

Prepared by:

Creative Associates International, Inc.

**Dr. James A. Van Fleet
Mr. Sidney Chernenkoff
Dr. Lubov Fajfer
Dr. Joel Gomez**

**Macedonia: Assistance to
Higher, Minority and Bilingual
Education**

Site Visit Final Report

**The Basic Education and Policy Support
(BEPS) Activity**

**Contract No. HNE-I-00-00-00038-00
Task Order No. 03**

Prepared for:

**The Global Bureau
Human Capacity Development Center
US Agency for International Development**

June 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

From 24 April to 24 May 2000, a team of consultants working with Creative Associates International, Inc., traveled to Macedonia (and Holland) to review issues in higher education, particularly as they relate to ethnic tensions and minorities' access to higher education and educational opportunities to learn in their own languages.

PURPOSE/GOALS/OBJECTIVES

The team began work with the understanding that the United States, through the Embassy and United States Agency for International Development Mission in Skopje, would assist the Government of Macedonia (GOM) in ameliorating ethnic tensions between ethnic Macedonians and ethnic Albanians (and perhaps others) arising from the inability of Albanians to pursue higher education in their own language. Toward this end, the Team sought to identify all principal stakeholders in resolving outstanding problems, to interview these parties, and to draw conclusions upon which action by American agencies could act constructively and in a timely fashion to resolve a major matter in ethnic tensions.

Additionally, the Team reviewed facets of the skeletal proposal of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) High Commissioner on National Minorities, the Honorable Max van der Stoel, with the aim of building upon this endorsed approach to ensure that effective and efficient higher education solutions were fleshed out, with long-term benefits to all ethnic groups in the country. This included matters related to the proposed new law on higher education, then being drafted by Macedonian authorities.

The Team for this activity included Mr. Sidney Chernenkoff of USAID/Washington, and for Creative Associates International, Inc., Dr. James A. Van Fleet, Team Leader; Dr. Lubov Fajfer; and Dr. Joel Gomez. As stated, their work was focused in the 24 April to 24 May 2000 time frame, with a Final Report due 12 June 2000.

METHODOLOGY

The activity methodology consisted of three steps: (1) reviewing all available country background reports, proposals, draft laws, and other materials relating to the project in question and work done to date on higher education issues; (2) identifying principal stakeholders in Macedonian education, particularly in higher education, and interviewing same; and (3) reviewing accumulated materials and interview notes to prepare a final report and recommendations for USAID/Macedonia (as well as the United States Embassy and USAID/Washington). All activities were completed in the given time frame.

RESULTS

This activity had three principal results aiding education in Macedonia.

- The team identified major deficiencies in the teaching of Macedonian, the country’s official language, in the schools where instruction is in minority languages. Moreover, the deficiencies that are most severe in secondary schools are attributable to a poor quality of teaching. As a result, in many cases, minority students attending minority schools receive inadequate preparation in Macedonian language to be competitive for university admissions.”
- The team found that minority students were not treated unfairly in university admissions. The quota system in place is more than even-handed in admissions matters, with more stringent criteria being applied to ethnic Macedonians than to those of any other nationality in Macedonia.
- The Team concluded that the van der Stoel proposal laid the foundations for a political solution to a question of ethnic tensions, but one that inherently had an educational dimension as well. The Team also concluded that it was appropriate to support the OSCE proposal. With that act, there can be collaboration of the United States agencies in support of a new educational institution that would offer instructional programs in Macedonian, Albanian, and English (among other possible languages), utilizing traditional instructional but more importantly informational technology and distance learning methods. This approach would enable the United States agencies and American academic institutions to proffer financial aid and technical assistance while not assuming a lead in the activity or prolonged involvement in this field. The resulting institution building would include a stronger system of higher education in the country as well as a resolution of concerns among the ethnic Albanian population.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Once the proposed new higher education legislation is enacted, USAID should review the law to determine its impact on the following: (a) the future structure and quality of higher education in general; (b) the processes that must be established and followed in creating new public and private institutions of higher learning; (c) the opportunities for establishing a higher education system in Macedonia based on a comprehensive information technology infrastructure, including distance learning; (d) business management and public administration program improvement and/or redevelopment; (e) improvement of elementary and secondary teacher education preparation programs for the entire country; (f) access to higher education opportunities for ethnic minorities, particularly the ethnic Albanians; (g) the recommended OSCE proposal on higher education opportunities for Albanians and others; and (h) the prospects of the new law for contributing to a socially and ethnically stable society.
- USAID should establish in the very near future procedures to provide the government of Macedonia with appropriate technical assistance to implement various features of the new law, including: (a) the founding and implementation of an accreditation board; (b) the establishment of an information technology infrastructure and related distance learning capabilities for the country; (c) the creation of a National Resource Center for Education, to serve the entire country; (d) the utilization of English as a language of instruction in higher

