



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

WHITE PAPER SERIES

Centers for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) Program

Paper Three: Sustainability

FINAL REPORT

January 2011

This final report was prepared for the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, Office of Regional Sustainable Development, Education and Human Resources Team, under the Evaluation and Technical Support to LAC/RSD/EHR Contract AFP-M-00-06-00047-00. It was prepared by the Aguirre Division of JBS International, Inc. Its primary authors are Pablo Javier Zardini and Ignacio Enrique Zardini.

CETT WHITE PAPER SERIES

This document is one in a series of white papers discussing the implementation and outcomes of the Centers for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) program. The CETT program was implemented by USAID's Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, Office of Regional Sustainable Development, Education and Human Resources Team from 2002–2009. CETT was based on a Presidential Initiative derived from commitments made by the U.S. Government at the Summit of the Americas in 2001 and operated in twenty-one countries in the regions of Central and South America, as well as the Caribbean.

The purpose of this CETT white paper series is to highlight the legacy of the initiative and to provide future program designers with some of the most important lessons learned and best practices developed within the long-term implementation of the CETT program.

The CETT white paper series includes five publications by theme:

Paper One: Regional Nature

This white paper discusses the challenges, successes, and lessons learned implementing a regional model for teacher training. The regional nature of CETT differentiated this program from other, strictly national, teacher professional development efforts undertaken by USAID. Three CETTs in the Caribbean, Central and South America underwent a significant process of compromise and cooperation to arrive at their regional models and this paper documents the initiatives taken.

Paper Two: Testing and Assessment

This white paper discusses the challenges and lessons learned in the process of creating a cross-country testing initiative. The three CETTs carried out testing initiatives to track student performance toward literacy benchmarks, with the goal of showing valid and reliable results. An extremely challenging endeavor, student assessment is further complicated when using tests across countries.

Paper Three: Sustainability

This white paper discusses the lessons learned while anticipating the challenges of sustaining the CETT program after the end of USAID funding. The CETTs worked closely with USAID to prepare for the continuation of the program at the regional, national, and local levels. The paper examines the political, financial, institutional, and social sustainability dimensions of these efforts.

Paper Four: Paradigm Shift

This white paper discusses the systemic change in the behaviors and attitudes of CETT stakeholder groups, including school administrators, teacher trainers, teachers, parents, and students. CETT's teacher training model stressed the inclusion of stakeholders at all levels to promote the importance of reading and writing. Achievement of the program's intended effects depended on the willingness of the institutions and individuals involved to change their behaviors. This paper highlights the lessons learned and best practices in promoting this change.

Paper Five: Cost Effectiveness

This white paper presents a cost-effectiveness study linking financial inputs and CETT program outcomes. The CETT model of teacher training developed differently in each of the three regions and this white paper analyzes the history of costs over time, cost-effectiveness based on teacher and student performance, and the limitations of comparing costs across countries and programs.

WHITE PAPER SERIES

Centers for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) Program

Paper Three: Sustainability

Prepared by:

Pablo Javier Zardini
Ignacio Enrique Zardini

Edited by:

Mirka Tvaruzkova

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms.....	iii
Introduction and Methodology.....	1
Purpose	2
Concept of Sustainability.....	2
Research Questions	3
Methodology	4
Limitations of the Study.....	4
CETT Sustainability Efforts.....	7
Phase One (2002–2006).....	7
Phase Two (2006–2009)	8
Political Sustainability	11
National Government.....	11
Local Government.....	14
Role of USAID.....	15
Financial Sustainability.....	17
Marketing CETT Products.....	17
Partnerships and Alliances	19
Institutional Sustainability.....	23
Institutionalization in Host Entity.....	23
Institutional Capacity Building.....	24
Efforts to Sustain Regional Cooperation.....	25
Social Sustainability.....	27
Social Marketing: Creating a Culture of Literacy	27
Knowledge Sharing of Effective Teacher Practices	28
Lessons Learned and Recommendations	31
Program Sustainability Lessons.....	31
Political Sustainability	31
Financial Sustainability	32
Institutional Sustainability.....	32
Social Sustainability	33
Recommendations for Future Programs.....	33

Acronyms

AOTR	Agreement Officer’s Technical Representative
CA-RD	Centroamérica – Republica Dominicana
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
C-CETT	Caribbean CETT
CETT	Centers for Excellence in Teacher Training
EDUCO	Educación con Participación de la Comunidad
EDUCOMM	The Caribbean CETT’s Virtual Technology and Communication Platform
FEPADE	Fundación Empresarial para el Desarrollo Educativo, El Salvador
JBTE	Joint Board of Teacher Education, University of the West Indies
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
INICE	Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Capacitación Educativa
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PUCMM	Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra, Dominican Republic
RICETT	Red Inter-institucional del CETT (CETT CA-RD Inter-institutional Network)
UASB	Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, Ecuador
UPCH	Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Peru
UPN	Universidad Pedagógica Nacional Francisco Morazán, Honduras
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UVG	Universidad del Valle, Guatemala
UWI	University of the West Indies

Introduction and Methodology

The Centers for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) program was a Presidential Initiative to improve the pedagogical skills of teachers in the first, second, and third grades in economically disadvantaged communities of Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). The hemisphere-wide program—announced in 2001 and implemented by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)—created three regional¹ CETTs that began implementation in 13 countries, referred to in this study as:

1. C-CETT (beginning in the Caribbean countries of Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, St. Lucia, Guyana, and Belize);²
2. Centro Andino (Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia in South America); and
3. CETT CA-RD (in the Central American countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua; and in the Dominican Republic).

The Cooperative Agreements for USAID assistance to the CETT program ended in December 2009 after over seven years of technical support. (Two CETTs were issued a no-cost extension until early 2010.) As a result of the program, 35,095 teachers and administrators received training in interactive methods of literacy instruction. The program reached over 799,000 students in 21 countries.

CETT provided in-service training to teachers and administrators located in disadvantaged rural and urban areas that did not benefit from other donor programming. The program promoted the development of skills and adoption of active-learning strategies for teaching reading by aligning existing pedagogical practice with research-based best practices. The program had five core components:

1. **Teacher training** in effective reading methodologies and classroom management techniques
2. **Materials** for teachers to use to improve their reading instruction
3. **Diagnostic tools** to enable teachers to identify and address students' weaknesses and needs
4. **Applied research** to ensure the efficacy of the training, tools, and materials provided
5. **Information and communications technologies (ICTs)** to broaden access to the program

In addition, the CETTs also focused on sustainability efforts to ensure continuance of the program after the end of USAID funding. Within the parameters of these components, each CETT had the flexibility to manage and implement the program based on its regional context and needs. As a result, the CETTs developed with slight differences in each region.

CETT training *content* was related to seven literacy skills: reading comprehension, phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, oral expression, written expression, and vocabulary. Knowledge of these skills provided the foundation for integrated and effective reading instruction.

¹ In this study, “regional” refers to one of the three CETT areas: the Caribbean, South America, or Central America and the Dominican Republic. “Hemispheric” refers to all three CETTs as a single unit.

² By the end of the program in 2009, many more islands in the Caribbean had adopted CETT. Jamaica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Belize, Guyana, and the Commonwealth of Dominica implemented CETT with USAID funding. After learning of the experiences and results of other countries, the governments of Trinidad and Tobago and Grenada approached C-CETT to join, fully financing their own implementation and purchasing C-CETT’s technical support. In 2009, five additional countries signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) to expand CETT implementation to St. Kitts and Nevis, Antigua and Barbuda, Anguilla, Montserrat, and the British Virgin Islands.

The CETT teacher training model introduced innovative *techniques* such as continuous teacher training throughout the school year and follow-up support in the classroom. Teacher trainers visited CETT classrooms where they observed teachers and provided feedback and recommendations. Teacher circles gave teachers the opportunity to share their experiences with peers. Each CETT also emphasized the role of parents and the greater community in embracing a “culture of literacy” to support the importance of reading in the early grades.

The program was implemented in two phases: Phase One (2002–2006) and Phase Two (2006–2009). Phase One launched the initial CETT program design and development. Lead implementing institutions in Jamaica, Honduras, and Peru signed Cooperative Agreements with USAID. Phase Two supported a continuation of the CETTs following USAID’s emergent consensus that five years were not sufficient to fully implement the program and achieve the desired results.

Purpose

The purpose of this white paper is twofold. It describes the sustainability efforts undertaken by CETT to ensure continuity of the program after the end of USAID funding in September 2009. The paper also presents lessons learned that may inform sustainability practices for future teacher training projects, especially at a regional level.

This white paper is part of the CETT white paper series, a compilation of five research papers on key topics related to CETT: regional nature, testing and assessment, sustainability, paradigm shift, and cost effectiveness. Each of the white papers examines the three CETTs through a selection of lenses and analyzes the research findings to bring significant and specific lessons learned with respect to CETT activities into focus. This research gives form to the legacy of the Presidential Initiative and provides future program designers with some of the most important lessons learned during the long-term implementation of the CETT program.

Concept of Sustainability

Sustainability of international development initiatives generally refers to the continued flow of program benefits to intended populations beyond the end of donor funding.³ Sustaining the effects of a given program involves, for instance, transferring its activities to existing administrative structures (such as projects taken over by governmental agencies) or providing further assistance through continued implementation by the same entity (such as programs that become part of NGOs or other organizations’ programmatic activities). For the purpose of this study, sustainability refers to the long-term maintenance and growth of the CETT program.

