, Ka, Li, Mo, Po, Ru, Ru/Bl, Uk, Uz

*Table 7. Teams with Strong Emphasis in Each Activity*

## Appendix C

### Numbers of Participants in CEE/NIS DEEP Team Activities

	Students <sup>5</sup>	Teachers	Admin.	Officials	Experts, NGOs	Univ. Fac./Std.	Others (mixed)	Inform. (Media)	Total
<b>Armenia</b>	1200	66	7		8		15	3,050	4,346
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	490	23	10	UN <sup>6</sup>	UN		55	NA	578
<b>Croatia</b>	25	100	15	8			11	NA	159
<b>Czech Republic</b>	392	37	4		4	61	1	5,760	6,259
<b>Estonia</b>	(1400) <sup>7</sup>	70	8	6	3	2		NA	1,489
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	1350	10		1	32	21	7	NA	1,421
<b>Lithuania</b>	500	20	7	2	4	UN	6	NA	533
<b>Moldova</b>	61+	34		4	UN			NA	99
<b>Poland</b>	290	173	8	3	1	3		NA	478
<b>Russia</b>	1378	253	17	17	31	59	17	NA	1,772
<b>Ukraine</b>	579	14	8	UN	9	UN	40	1,550	2,200
<b>Uzbekistan</b>	158	50	30	UN	8			UN	246
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,823</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>10,360</b>	<b>19,588</b>

*Table 8. Numbers of Participants in CEE/NIS DEEP Team Activities*

<sup>5</sup> The numbers do not include numbers of the DEEP team who also represent these groups as well.

<sup>6</sup> UN means that people in this category were involved, but we don't know the number (UN = unknown number).

<sup>7</sup> ( ) means potential number that might be involved.