education classes throughout Macedonia; and (e) the preparation of elementary and secondary education teachers to teach in Macedonian, Albanian, and other languages.

- The USAID/Macedonia Mission should seek to collaborate with the OSCE before the Macedonian higher education law passes, in order to establish procedures to implement the OSCE proposal for a new private institution of higher learning.
- The USAID/Macedonia Mission should collaborate with the OSCE in providing technical assistance and in monitoring progress of the new institution, once begun.
- The USAID/Macedonia Mission should investigate possibilities of utilizing the ALO to provide technical assistance through a Partnership (or other) agreement to do the following: (a) assist the OSCE in establishing implementation procedures for the new institution; (b) help the Government of Macedonia in implementing features of the new law on higher education, once enacted; and (c) aid the OSCE in establishing and monitoring the progress of the new institution for higher education in general.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
Background	ii
Purpose/Goals/Objectives	ii
Methodology.....	ii
Results	ii
Recommendations	iii
COUNTRY PROFILE	1
INTRODUCTION: A HIGHER, MINORITY AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECT	2
METHODOLOGY	3
GENERAL ENVIRONMENT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN MACEDONIA	4
TEAM FINDINGS.....	6
Finding #1: The OSCE Proposal.....	6
Finding #2: Higher Education Legislation	8
Finding #3: Private Institutions of Higher Education	9
Finding #4: Private Institutions and Minority Access	10
Finding #5: Reviews on Private Higher Education	11
Finding #6: Tetovo University.....	11
CONCLUSIONS.....	12
Conclusion #1: OSCE Proposal	12
Conclusion #2: Albanian Access to Higher Education.....	13
Conclusion #3: Higher Education in Albanian.....	13
OPTIONS.....	14
Option #1: Budget Support to the GOM/MOE with Conditionality.....	14
Option #2: Direct \$5 Million Public International Organization (PIO) Grant to OSCE	14
Option #3: Direct USAID Cooperative Agreement with United States IHE and European Partner(S) for Starting the Institution.....	15
Option #4: Direct Grant to GOM in Addition to Options #2 and/or #3.....	16
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
Recommendation #1	17
Recommendation #2	17
Recommendation #3	18
Recommendation #4	18
Recommendation #5	18
A FINAL APPRAISAL BY THE TEAM.....	18
Appendices	20
Appendix 1. List of Principal Contacts in Macedonia for USAID Education Team.....	20
Appendix 2. Appointment Schedule	22
Appendix 3. Data on Other Donor Projects in the Education Sector.....	24

COUNTRY PROFILE

The collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989 signaled not only the end of communism in Central and Eastern Europe, but also a beginning in many cases of volatile ethnic strife as the newly independent countries such as those of the former Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia attempted to secure their political space.

Western diplomats and commentators on the region long recognized the fact that ethnic tensions in the Balkans posed a serious threat not only to the viability of the newly independent states but also the cohesion of the European Union and NATO. Positioned between Albania and the Serbian province of Kosovo, Macedonia was considered the last bastion of stability in the region. Perhaps it also was a symbol of hope that the resolution of ethnic tensions could be accommodated through peaceful and democratic processes. From this vantage point, then, domestic politics in Macedonia have remained in the center of attention for much of the international community.