To fully understand the results of the CETT program, the research team examined sustainability through four lenses. First, political sustainability depends on government support.⁴ Long-term sustainability of government or donor-funded programs generally requires leadership and commitment of political will on the part of authorities at the municipal, district, state, or national levels. Second, financial sustainability depends on the ability to deploy financial resources necessary to sustain program activities.⁵ Over time, the sources of funding may change, but funding is required to maintain the flow of program benefits. Third, institutional sustainability depends on key institutional stakeholders’ long-term

³ Sclafani, J. A. (2000). Sustainability: A client-driven model. *Initiatives/JSI Research & Training Institute*.

⁴ Devine, J. (2003). The paradox of sustainability: Reflections of NGOs in Bangladesh. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 590, 227–242. doi: 10.1177/0002716203257067.

⁵ Ibid.

commitment to the program's success. The commitment of local universities and other educational institutions to the CETT program was essential to its development, maintenance, and expansion. Fourth, social sustainability depends on the participation and commitment of key community stakeholders to the CETT program.⁶ Community participation in education projects, for example, is one of the driving forces of social sustainability, because it helps develop a sense of ownership. Increasing the community's stake in a particular program can ease resistance to change and generate local leadership and support for the effort, both of which are powerful forces that promote sustainability.

Research Questions

To accomplish the purpose of the study, the research team compiled opinions, experiences, and attitudes of CETT program stakeholders and beneficiaries in all three regions. Consultants Pablo Javier Zardini and Ignacio Enrique Zardini led the research team. The team collected data for the white paper in order to answer the following research questions:

1. What practices and lessons learned for sustaining operations and expanding the program have emerged from the national and regional CETT teams?
2. Have there been successes in gaining government buy-in and support at the national level and how can this experience be used to foster political sustainability in other programs? How have the CETTs marketed themselves to foster buy-in?
3. Some CETTs actively expanded their programs using resources from private donors and other partners. What methods of financial sustainability have been successful, and under what conditions? How can lessons learned from that process assist other CETTs with their quest for sustainability?
4. Where there have been successes in fostering institutional and social sustainability, how have the CETTs managed these efforts and what best practices and lessons learned might future implementers utilize? Specifically, what challenges did the CETTs face in attempting to collaborate with the private and civil sectors?
5. Are there potential capacities among the CETTs, such as evaluation and assessment abilities, which have not been utilized enough to foster sustainability?

The research team drafted these questions to help gather views on the sustainability process from both inside and outside the CETTs and to understand the evolution of this process. Using the various themes of sustainability already discussed, the research team studied the level of sustainability achieved by the CETTs in the following four dimensions:

- *Political Sustainability*: The interest and commitment of local or national governments in supporting the program and the degree of government involvement in scaling up the CETT program
- *Financial Sustainability*: The interest, commitment, and participation of private companies, NGOs, international organizations, and foreign cooperation agencies in CETT activities and the deployment of resources needed to help sustain those activities in different countries

⁶ Meza, D. & Guzmán, J. L. (2004). EDUCO: A community managed education program in rural areas of El Salvador. *Reducing poverty and sustaining growth: A global exchange [Case study]*. Retrieved from <http://go.worldbank.org/1LHRXHL9F0>

- *Institutional Sustainability*: The interest and commitment of implementing institutions to the CETT teacher training model, personnel retention, and program expansion
- *Social Sustainability*: The degree of participation in and commitment to the different stakeholder groups benefiting from the CETT program, including teachers, students, parents, school principals, CETT staff, and donor partners

Methodology

Sample Selection

The study sample included the country of the lead implementing institution in each of the three regions: Jamaica in the Caribbean, Peru in South America, and Honduras in Central America. The lead institutions in these three countries led the majority of CETT sustainability efforts. Two additional countries—the Dominican Republic and Guatemala—responded to information requests.

In each country, the sample consisted of individuals from the following stakeholder groups:

- CETT executive directors
- CETT national or regional coordinators
- CETT training coordinators
- Other CETT staff relevant to sustainability
- USAID staff at local missions
- Local ministry officials to determine the level of local buy-in

The personnel interviewed varied according to the structure of each CETT. For example, in C-CETT the team interviewed a regional sustainability expert, whereas in Central America, the team interviewed each member country's own sustainability staff member. The authors of this report were especially familiar with sustainability efforts at the country level in Central and South America, as they had helped local CETT staff develop their sustainability goals and plans at the beginning of Phase Two. The team made efforts to reach out to any stakeholders that were involved in developing a sustainable CETT program, including former CETT coordinators and ministry officials.

Data Collection and Analysis

In-person and telephone interviews took place during February, March, and May 2010. The research team collected data based on four kinds of sustainability and used this information in combination with an analysis of relevant documents such as annual and quarterly program reports and sustainability reports. A semi-structured interview protocol, which was used in all interviews, included the main research questions.

The white paper series covers various themes that overlap, thus field notes from other white paper research teams were also valuable resources for this report, especially those from countries that were not visited. The researchers used field notes from the paradigm shift white paper (paper four) and the regional nature white paper (paper one) to collect information from Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Limitations of the Study

The research team identified several limitations of the research study. Some of the limitations had been known from the outset of the research, while others became apparent during the data collection

process. Though the research team worked hard to overcome the challenges that arose, it is important to note that some of these limitations do affect the findings and results.

- USAID funding for the CETT program was coming to an end or had concluded in many countries during data collection. As a result, some staff members were transitioning out of the program or had already moved on to other positions. In addition, the program had been in place for over seven years when data collection began. For this reason, it was impossible to conduct interviews or communicate with all of the current and former CETT staff.
- It is possible that the stakeholders who responded to the research team's requests to take part in interviews and focus groups had been the most involved with the program. It is also possible that they over-represented a view that the CETT program had made the most impact on program beneficiaries.
- Reports from respondents were not always consistent. In these situations, the research team attempted to clarify discrepancies by triangulating reports with additional sources and documentation.
- Across the regions, respondents held different philosophical approaches and practical approaches to sustainability. Respondents also held contrasting conceptualizations of sustainability within regions, especially when changes of leadership had occurred (whether in the implementing institution, USAID mission, or MOE). For example, some CETT staff equated sustainability with program expansion, while others did not.
- Prior to researching and writing this white paper, the authors had been involved in the development of sustainability plans for countries in Centro Andino and CETT CA-RD. Although the team made efforts to collect and analyze data from across the three regions, the authors' experience may have contributed to a more detailed analysis in some CETT countries.

CETT Sustainability Efforts

USAID focused on sustainability efforts from the beginnings of the CETT program. The following section provides a general overview of CETT sustainability efforts in Phase One (2002–2006) and Phase Two (2006–2009). In Phase One, the sustainability component was separate from the technical components of the program. Efforts to ensure sustainability centered around fundraising and private–public partnerships led by an implementing partner managed by USAID/Washington. In Phase Two, sustainability efforts shifted from a hemispheric effort to individual plans at the regional level. As a result, this report presents separate sustainability plans for the three CETTs: C-CETT, Centro Andino, and CETT CA-RD.

Phase One (2002–2006)

In Phase One, USAID planned to foster the long-term sustainability of the CETT program primarily by focusing on financial sustainability. The U.S. Government dedicated an initial US\$20 million to CETT as seed money. USAID selected an NGO to raise an additional US\$20 million in donations, partnerships, and government buy-in to sustain the program after 2006. “By the end of this fiscal year [2002] USAID will enter into a cooperative agreement with a non-governmental organization (NGO) to fundraise, manage, and distribute cash and in-kind contributions and provide assistance to the three Centers in developing long-term sustainability plans. The NGO will be advised by the Corporate Advisory Council consisting of U.S. and Latin American and Caribbean businesses committed to supporting the program.”⁷

In September 2002, USAID chose international NGO INMED Partnerships for Children to carry out fundraising activities to foster program sustainability. INMED received a multiyear grant from USAID with the objective of increasing private involvement in the program. INMED was to raise the US\$20 million of private monetary and in-kind resources that USAID envisioned was needed to supplement its own funding. This partnership intended to lay the groundwork for a network of CETT allies and private partners capable of sustaining the initiative once USAID financing ended.

In practice, INMED worked mostly with C-CETT and Centro Andino. While INMED was able to secure some partnerships and donations (such as with Scholastic Books, a major children’s book publisher), the level of success was hampered by a number of factors. An evaluation of USAID’s partnership highlighted the following limitations:⁸

- Overall philanthropic donations from international organizations to Latin America had been decreasing due to the perception of greater need in other regions of the world. Intraregional philanthropy, although growing, was immature and tended toward small donations that would not have been sufficient to sustain a program as large as CETT. These trends likely constrained INMED’s ability to secure funds.
- The expectation that a small NGO could carry out an effective fundraising strategy without considerable support and collaboration with USAID may have been unrealistic. Fundraising experience in the region and appropriate existing organizational infrastructure were two components that were vital for securing donations and partnerships for the program.

⁷ USAID. (2002). Centers for Excellence in Teaching Training: A Summit of the Americas Initiative Information Packet. Retrieved from http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACY696.pdf

⁸ Information about the outcomes of the internal USAID evaluation was based on communication with USAID Washington.

- Confusion about whether INMED’s primary role was to raise funds or develop public-private partnerships made it difficult to communicate an appropriate message to potential donors and partners. The relationships established with most of CETT’s private partners were primarily for fundraising. Few were true partnerships in which the private partners developed a vested interest in the program. It was also very hard to sustain partnerships because donors had not been included in setting the long-term objectives of the CETTs.

USAID recognized these constraints and shifted its strategic plan for sustainability in Phase Two from fundraising at the hemispheric level to region-specific efforts focusing on a range of sustainability options.

CETT Hemispheric Workshop—2005

The 2005 Hemispheric Workshop in Kingston, Jamaica, was especially relevant for the development of a new sustainability strategy. Executive directors, CETT staff, specialists, and trainers agreed on the need for each CETT to draft a sustainability plan, elaborating its future strategy for ensuring sustainability at the regional level. The stakeholders agreed that CETT sustainability efforts should have two priorities:

- Sustainability of the program’s progress in the CETT schools
- Sustainability of the services rendered by the program’s implementing institutions

After the workshop, USAID asked each CETT to design its own sustainability plan. Each was to start with a specific plan (a) enabling the deployment of players and resources, (b) based on an effective and proven model, and (c) capable of improving teacher and student performance.

Phase Two (2006–2009)

In Phase Two, the strategy to foster program sustainability shifted from a singular focus on financial sustainability to a holistic focus on political, financial, institutional, and social sustainability. The strategy encouraged each CETT to engage more actively in sustainability-related activities, such as identifying alternative funding sources; engaging in promotional activities to highlight project accomplishments within, across, and beyond CETT countries; and building relationships with non-CETT entities. USAID’s Cooperative Agreement with each CETT’s lead implementing institution formalized this requirement.

C-CETT

The Joint Board of Teacher Education (JBTE), housed at the University of the West Indies (UWI) in Mona, Jamaica, implemented the Caribbean CETT (C-CETT) and oversaw sustainability efforts. Housing the program at the JBTE fostered its sustainability from the start. JBTE’s status as a regional statutory body that governs teacher training throughout the Caribbean provided both the credibility and capability to implement the program. The fact that UWI is one of the only regional universities in the world (funded by 15 Caribbean countries) meant that the program “benefited from a considerable amount of social capital accumulated through the general work of UWI in the [region] and specifically through the work of the Joint Board of Teacher Education.”⁹ JBTE’s own public partnerships already included “strategies to ensure that the results and outcomes of projects they implement in teacher training are sustained.”¹⁰

⁹ Miller, E. (2009). Standardizing the Teaching of Literacy in the Caribbean through the Caribbean CETT/JBTE Foundation Public Private Partnership. Sent to the research team by C-CETT.

¹⁰ Ibid.

Sustainability was a central concern of C-CETT. The sustainability plan “Standardizing the Teaching of Literacy in the Caribbean through the Caribbean CETT/JBTE Foundation Public Private Partnership” was the framework for the JBTE Foundation’s continuation of CETT. In this plan, the JBTE Foundation dedicated itself to continuing the program beyond USAID funding with a level of operational and management autonomy. The plan had six main objectives to:

1. Institutionalize the CETT model, its standards for literacy instruction, and its materials within the curricula of teacher training programs governed by the JBTE
2. Institutionalize CETT units and literacy centers in teacher training colleges of participating countries and propose similar actions for the remaining Caribbean countries
3. Set up C-CETT as a permanent, self-sufficient, and self-managed entity within the JBTE Foundation, incorporating assessment services, teacher training, materials, the technological platform EDUCOMM, and its personnel
4. Continue and consolidate the public-private partnerships already developed and endorse support from the private sector for infrastructure and equipment
5. Document CETT findings and accomplishments, and advertise them in the Caribbean region
6. Market C-CETT services and capabilities to development banks and cooperation agencies

The sustainability plan included a detailed set of activities for each objective within a comprehensive budget. C-CETT’s Project Implementation Unit (PIU) reported achieving several of the plan’s goals: (a) producing 12 resource titles for teacher education curricula, (b) developing standards for teacher training, (c) supporting the development of literacy courses, and (d) expanding to more schools and countries in the region. That some of the sustainability plan’s goals had not yet been met reflected difficulties in institutionalizing the program in some countries due to improper management, inadequate political support, or financial constraints.

Centro Andino

Centro Andino’s Executive Committee developed the Center’s regional sustainability plan. The Executive Committee’s five members included the Executive Director from the Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia (UPCH) in Lima, Peru; the national coordinator from the Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar in Quito, Ecuador; the national coordinator from the Universidad Nur in Santa Cruz, Bolivia; USAID’s regional coordinator; and USAID’s Agreement Officer’s Technical Representative (AOTR). In each country, a sustainability team under the direct supervision of its national coordinator was tasked with drafting a national plan for promoting and sustaining the program. In addition, Centro Andino hired an international consultant (one of the authors of this report) to help draft the regional vision for the program.

The Executive Committee made an important decision to define an integrated strategy that included (a) institutionalization of CETT in the three universities (institutional sustainability), (b) alliances with public and private partners (financial sustainability), and (c) working with “reading schools”— *escuelas lectoras*— and teachers’ associations to enhance CETT results in schools (social sustainability).

CETT CA-RD

The sustainability process took another course with CETT CA-RD. After many discussions about the future of the program, the CETT CA-RD Executive Committee agreed that the key priority was to endorse CETT to the ministries of education (MOEs) for nationwide expansion in each member country. Five implementing institutions led these efforts: the Universidad Pedagógica Nacional Francisco

Morazán (UPN) in Honduras; the Universidad del Valle, Guatemala (UVG); the Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra (PUCMM) in the Dominican Republic; the organization FEPADE (Fundación Empresarial para el Desarrollo Educativo) in El Salvador; and the Escuela Normal Ricardo Morales Avilés and the MOE in Nicaragua.

In 2008, CETT CA-RD predicted good prospects in virtually all countries. As sustainability work evolved, several countries saw the need to have a local sustainability expert to build additional partnerships to supplement the effort to convince the national MOEs to support CETT. The member universities then sought technical support from the PIU in Honduras and USAID to set up local sustainability teams and to train technicians for program formulation and social marketing.

In 2009, the implementing institutions of CETT CA-RD committed themselves to building a network that would outlive the program. This inter-institutional network—Red Inter-institucional del CETT (RICETT)—includes all participating institutions. At the time of publication, several MOEs had adopted the CETT teacher training model. In other countries, as CETT continued to have a positive and lasting impact, donors with shared goals have shown an interest in taking responsibility for funding components of the program in some CETT schools.

Key Findings

- Early sustainability efforts in CETT focused primarily on matching USAID donor funds by creating public-private partnerships with local and regional donors. USAID selected an NGO to organize efforts that focused primarily on financial sustainability.
- In Phase Two of the program, each CETT was tasked with creating a regional plan that included various sustainability efforts including committing program funding, promoting the program to local and national MOEs, and garnering support for CETT sustainability among key stakeholders.

Challenges

- Having an NGO lead sustainability efforts outside the CETT operating structures proved to be a challenge. The organization focused on garnering donations for the program, rather than building long-lasting partnerships in which donors had a vested interest in the CETT program and its outcomes.

This sketch of the regional context of sustainability efforts in the CETT program is followed by an examination of efforts in the four dimensions of sustainability outlined in the Introduction: (a) political sustainability, (b) financial sustainability, (c) institutional sustainability, and (d) social sustainability. The final section focuses on overall lessons learned and conclusions.

Political Sustainability

Political Sustainability: *The interest and commitment of local or national governments in supporting the CETT program and the degree of government involvement in scaling up the program.*

The implementing institutions in all CETT countries save one were universities or NGOs purposely chosen to help insulate the CETT program from political influence and support the goal of innovation. Though the MOEs were included in the design phase of the program, when USAID was choosing the member countries and university partners, program implementation was left solely to the institutions. In turn, the institutions were to inform the MOEs of their progress.

By the end of Phase Two in 2009, however, all three CETTs had concluded that political sustainability was necessary for program sustainability and that it was important to consider a role for the national, regional, and local governments in CETT. While certain countries moved toward program expansion at the national level, others sought to consolidate partnerships with regional and municipal governments, enabling the continuation of the program in targeted communities. The analysis of efforts to engage governments in sustaining CETT indicates that while political commitment can play a key role in sustainability, it can also create some level of inherent instability due to political climates and turnovers.

National Government

The involvement of the MOEs in the CETT program varied. Though some country efforts had worked in collaboration with the MOE since the inception of the program, leaders in other countries shied away from government involvement. The following descriptions of regional CETT experiences conclude with a summary of overarching findings and challenges encountered.

C-CETT

The JBTE is a public partnership composed of representatives of universities and teacher training institutions, MOEs, and teachers' unions and associations from many countries across the Caribbean. Its considerable political capital in the region contributed to C-CETT's visibility and political acceptance. Respondents reported that fluid and permanent contact between the JBTE and governmental authorities had existed from the beginning of the program. The well-established tradition of working regionally facilitated the smooth implementation and expansion of CETT in each country.

A set of Caribbean standards for reading and writing that provided a regional framework specifying the expected literacy outcomes for primary education, was a significant accomplishment of C-CETT. The JBTE created these standards after studying the national standards of each country in the region and international standards. After extensive review and dissemination to all of the countries represented on the JBTE Governing Board, these regional standards became the first common standards endorsed by the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). This endorsement provided the political momentum needed for their adoption by all CARICOM member countries in the region.¹¹

¹¹ The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) is an association of 15 nations and dependencies throughout the Caribbean whose purpose is to promote economic integration and free trade among member states, as well as the coordination of labor, industrial, social, and foreign policies. The Treaty of Chaguaramas established CARICOM in 1973. (http://www.caricom.org/jsp/community/revised_treaty-text.pdf).