Deep ethnic, religious, and cultural cleavages represent a major threat to Macedonia's stability. Although most of the discussions of inter-ethnic friction concentrate on Macedonian-Albanian issues, the problem is more complex and involves all minority groups in the country. The crisis in Kosovo has further exacerbated the already tense situation between the Macedonian Slavic majority and the Albanian Muslim minority. The tensions between these two groups are not a new development, and the more recent pre-independence frictions date to the 1980s when the repressive measures against Kosovo by the Yugoslav government were paralleled by similar policies toward ethnic Albanian populations in Macedonia.

Since its independence in 1991, the new Macedonian government has made efforts to provide opportunities to ethnic Albanians in the political arena, but they still remain greatly under-represented in many fields, including local government, law enforcement, and the military. For their part, Macedonia's ethnic Albanians complain that they are subject to pervasive discrimination in everyday life.

These ethnic antagonisms surfaced during the period of the formation of the new Macedonian state and have left an enduring stamp on domestic politics. The ethnic Albanians in large part boycotted the 1991 referendum on independence from Yugoslavia and the adoption of a new constitution. This boycott occurred because of Albanian demands for recognition as a constituent people of the Republic, equal in status to the ethnic Macedonians. In principle, the constitution of the former Yugoslavia placed nations and ethnic groups on equal footing, although the issue of minorities was neither discussed nor even defined in specific terms.

The new Macedonian constitution accords its non-ethnic Macedonian citizens the status/designation of a "nationality," a carry-over term from Yugoslav times when the constitution made a distinction between the six "nations" of the country and other "nationalities." Not surprisingly, ethnic Albanians interpreted this as a lower constitutional status for non-ethnic Macedonians, although the constitution per se guarantees the same civil rights and liberties to all

citizens of the country. However, the issue of the constitutional status of Albanians and their language remains a major divisive cleavage to the present day.

INTRODUCTION: A HIGHER, MINORITY AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECT

Macedonia, the erstwhile southernmost of republics, gained independence in 1991 without a military struggle from the crumbling former socialist state of Yugoslavia. However, peace in the Balkans did not evolve. Croatia, Bosnia, and later in Kosovo were characterized by war for much of the decade. The underlying elements of strife – ethnicity, language and religion – did not spare the new Republic, and problems of these natures that have been evident for a century or longer have arisen in the new political environment to threaten Macedonia.

In May 2000, a team of four individuals from Creative Associates International, Inc. (CAII) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) traveled to Macedonia to investigate conditions in higher education and to propose an activity that was aimed at decreasing social and political tensions among Macedonians and native ethnic Albanians by assisting all groups in implementing decisions reached for higher education reform. These reforms would, in a timely fashion, adequately address (and perhaps resolve) issues of minorities receiving educational instruction in their own languages.

The Team faced three primary tasks. These were:

- To become familiar with the context, evolution and design of proposals and draft laws for higher education, then under consideration by the Government of Macedonia (GOM) and the Ministry of Education (MOE);
- To identify and discuss with key national and international stakeholders and donors, their involvement and plans for supporting reform of higher education in Macedonia; and
- To develop an issues paper and options list for alternative strategies that USAID/Macedonia might employ to support ethnic diversity in higher education, including but not limited to the following options:
 - Simple budget support to the GOM/MOE with conditionality;
 - Budget support to the GOM with conditionality and additional technical assistance; or
 - Budget support with a university partnership/cooperative agreement, technical assistance, and involvement aimed at implementation with other bilateral or multilateral donor partners.

Elaborating on these tasks and the options, the Team was charged with providing briefings on its initial findings to the USAID/Macedonia Mission and to the Embassy, accompanied by a written report (all delivered 19 May 2000). Additionally, it was charged with providing a final report that would encompass the following topics:

- the current context of proposed legislation for higher education reform;
- options for USAID/Macedonia support for ethnic diversity in higher education; and
- recommendations for future USAID action.

The final written report was submitted to the Project Officer on 12 June 2000, the assigned due date. Modifications have been made based on the comments that were provided as a result of that review. This revised document reflects those comments.