Most of the 13 countries involved in CETT have continued the program in varying degrees, some by formal incorporation of the model by the MOE and others by continued reliance on JBTE support. Though neither was affiliated with JBTE, Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago have both flourished under C-CETT and experienced national successes of their own. The small size of the Caribbean countries may have facilitated implementation; dialogue among the region's top educational authorities was more manageable, and scale-up of the program was on a smaller scale. Directly or indirectly, JBTE will likely continue to be influential in C-CETT's success.

Centro Andino

Centro Andino was more limited in scaling up the CETT program, mainly due to the size of the three member countries. Nationwide expansion in Peru, the largest and most populous country where CETT operated, entailed higher costs and far more complex logistics than in the smaller Caribbean countries. In addition, throughout the Andean region, MOE officials were often reluctant to adopt already-branded programs developed with the support of international donors. Nevertheless, programs like CETT have been very important in setting the agenda for education policies on matters such as teacher training and teacher professional support in the classroom.

From the beginning of the program, the UPCH in Peru made every effort to ensure geographic coverage and increase the number of schools, teachers, and students reached. Though the program has not expanded nationwide, the MOE recognized the quality of the CETT training model and hired the UPCH to implement the national teacher-training program during 2008–2009 in some of the most populous districts of Lima. Other examples of partnerships with local governments are mentioned in the next subsection.

In Bolivia, the relationship with the national government was strained by the frequent turnover of political appointees in the MOE and the change in national leadership in 2006 that exacerbated differences between the Bolivian and U.S. Governments. In Phase One, Universidad Nur signed a Cooperation Agreement with the MOE that included an approved training proposal for 34,000 teachers. This relationship changed with the transition to the new government. The provinces of Santa Cruz (where the Universidad Nur is located) and Tarija have been in the forefront of a struggle for regional autonomy. The new central government has rejected that desire, and as a result, all efforts to cooperate with the MOE have been unsuccessful.

The Ecuadorian CETT was the most successful in building political sustainability at the national level. The program, for example, was successful in having the CETT curriculum included in the nation's education plan. Even though the CETT curriculum only targeted first to third grades, the MOE proposed implementing the CETT teaching practices in classrooms through the tenth grade.¹² The UASB has had very good communication with political administrations in Ecuador. At the time of publication, for example, the Minister of Education taught at the UASB and the university dean had significant public visibility and a good relationship with the MOE. All of these factors helped to strengthen the national political sustainability and gave considerable credibility to the CETT program.

CETT CA-RD

In Phase Two, the CETT CA-RD members developed regional sustainability plans that called for them to approach their respective MOEs with the proposal that each ministry adopt the CETT model and

¹² The CETT program included in-service teacher training in reading instruction content, as well as general teaching practices in the classroom. Though the training content was specifically targeted to grades one to three, the general teaching practices (such as time management, lesson planning, etc.) could be applied in higher grades.

provide the means for financial sustainability and expansion. The expectation of the CETT CA-RD Executive Committee members was that once the CETT program was turned over to the MOEs, the ministries would continue to need technical assistance from CETT to implement the model and maintain its quality, thus ensuring the institutional sustainability of the regional network. The CETTs in the CA-RD countries have had varying levels of success working with the MOEs.

In Honduras, the UPN signed an Inter-institutional Agreement with the MOE in September 2009.¹³ Under this agreement, the MOE adopted the CETT teacher training model and pledged to implement it nationwide. The body in charge of implementation was the Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Capacitación Educativa (INICE); the UPN guaranteed that the agreed task was completed properly. To achieve this, the UPN trained INICE's technical team, which in turn trained 720 teachers throughout the country. One of the biggest challenges for CETT in Honduras was the country's institutional and political crisis following a change in government in the second half of 2009. The changes resulted in the suspension of USAID activities in Honduras for several months. Nevertheless, CETT communicated with the new MOE soon after its appointment and on May 4, 2010, the UPN signed an agreement with the new MOE that CETT would provide technical assistance for an indefinite period.

In Guatemala, the UVG developed relationships with the MOE and local governments. In 2010, the MOE pledged its support to CETT and its willingness to integrate CETT components into the nationwide effort to improve the quality of education. USAID/Guatemala supported CETT's efforts with a grant that enabled the transition of CETT into the MOE. The four-fold purpose of this grant was to (a) support CETT schools that had not completed the training cycle, (b) design a graduation process for CETT schools, (c) support the incorporation of CETT components into an MOE scale-up, and (d) assess the progress of CETT students in reading and writing. USAID/Guatemala funded this grant through December 2010.

In the Dominican Republic, cooperation with the MOE was a central part of sustainability efforts and the USAID mission (USAID/Dominican Republic) supported these efforts. CETT's implementing institution, the PUCMM, had been promoting better literacy instruction in primary schools in the Dominican Republic for decades and was well-regarded by MOE officials. As a result, the MOE agreed to support and expand CETT in public schools across the country. In January 2008, the MOE, USAID/Dominican Republic, and the PUCMM signed a three-way Cooperative Agreement that made the CETT model and the MOE's management model national public policy. Though CETT implementation in public schools across the country began in 2008, in 2010 the MOE initiated a new strategy that delivered classes at the primary level that could hinder progress in the implementation of CETT nationwide. USAID/Dominican Republic and CETT negotiated with the MOE to continue CETT efforts in the geographic areas where CETT has been implemented.

In Nicaragua, the only country where the program was implemented by a public institution within the MOE, CETT encountered difficulties due to inconsistent program management resulting from the frequent turnover of ministry staff. Lack of political continuity forced program staff to look for other avenues of assistance, including teachers' unions and NGOs, but these efforts met with only limited success. CETT moved its headquarters from the Escuela Normal Ricardo Morales Avilés to the Instituto Nacional de Excelencia Académica Sandino in 2010. The Instituto Nacional, however, is itself a public institution directly dependent on the MOE and CETT continues to face the same political instability that has impeded sustainability efforts to date.

¹³ The Inter-institutional Agreement between the MOE and the UPN (*Convenio de Cooperación Interinstitucional entre la Secretaría de Estado en el Despacho de Educación y la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional Francisco Morazán (2008-2009)*) was discussed in interviews with CETT staff in Honduras. It is also mentioned on the university's website: http://www.upnfm.edu.hn/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=269&Itemid=332

In El Salvador, CETT also encountered challenges in sustaining the program. Differences between FEPADE and the MOE over an acceptable timeline for rolling out the full CETT teacher training model (with training, follow-up, and coaching in the classroom) resulted in CETT being restricted to a very limited number of schools. The MOE implemented a teacher training model similar to CETT, but without the follow-up components, making it more difficult for local authorities and school officials to implement CETT as a distinct training model alongside the national version. In July 2010, FEPADE and USAID/El Salvador opened a new possibility for partnership in a ceremony presenting the CETT model to current MOE authorities.

This review of the political sustainability efforts made in each CETT highlights the importance of building partnerships with well-respected institutions to bridge the gaps between nongovernmental and governmental institutions. In all three CETTs, support for the CETT model's implementation and expansion was successfully facilitated by the highly regarded institutions selected as implementing partners: the JBTE in C-CETT, the PUCMM in the Dominican Republic, and the UASB in Ecuador. In Nicaragua, the significance of wavering political stability was readily apparent; new government administrations led to upheavals in both MOE personnel and CETT program staff. The Nicaraguan case is particularly important: Housing a developing program in a ministry of education may affect the political stability of the program and longevity of program efforts.

Key Findings

- The implementing institutions that had a strong record in education and in their relationship with the MOE withstood political turnovers better and were more likely to have long-lasting relationships with administrations across the political spectrum.
- UWI, an established regional institution, had the capacity to develop the infrastructure needed to implement the regional program faster than entities developing new cross-country institutional partnerships. As a regional institution, UWI had already established government contacts in multiple countries.

Challenges

- In Nicaragua, having a government institution implement the program directly without intermediaries presented many challenges, mainly due to political turnover. The importance of a university's relative autonomy, especially during times of political instability, cannot be overstated.
- Respondents noted that the size of some countries presented both cost and logistical challenges to national program expansion. Respondents from small countries, such as those in the Caribbean, noted the relative ease of expanding a program in compact countries with smaller populations and fewer teachers.

Local Government

In countries where cooperation with the national government was not possible, CETT sometimes approached local governmental entities to promote the continuation of the program. Centro Andino in Peru, for example, drafted agreements with the regional governments of Lima-Provincias, Lambayeque, and Piura, and worked with municipalities of Lima, Sullana, and Piura. Similarly, the Universidad Nur, CETT's implementing institution in Bolivia, devised the strategy of consolidating relationships with local governments, especially in the cities of Santa Cruz, Montero, and Warnes, and the local governments in Chuquisaca and Tarija. Montero and Warnes adopted the CETT model for their schools and paid CETT trainers to train all their teachers. Other districts printed CETT teacher materials for use in their

classrooms. A former CETT team member from the Universidad Nur, who works for the municipality of Cochabamba, also expressed interest in implementing CETT training.

The focus on regional and municipal governments in Bolivia and Peru highlights the potential for local political sustainability of educational programs that are not adopted by the MOE. As several respondents in Bolivia noted, CETT trainers, teachers, and principals became advocates for the program, both in their classrooms and with regional administrators. To the extent that CETT principals argued to keep the CETT model in their schools (see Social Sustainability section), the municipal and regional governments became more interested in the program. Since municipal and regional education systems operate on a much smaller scale than the national education apparatus, the advocates for CETT were better able to communicate their message and gain support for the continuation or even expansion of the CETT program at levels closer to the communities.

Key Findings

- CETT program sustainability was more feasible at the local level in larger countries with decentralized education systems, where national scale-up faced greater institutional challenges (as in Peru) or where program support from the central government was not forthcoming (as in Bolivia).
- In Peru and Bolivia, CETT institutions successfully advocated for local or regional governments to adopt the CETT teacher training model in individual programs.

Role of USAID

In Phase Two, the Office of Education and Human Resources within USAID's Latin America and the Caribbean Bureau (LAC/RSD/EHR) encouraged the CETTs to consider the role of USAID missions in the sustainability planning process. Though program sustainability was the ultimate responsibility of the implementing partners, USAID missions helped by (a) researching opportunities and constraints in the national education systems, (b) identifying potential synergies with bilateral programs and donor partners, (c) supporting CETT efforts to increase public awareness and participation, and (d) negotiating with the MOE to expand the program. The role of USAID missions varied greatly among the CETTs, a topic discussed further in the first white paper on regional nature. This section focuses only on examples of the involvement of USAID missions in sustainability efforts.

Some USAID missions played a critical role in supporting the sustainability of the CETT program. For example, USAID/Peru (particularly its AOTR) was instrumental in helping Centro Andino design its sustainability plan. The mission assisted the three implementing institutions in assembling their sustainability teams and worked with them to create a database of potential partners. In CETT CA-RD, the USAID/Dominican Republic mission actively raised awareness of the CETT program in the country, both within the MOE and among other multilateral and bilateral donors and funders. Ultimately the Cooperative Agreement signed by the MOE, the PUCMM, and USAID/Dominican Republic attested to the strength of the resulting three-way partnership.

Several USAID missions also supported the CETT program after the end of USAID/Washington funding. The USAID mission in Guatemala, for example, issued the UVG a grant to continue its efforts through the end of 2010. USAID/El Salvador helped FEPADE present the CETT program and its successes to the MOE. These examples illustrate the USAID missions' continuing support for CETT's long-term legacy and sustainability.

Key Findings

- USAID missions were valuable partners that helped promote CETT program sustainability by liaising with the MOE, raising public awareness, researching potential partners, and, in some cases, providing funding.

Financial Sustainability

Financial Sustainability: *The interest, commitment, and participation of private companies, NGOs, international organizations, and foreign cooperation agencies in CETT activities and the deployment of resources needed to help sustain those activities in different countries.*

USAID originally envisioned that the long-term financial sustainability of the CETT program would be achieved through fundraising and public-private partnerships formed by a single NGO contracted for this separate component. This effort was ultimately unsuccessful and financial sustainability efforts shifted from a hemispheric to a regional model. The strategies employed in each region to ensure financial sustainability ranged from marketing CETT products, to building partnerships with private businesses, to organizing award competitions to promote the CETT program.

Marketing CETT Products

To develop a sustainability plan, each CETT completed a careful analysis that included an assessment of the operating costs of the program and opportunities in each member country. This analysis of market opportunities included an assessment of product and scale-up cost estimates, the program's cost effectiveness, and overall financial viability. Different regions assessed different products: Some focused on materials, others on training models and services. Once this analysis was completed, each CETT devised a marketing strategy to reach potential private sector, NGO, and MOE partners. USAID missions and USAID/Washington aided this process by providing technical assistance and sustainability consultants to review the sustainability plans.

Cost Analysis and Market Research

C-CETT conducted a market assessment and gap analysis to decide the best strategy for marketing its products. There were two types of products for program beneficiaries (school administrators and teachers): (a) a diagnostic kit and performance assessment tool with rubrics for testing reading and writing, and (b) guides for administration and analysis. Near the end of Phase Two (2006–2009), C-CETT's sustainability consultant created a detailed sustainability work plan that developed a price structure for CETT products. The JBTE Foundation planned to make C-CETT a self-financing entity by selling CETT materials and teacher training guides and by selling access to its own EDUCOMM system, a "commercial space" within the Foundation. The relationship between C-CETT and EDUCOMM was mutually supportive. EDUCOMM offered C-CETT trainings, communication services, and support for C-CETT participants, while bringing in funds to support its own budget.¹⁴

The Andean Executive Committee identified the CETT products and services that could be marketed to potential donors. Among others these included the teacher training model's methods and materials; testing and assessment instruments and services; and the distance learning model. The sustainability team prepared a document establishing policies for selling these products and services, and underwriting the marketing strategies for each of the sectors identified.

Centro Andino also assessed the operating costs of maintaining the basic CETT structure, a regional network of six to eight staff, and a support budget. The Executive Committee concluded that this

¹⁴ Miller, E. (2009) Standardizing the Teaching of Literacy in the Caribbean through the Caribbean CETT/JBTE Foundation Public Private Partnership. Sent to the research team by C-CETT.

structure would need to be financed separately from specific CETT products and services. As a result, Centro Andino also explored potential strategic partnerships with bilateral and multilateral donors, large NGOs, and foundations willing to finance the basic operating expenses of CETT.

CETT CA-RD focused more narrowly: The primary product was the CETT model and the primary market was MOEs. Unlike the other two CETTs, CETT CA-RD did not diversify its marketing strategies. The CETT staff primarily explored two sources of financial sustainability: (a) MOEs, and (b) implementing institutions.

The CETT CA-RD staff did a cost analysis based on the capacity of each country's MOE to lower training costs and ensure the expansion of the CETT model on a national level. One of the findings clearly showed the link between political and financial sustainability. The expansion costs of the training model were significantly lower when working jointly with the MOE.

The materials package was priced at three levels: (a) Basic, for the essential program materials required for the success of the CETT model, (b) Intermediate, for materials to facilitate development of the CETT model and improve the quality of teaching over time; and (c) Optimal, for material produced in high quality versions using full-time CETT technical assistance. Most of the CETT contents were included in Basic- and Intermediate-level materials. The CA-RD Executive Committee created these three categories to enable better adaptation of the CETT package during possible program scale-up.

Advertising Strategies

The CETTs used two advertising strategies: (a) commercial marketing to sell products and services to potential customers, and (b) social marketing to promote a culture of literacy and the central importance of teaching reading and writing. Social marketing is discussed more in the section on Social Sustainability.

C-CETT marketed its products and services principally through an upgraded website, videos highlighting program successes, and evidence-based brochures and other materials highlighting C-CETT's capabilities. C-CETT leaders also used the CARICOM meetings as a forum for updating leaders on the program's progress and successes. In some cases these updates motivated new countries to request CETT services.

Centro Andino developed a database of potential partners and each university created a team to visit both public and private sector organizations. It was important for each university to learn how to approach the private sector. Though proposals were more technical and less specific in the beginning, over time the teams learned how to address the private sector's interests and to develop mutually beneficial scenarios and proposals. Centro Andino also created a marketing portfolio of CETT services and successes with PowerPoint presentations highlighting the three institutions, promotional brochures, and samples of materials for teachers, students, and parents.

CETT CA-RD organized two internal workshops to provide tools and instructions on how to identify potential contributors, prepare technical proposals, and create networks. Because CETT CA-RD focused on selling the CETT program to the MOEs, most of the marketing strategies included meetings with key personnel in the MOE to ensure financial commitments and CETT scale-up. This approach was successful in some countries, but, as noted in the last section, these negotiations with MOEs often required an inordinate amount of time. When it took too long to secure MOE buy-in with a firm commitment to provide financial resources, some member countries began to diversify their options to include private, institutional, or NGO partners. Examples of successful partnerships with NGOs such as CARE International are included in the next subsection.

Key Findings

- A cost analysis of CETT products and services was useful in understanding the financial and operational needs of the program. A cost breakdown of program products at various price levels (as in CETT CA-RD) gave potential donors options for funding.
- The most successful outcomes came from programs that diversified their marketing strategies. The sustainability plans created by Centro Andino, for example, outlined a market assessment of potential government, NGO, private sector, and international donors.
- To offer their services to potential donors, C-CETT created promotional materials that were current and concise. These included videos of evidence-based results of the program. CETT advertising and promotional content gave potential donors key information about the benefits and successes of the program.

Challenges

- Relying on just one marketing strategy is unlikely to guarantee financial sustainability. In Phase One, the CETTs' singular focus on fundraising resulted in poor outcomes. A diversified strategy includes cultivation of potential partnerships with both public and private donors.

Partnerships and Alliances

One of the lessons learned from Phase One was that CETT sustainability approaches cannot focus solely on fundraising or in-kind donations. In Phase Two, therefore, the CETTs focused on developing more effective partnerships and alliances with various organizations. Diversification that includes bilateral or multilateral partnerships promotes sustainability by ensuring that the CETTs can rely on more than one funding source. Furthermore, partnerships ensure that donors, whether the MOE or another entity, are involved based on their vested interest in the long-term sustainability of the program, rather than just a one-time donation. Some notable partnerships in each of the three CETTs are described below.

Caribbean

C-CETT focused on finding partners that would help promote the long-term objective of CETT. Their efforts to secure financial sustainability shifted from fundraising alone to establishing private-public partnerships. In exchange for their cooperation with CETT, private companies expected to enhance their public image and expose more people to their products. C-CETT staff assessed their program needs and sought partners that would provide support in those areas.

C-CETT's partnership with Air Jamaica was particularly helpful, given the difficulty and expense of travel around the Caribbean. Air Jamaica provided air travel for PIU staff and reading specialists to attend various workshops and meetings. C-CETT established direct relationships with publishing companies that resulted in large quantities of donated books from Scholastic, Pearson, and The Book Merchant. A partnership with DHL provided transportation for the books to the C-CETT countries.

C-CETT also built partnerships with private companies to support the dissemination of the CETT model using communication technologies. The Center negotiated agreements with telecommunication companies that allowed it to install a new microwave radio system on existing transmission towers and to piggyback its own programs on an existing network infrastructure.

The ICT team and communications authorities also negotiated an exemption from assessments and license fees for new microwave radio system installations in Jamaica, Grenada, and Belize. In 2006, C-

CETT reached an agreement with cell phone service provider Digicel to supply free broadband internet access to the EDUCOMM system. Technology companies had begun to notice EDUCOMM's capability and potential for becoming a universal online education resource serving the entire Caribbean region.

Centro Andino

Centro Andino looked at organizations or education program funders that were interested in supporting CETT trainings and teacher professional development, rather than partnering with companies to finance components of the CETT model, as in the Caribbean. Centro Andino saw, for example, that education programs that could take advantage of its competencies were potential sources of funds. The aim was to replicate the CETT program at a smaller regional scale involving a company's or organization's areas of interest.

In 2006, the UPCH signed a Cooperative Agreement with Pluspetrol for teacher training interventions in Pisco and the lower Urubamba Valley, which lasted for three years. Pluspetrol, an oil and gas company supported a reading conference in Peru and professional development opportunities for teachers trained in the Pisco region. The UASB in Ecuador received private funds from HOLCIM, a prominent cement company, to prepare a training program for the Guayas region. A partnership was also established with the Fondo Italo Ecuatoriano Populorum Progresio for funding joint training activities.

The UPCH in Peru also created a partnership with the Asociación de Empresarios por la Educación (ExE). The ExE is an organization set up by business people to support education initiatives that impact vulnerable populations. The ExE contacted Centro Andino because it had decided to finance a reading and writing program. In cooperation with the ExE, Centro Andino found additional funding sources, such as the Mining Fund and the Gloria Group. This was an example of one partnership's success in opening doors to other potential donor partnerships.

Finally, Centro Andino forged partnerships with private organizations promoting instruction in Guaraní, a local language in eastern Bolivia, where the CETT model was used to train non-Spanish-speaking teachers. Universidad Nur signed key agreements with private partners Teko Guaraní, Asamblea del Pueblo Guaraní (APG), and the Consejo Educativo del Pueblo Guaraní (CEPOG). The three were to follow up and systematize Guaraní instruction using the CETT model. The Teko project covered training for 100 teachers in 2010.

CA-RD

CETT CA-RD had several partnerships with private companies and NGOs that went beyond the search for an MOE buy-in; two are mentioned below. As in Centro Andino, most of these partnerships included replication of the CETT model in specific regions or municipalities. In Honduras, for example, the UPN created a successful partnership with CARE, a leading humanitarian NGO. These institutions signed an agreement in September 2009 enabling the implementation of the CETT program in CARE schools and CARE's funding for materials and teacher training. In 2010, CARE continued financing the printing of materials for multi-grade classrooms and initiated a validation process for the guidebooks prepared by the UPN. In this partnership, the UPN agreed to supervise the implementation of the CETT model and the training of the teacher trainers funded by CARE. Though still in the planning process, the UPN is also in talks to partner with Plan International, ChildFund International, and PROHECO (a World Bank-funded development organization).

In El Salvador, FEPADE created a successful partnership with the Empresarios por la Educación (abbreviated ExE, but not related to ExE in Peru) that enabled the implementation of a school

sponsorship program initiative. The initiative promoted partnerships for quality and infrastructure improvement in schools. These partnerships provided an opportunity to enhance CETT's sustainability in El Salvador by establishing 15 education centers where teachers acquire and strengthen their teaching skills. The centers offered in-person training, workshop development, action research, teacher innovation circles, experience exchange, adoption of innovative material, and in-class coaching to develop monitoring and follow-up systems to systematize the experience.

Key Findings

- CETTs that anticipated their strategic funding needs were able to reach out to potential donors with specific proposals for partnership. CETT partners who were able to provide a distinct service (such as Scholastic Books in Jamaica) or to replicate the program on a smaller scale (such as Pluspetrol in Peru) had a greater vested interest in program success. These were the best examples of “win-win” partnerships.
- Partnerships with organizations already working in education showed that these organizations had the experience and resources needed to implement teacher training programs. An example of this was CARE's implementation of the CETT model in its schools in Honduras,
- Successful partnerships sometimes opened doors to more donor opportunities, as in Peru.

Challenges

- Experiences during Phase One revealed that more emphasis should be put on forming vested partnerships with potential donors. Thereafter a distinction was made between fundraising campaigns and long-term partnerships. In some instances, however, it was still difficult to commit partner funding long-term.
- In CETT's experience with partnerships, both partners need to agree formally to the terms of the partnership and their responsibilities for the program's replication and success. Differences in visions for program replication sometimes hampered negotiations with both government and nongovernment partners.

Institutional Sustainability

Institutional Sustainability: *The interest and commitment of implementing institutions to the CETT model, personnel retention, and program expansion.*

A measure of institutional sustainability efforts was the degree to which the implementing institutions embraced the CETT program and its principles and how much they actively promoted and institutionalized their CETT initiatives. With USAID funding coming to a close, implementing institutions needed to decide whether the CETTs would continue under their auspices, and if so, in what capacity and with what resources. While CETT staff generally wanted to continue working on the program, they had to negotiate with the institution's governing body to decide how the program would integrate into the institution's organizational structure. The demonstrated effectiveness of the program and its personnel were both crucial in promoting this institutionalization.

Institutionalization in Host Entity

All three CETTs have examples of implementing partners that institutionalized the CETT program upon the end of funding. In the Caribbean, for example, the JBTE Foundation incorporated the CETT program as a permanent entity and supported its continuation. Many former PIU staff from C-CETT work in the School of Education at UWI Mona, the same campus that houses JBTE, enabling easy access to CETT-trained specialists who serve as consultants on an as-needed basis.

The three implementing universities in Centro Andino decided to incorporate the CETT program into their structures and to continue generating resources for the program with minimal operating requirements. The Executive Committee, when drafting its sustainability plan, agreed that it was important to keep the CETT program within the universities in some capacity in order to promote advocacy for the CETT model and continued support to the MOE. In Peru, the UPCH institutionalized the CETT staff in its Department of Education, where the CETT Executive Director is the dean. In Bolivia, the Universidad Nur institutionalized CETT staff within the Department of Graduate Studies. In Ecuador, the CETT program has continued under the auspices of UASB.

In CETT CA-RD, because one of the main strategies for sustainability was to incorporate the CETT program into the implementing institutions, the deans or rectors of the partner universities served on the Executive Committee. (The organizational structure of the CETTs is discussed more in the regional nature white paper). In some countries, the involvement of university leadership was very effective. In the Dominican Republic, for example, PUCMM's leadership decided to incorporate CETT staff into the university's operating structure by creating a Literacy and Research Center based on the CETT program. In Honduras, the UPN leadership studied alternative ways to institutionalize the CETT program, one of which would also incorporate CETT into a literacy research institute. As of 2010, UPN's Director of Research was working to incorporate CETT staff into the institute as permanent staff, paid by the UPN, to develop literacy research, follow up, implementation of the CETT model, and preparation of materials.

Key Findings

- CETT leadership staff were included in program decision-making long before USAID funding ended, creating a vested interest among these individuals and institutions in the program's success and continued support. PUCMM's creation of a Literacy and Research Center is an example of institutional support.

- It appeared to be easier to incorporate CETT in institutions where its staff can be integrated easily into the organizational structure, such as in the UPCH's Department of Education, where the Executive Director is the dean.

Challenges

- While the CETTs were able to market and “sell” their products and services, a challenge was sustaining funding for the CETT staff and the program's organizational structure. In Centro Andino, the three implementing institutions agreed that the key CETT operations would be incorporated into the university structures to sustain program support.

Institutional Capacity Building

The implementing institutions that housed the CETT program benefitted from the program's accomplishments and the CETT staff's capacity to introduce innovative teacher training methods in literacy instruction. C-CETT and Centro Andino acquired new capacities to offer degree programs focused on reading and literacy, teacher training, and distance education.

In the Caribbean, associate's degree programs in reading were developed or enhanced in some teacher training colleges and institutions, and an online degree program in literacy was initiated in 2007. Many CETT teachers have gone on to such programs. One former CETT staff member currently working at a community college mentioned that, because of CETT, he was successful in doubling the number of courses in the language arts curriculum for the associate's degree. The development of these programs is likely due, at least in part, to the capacity built among the personnel in the implementing institutions through their participation with CETT. Since these new programs incorporate CETT methodology, they are likely to contribute to the long-term institutional sustainability of the program.

In both the UPCH and the Universidad Nur, extensive discussions took place on how to ensure sufficient resources for CETT staff. In the end, both universities covered program costs by offering degree programs and providing training and technical expertise to the MOE and other interested partners. All three universities from Centro Andino reported that they now offer post-graduate degrees in reading and writing. The UPCH offers specializations in the teaching of reading, as well as new requirements and specializations for undergraduate teachers. The Department of Education at the UPCH is in the process of preparing a graduate degree in the teaching of distance learning.

The last research question of this report asks whether the CETTs had other attributes or capacities that could be used to build sustainability. One of the greatest attributes of the program was, in fact, the technical knowledge and expertise of the CETT staff and teacher trainers that contribute to the capacity of the implementing institutions, as well as the social sustainability of the program. In all countries of the CETT program, the teacher trainers dedicated to the CETTs built a knowledge base of effective practices in teacher training.

Centro Andino's sustainability plan specifically mentioned the technical expertise of the CETT staff and teacher trainers. The plan stated that the CETT staff members are knowledgeable in teacher training, designing materials, and training and evaluation skills. Centro Andino's plan noted that these services are in demand from both in-country contractors and NGOs that implement or design teacher training projects. Some implementing institutions chose to market these skills more broadly and created teams of teacher trainers that could provide services to interested schools.

Key Findings

- CETT enhanced knowledge in literacy instruction and teacher training methods in the implementing institutions, thus building institutional capacity. Academic institutions in C-CETT and Centro Andino now provide academic programs in literacy, teacher training, and distance education, among others.

Challenges

- Implementing institutions needed to be willing to invest in building the capacity of former program staff once donor funding ended. Some institutions were more likely to inherit the program and provide further training than others.

Efforts to Sustain Regional Cooperation

The CETT implementing partners worked hard to continue the regional cooperation that had proven to be fruitful for sharing ideas and overcoming challenges. The first white paper discusses the regionalism of the CETT program further. Only specific regional efforts related to sustainability are addressed here.

To sustain regional cooperation, C-CETT developed EDUCOMM, a technological platform enabling virtual connections among countries and clusters participating in CETT. EDUCOMM's goal was to bring evolving technology into the classroom and to become a platform for distance learning and communication throughout the Caribbean. While showing great potential, the EDUCOMM platform did not scale-up to the greater Caribbean community and was not considered fully successful.¹⁵

The institutions of CETT CA-RD have committed to continue their regional cooperation formally through RICETT, the CETT CA-RD Inter-institutional Network. CETT CA-RD's decision-making body, the Executive Committee, signed an agreement among all of the CETT institutions, committing them to continue working together to promote the CETT program in Central America. The specific parameters of this cooperation have not been developed further.

Key Findings and Challenges

- CETT sustainability efforts considered the future cooperation of national partners once regional funding from USAID ended. Regional cooperation, though useful, was often secondary to national program continuity, as implementing partners and MOEs were less likely to fund regional initiatives. In that case, an academic network, such as the one created by CETT CA-RD, proved to be a sustainable option to continuing dialogue and cooperation.

¹⁵ Though the EDUCOMM platform was designed and established to support the entire region, some participants in non-hub countries reported ongoing connectivity problems. Topography prevented some countries from utilizing the tool. In some countries, though the technological pieces (white boards, televisions, special cameras, etc.) had been purchased, EDUCOMM was not functional in all islands and reports of the extent of its use varied.

Social Sustainability

Social Sustainability: The degree of participation in and commitment to the different stakeholder groups benefiting from the CETT program, including teachers, students, parents, school principals, CETT staff, and donor partners.

Though CETT's social sustainability was a core concern from the beginning, it has become a major program success and strength. Universities and NGOs hosted, managed, and implemented the program, drawing on local teams to lead and carry out the effort. To the extent that parents and communities became involved in successful education services, they became stakeholders, ensuring that those services remained over time. A complete analysis of the change in attitudes and behaviors of various CETT stakeholders is included in the fourth white paper on paradigm shift.

Sustainability efforts involved two strategies for engaging the general public. First, the CETTs were encouraged to use social marketing to generate support for literacy and raise awareness about the importance of reading and writing among various beneficiaries and stakeholders. Second, some CETT teachers and teacher trainers shared the CETT model and materials with non-CETT teachers, informally replicating the CETT techniques to a greater number of educators.

Social Marketing: Creating a Culture of Literacy

CETT targeted social marketing techniques to promote a culture of reading and literacy at all sectors of society: teachers, directors, students, parents, community members, community leaders, and people making decisions affecting child literacy. It promoted a cooperative, national focus on literacy by energizing community involvement and establishing formal partnerships. Examples of CETT's use of social marketing in these efforts are described below.

Events to Promote Literacy

In its campaign to promote literacy, C-CETT organized several reading workshops for parents in non-CETT schools to show them how they could create a pro-literacy environment at home. For example, a second grade CETT teacher developed a parents' certificate program. Through classes on the Bible and literature, the program helped parents to improve their own reading skills and affirm their key role in educating their children, especially in literacy. The program started in 2007 and by February 2008 about 100 participating parents had received certificates.

Centro Andino organized and participated in many national reading and writing workshops in Peru, in addition to workshops held in Bolivia and Ecuador during program implementation. Workshop attendees included teachers from literacy schools, non-CETT teachers, principals, parents, government authorities, other education specialists, and representatives from NGOs and international organizations. These workshops provided a forum for reflecting on and debating different literacy approaches, discussing the status of the CETT program, and collecting the opinions of all the participants. In addition to building social sustainability, these events raised the profile of Centro Andino as a leader in the field of literacy. The purpose of this *movimiento pedagógico* ("pedagogical movement") was to encourage and promote a culture of continual capacity development through teacher associations, workshops, and events. Teachers from different communities could compare experiences and share best practices in teaching.

In Central America, the national teams organized reading fairs as part of their strategy to promote the CETT program and its focus on literacy among children and their families. The fairs were popular and became social events for the young CETT readers and the education community. In the Dominican Republic, the fairs offered several educational activities, including a storytelling corner. The storytellers were university students from PUCMM's Social Communication and Psychology program.

Promotional Media

CETT implementing institutions used many strategies to promote their message and worked hard to generate media interest in literacy. For example, C-CETT focused on disseminating information on how families contribute to their children's literacy development—a key part of the program's curriculum. In Centro Andino, several radio networks in Bolivia aired informational spots about the CETT program and its work across the country. Public service announcements created by CETT CA-RD on CNN International and CNN Español raised awareness of the importance of literacy in Central America.

In Guatemala, CETT children sent letters to local and national authorities in education and other fields. The purpose of the strategy was to get the attention of mayors, deputies, ministers, and important public personalities with letters that exemplified children's advances in language and communication. Newspapers and other media published the letters, in which children wrote about their rights, dreams, expectations, and difficulties. The letters had the desired impact; education authorities paid particular attention to the children's demands and their support became evident in the CETT classrooms.

Some CETT institutions published books of CETT children's stories that were sent to education authorities and the media. In the Dominican Republic, several nationwide bookstores sell the storybooks as part of the CETT sustainability strategy. Because of books published in Honduras, the UPN staff was interviewed on TV and radio programs. These and many other campaigns drew the public's attention and sparked interest in the importance of literacy and the CETT program.

Key Findings

- CETT social marketing campaigns spread awareness of the importance of literacy and early grade reading to stakeholders and beneficiaries in target communities. Marketing employed a diverse set of strategies, including promotional events (such as reading fairs), informational advertising, and media campaigns.
- Promotional events, such as the reading workshops and fairs in all three CETTs, provided opportunities for stakeholders to find out more about how a program addresses the needs of the greater public and the importance of its social sustainability.
- The media was an effective resource for spreading information about CETT, particularly spots on television and radio, as well as advertisements in newspapers.

Challenges

- Funding was considered a challenge when CETT was sponsoring the social marketing. In Centro Andino, the implementing partners were able to team up with the MOE, local governments, and other partners to garner funds for the reading fairs. Often, parents and other community members would donate food and supplies for the events.

Knowledge Sharing of Effective Teacher Practices

The CETT model trained teachers in both knowledge of literacy concepts and practices for effective teaching. Though the literacy *content* of the CETT training specifically catered to first, second, and third

grade teachers, the effective teaching *practices* can be applied to any grade level. These practices included techniques for classroom management, how to design and implement lesson plans, and how to stimulate discussion and learning among students.

At first, most of the sharing of knowledge and CETT practices was informal. The teachers and school administrators who participated in CETT training shared their materials and the techniques they had learned with their peers. Site visits to the regions revealed that non-CETT teachers often made copies of teacher planning materials and some even observed CETT teachers during their lessons. Principals encouraged CETT teachers to share their new skills with other teachers in their schools. When CETT teachers were transferred or promoted to school principals, they often shared the effective teaching practices they had learned with the teachers in their new schools.

The CETT program produced a cadre of knowledgeable CETT teachers and school administrators. C-CETT created CETT Resource Centers that were open to CETT and non-CETT teachers alike. These Centers included teacher training materials and specific information about effective teaching practices. Centro Andino formalized this knowledge sharing through the *escuelas lectoras* model. Successful CETT schools served as models for further teacher training and capacity building in their districts. In these schools, the CETT teachers and principals were formally trained to teach their colleagues effective teaching practices from the CETT program. As was noted in the visits to Peru and Bolivia, “model schools” that continued to follow the CETT training model beyond USAID funding served as evidence of the success of the program.

Key Findings

- The CETTs realized early on that the teacher and school administrators that had been trained through the program were some of the best advocates of program success to the public. While knowledge sharing was informal at first, the implementing institutions later created more formal networks (such as the *escuelas lectoras*) to train CETT teachers and principals in sharing their techniques.

Challenges

- Informal replication needs to be considered carefully, however, exactly because the program is replicated by beneficiaries and not by the professionals trained through the program. As a result, the CETTs realized that a more formalized strategy was needed for this type of knowledge sharing.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

This section synthesizes the main lessons learned about promoting program sustainability. General program sustainability lessons are presented first, followed by a section that describes the most important lessons according to each type of sustainability: political, financial, institutional, and social.

Program Sustainability Lessons

1. It is essential to establish a coherent and realistic sustainability plan from a program's inception. Sustainability planning needs to be tied to the technical component and involve all key stakeholders so that everyone charged with fostering sustainability is invested in the program's long-term success.
2. Organizational units or partners charged with fostering financial sustainability through fundraising must be experienced, have established government and business networks, receive the full support of USAID in their activities, and be involved in or at least have knowledge of the technical implementation. Building such relationships requires an organization with the capability, experience, and leverage to achieve these goals.
3. Local sustainability experts who are familiar with government, business, and civil society should be drawn upon to inform the creation, execution, and evaluation of sustainability plans.
4. Sustainability efforts should be diversified across the four types of sustainability. Relying too much on a single type of sustainability puts the program at risk. Clear expectations should be made as to the type of relationships that are to be formed with various potential partners.
5. Plans for sustainability must consider the size and span of the program in question. A regional program, such as CETT, is more likely to be sustainable if efforts focus on regional, national, and local levels.

Political Sustainability

Relationship with MOEs. Most of the institutions that were successful in scaling up their CETT programs had good relationships with the MOE throughout the program. The UPN in Honduras, for example, is the most important authority in the country on educational issues, and several officials in the MOE, including several ministers, had been UPN students or teachers. At the same time, CETT staff at the UPN promoted the program's work among teachers and demonstrated the model's effectiveness to the MOE's authorities. The UASB in Ecuador also maintained a very good dialogue with various political administrations over time. These factors helped to strengthen political sustainability and to ensure government support during times of political change.

The partnership between the PUCMM and the MOE in the Dominican Republic was so solid that it survived three presidential elections and changing political leadership. Some of the lessons learned from this partnership include:

1. The importance of having an implementing institution with acknowledged academic leadership in the field of education and teacher training to facilitate interaction with government officials.
2. The importance of interacting not only with government officials at high levels but also with the technicians and middle officers of ministries or secretaries of education. This is especially vital in the case of political transitions, as these people often retain their positions irrespective of the incumbent government.

In the Caribbean, countries throughout the region noted the success of the CETT program and the MOEs in Trinidad and Tobago and Grenada approached C-CETT to implement the program in their countries. These MOEs' successful experiences informed the model for how national governments could buy into C-CETT.

Relationship with Local Governments. When the MOE was not interested at the national level, several CETT institutions were successful in getting local support for their cause, particularly in countries with decentralized education systems. The UPCH's strategy of allying with local governments to carry out training programs within the jurisdiction of municipalities was successful. This action appeared to have positive effects on both program protection and promotion to national authorities.

Relationship with USAID. A supportive relationship between the CETT implementing institution and USAID also fostered program sustainability. In several countries, a three-way relationship among the CETT implementing institution, USAID, and the MOE helped the MOE develop the political will to support the CETT program. In the Dominican Republic, CETT and the USAID/Dominican Republic mission worked together to collect and highlight data on educational outcomes needed to demonstrate program success. The in-country USAID office helped promote the continuation and expansion of the program and provided steady support for the program during changes in government.

Financial Sustainability

The CETTs engaged in multiple efforts to work with donor partners, including private businesses, NGOs, and international organizations. One of the main lessons of these experiences is that the nature of building public-private partnerships differs from fundraising and developing links to government.

Working with All Partners. Partner diversification strengthened program sustainability and diminished the vulnerability of long-term reliance on a single partner—in some cases, the MOE. The CETT implementing institutions that were most successful in expanding the program beyond USAID funding had diversified their financial sustainability plans to include various partners, while trying to preserve the CETT model's essence, monitoring its expansion in operative countries, and participating in new reading and writing initiatives.

Program Costs and Funding. One of the lessons learned is that negotiations with partners are complex, sometimes simply due to their expectation that operating costs be reduced to maximize cost-efficiency. To work with this expectation, it is useful to have up-to-date information on the costs of the components for financial analysis and identifying what businesses can buy at lower prices (e.g., air tickets, land transfer, or food). Cost studies carried out over time and presented in the fifth white paper on cost effectiveness, do show that the CETT program is more costly than other teacher training programs. Nonetheless, the availability of a cost study, with a breakdown of materials by category and alternatives for expansion (such as in CETT CA-RD), increases the possibility of making significant progress in negotiations with various entities. Informed negotiation was important in many countries' partnerships.

Institutional Sustainability

Commitment of CETT Staff. The commitment of CETT staff to the program, particularly members of the Executive Committee and the PIU, was important in promoting sustainability within the implementing institutions. The deans or rectors of the CETT universities were involved in the program and participated in meetings with potential partners. The ultimate success of sustainability efforts often depended on the CETT staff's commitment to pursuing all options to ensure the continuation of their CETT program.

Maintaining the CETT Model. Most CETT institutions that had partnerships with nongovernmental and governmental entities discussed the difficulties of maintaining the CETT model once other parties were involved. Extra flexibility and open-mindedness were sometimes needed to facilitate appropriate program expansion without altering its essence.

Creating Institutional Structures. Creating formal structures for maintaining or scaling up programs is a key step in developing institutional sustainability. CETT implementing institutions created new teacher education programs based on the CETT techniques. In the Caribbean, the development of the EDUCOMM technological platform enabled virtual connections and communication among countries and clusters participating in CETT.

Social Sustainability

Working with the Community. The main vehicles for promoting social sustainability were the workshops and other activities the CETT program provided for beneficiaries and the community. This outreach encouraged participation in the program by disseminating information about CETT and its impact on reading and writing.

Supporting Agents of Change. The beneficiaries of the CETT program are its greatest proponents and successful institutions worked with these individuals, CETT teachers, principals, parents, and other community members to promote the success and increase the impact of the program. In some instances, program stakeholders have been instrumental in encouraging government entities to buy into the program.

Recommendations for Future Programs

The CETTs worked on sustainability efforts throughout the seven years of the program. In some countries, the MOE is scaling up the CETT model nationwide. In other countries, as CETT continues to exert a positive and lasting impact, other donors with shared goals have shown their interest in funding the program. The CETTs' sustainability-related activities include mapping alternative funding sources; promoting activities that highlight project accomplishments within, across, and beyond CETT countries; and building relationships with non-CETT entities.

The following recommendations have been identified for future sustainability efforts in educational programs, particularly where ministries are not the implementing institutions and public-private buy-in is especially important.

- **Overall Sustainability.** The key factor in the overall sustainability of the program is the initial selection of an implementing institution that is prestigious, efficient, and widely experienced in technical expertise related to the program. These characteristics increase the likelihood that the implementing institution possesses the necessary political, private industry, and civil society contacts to implement, fund, and expand the program; and the capacity to execute the program components based on its background and competencies.
- **Political Sustainability.** It is vital for the program to build positive relationships with government authorities, particularly strategic relationships devised to ensure the survival of the initiative during political transitions. From its inception, a program should actively foster its own political sustainability by systematically building relationships with representatives of political parties and incorporating opportunities for successful communication with ministry officers and technicians. It is important to build political networks at multiple levels, because programs that

depend entirely on a national government for program sustainability may experience setbacks during political transitions. If the program is regional, it is also important to keep the local USAID mission informed and involved as a potential partner and resource.

- **Financial Sustainability.** Detailed information on program costs and possible alternatives is a key tool for negotiating with potential governmental or nongovernmental donors and funding organizations. In many cases, flexibility is required when it becomes necessary to think creatively about how to reduce costs while preserving the essential features of the program model. An information brief outlining available products and their costs is a practical marketing tool for fostering a program's financial sustainability through product sales.
- **Institutional Sustainability.** A key factor in a program's institutional sustainability is the implementing institution's commitment to the program model. The first step is building a high-quality program with proven effectiveness. The second step is supporting strategies for incorporating the program into the implementing institution's own work. For example, an implementing institution might consider conducting research on the program, establishing an offshoot of the program, or creating mechanisms to disseminate knowledge gained from the program.
- **Social Sustainability.** Planning for social sustainability should include a strategy for both local and international dissemination of information about the program and its successes in civil society. Concrete activities might include holding workshops, involving local volunteers and participants in the program, and promoting program outcomes (such as CETT CA-RD publishing the writing of children whose teachers were trained by CETT).

Sustainability efforts in the CETT program varied in success, but one indicator of the sustainability of CETT is that implementing partners have continued the program in one form or another in all participating regions. In all countries, there are efforts by the implementers to continue CETT and hopeful intentions to expand it in the future. To that end, the CETT institutions and beneficiaries leading these efforts are sustaining the CETT model and increasing the likelihood of making significant and systematic changes in the areas where they have worked.