METHODOLOGY

Two overriding questions guided the work of the Team in Macedonia:

- Will higher education in a native language promote, support, and facilitate integration processes in the Macedonian society, or will it lead to stronger divisions along ethnic and linguistic lines, with possible dire future political consequences?; and
- What kind of institutional programs in higher education can (or will) promote inter-ethnic tolerance, ultimately (but hypothetically) leading to decreased ethnic tensions in Macedonia?

The Team addressed these questions by interviewing many individuals one-on-one, as well as several representatives of offices as groups. In all, several score interviews were conducted in diverse settings, and included parties who, in the opinion of the Team, USAID Mission personnel, and Embassy staff, constituted most of the “principal players” in higher education in Macedonia, dealing with ethnic, linguistic, and donor matters.

The CAII Team interviewed representatives from international organizations, Skopje University, major political parties, and various Ministries. Interviews included the following:

- *International Organizations:* Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)/The Hague, OSCE/Macedonia, Catholic Relief Services/Europe, the Open Society Institute/Macedonia, the World Bank/Macedonia, Search for Common Ground/Macedonia, and the Peace Corps/Macedonia;
- *St. Cyril and Methodius University (also referred to as Skopje University):* Center for Ethnic Relations and Center for Refugees and Forced Migration Studies;
- *USAID Mission and United States Embassy Staff;*
- *Skopje University:* Faculty of Economics, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Pedagogy, Faculty of Philology, deans, associate deans, and teaching staff members;

- *Political Parties:* Leaders of the principal Macedonian opposition party, the Social Democratic Party (SDSM), and the principal Albanian party in the current governing coalition, the Democratic Party of Albanians (DPA);
- *Ministries:* Respective ministers of state within the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Education.
- *Other:* Individuals concerned with the new draft law on higher education, including the chair of the drafting committee.

All interviews were conducted with all or at least a majority of the Team present. Comments about the content and direction of the conversations were made in group sessions, and the information conveyed is contained in the findings of the Team.

Lastly, these interviews were conducted against the background of the first conversation by the Team at the beginning of the mission, that is, the meeting with Mr. Max van der Stoel, High Commissioner of the OSCE on National Minorities. After a reported 49 visits to Macedonia, most covered extensively by the Macedonia media, a proposal had been developed in mid-April and delivered to the Macedonian prime minister as Mr. van der Stoel's best effort at resolving a complex issue of higher education in the Albanian language. The Team reviewed this proposal and viewed it (as did Mr. van der Stoel) as a very basic foundation upon which the GOM (and donors) could build to address the issue of minority languages in higher education.

With all principal stakeholders – political parties, donors, and the United States country team – supporting this approach, it was incumbent upon the Team to consider it carefully. As its work proceeded, the Team found itself very supportive of Mr. van der Stoel's approach as well.

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN MACEDONIA

It is widely recognized that Macedonia has experienced ethnic tensions for some time. The history of the region is well documented in many readings, so most observations in this report will focus on recent events that have exacerbated long-standing tensions.

Macedonia's population of about 2.1 million is – according to a 1994 census – some 23 percent ethnic Albanian. Other important groups include Turks with around 4 percent, Roma (Gypsies) with about 2.5 percent, and smaller groups of one percent or slightly more represented by Croats, Serbs, Bulgarians, and Vlachs. Additionally, an ethnic Macedonian population, which is Muslim, is a group that is religiously and somewhat culturally apart for some contexts, but is included as a segment of the larger population in others.

Although Turks, Croats, Serbs, and Bulgarians appear fairly well integrated into the socio-economic order of the country, Roma – largely by their own cultural traditions – are very much separate. The largest minority ethnic group, however--the ethnic Albanians--are different in virtually every sense – linguistically, religiously, ethnically, economically, and geographically – from the mainstream of Macedonian society.

Occupying the western region of the country and up to 40 percent of the capital, Skopje, ethnic Albanians tend to see themselves as a “nation” and not just a “nationality,” using the old Yugoslav governmental criteria. As such, they believe that they are not granted equal standing with ethnic Macedonians in the new Republic of Macedonia, and are effectively “second class citizens.” This feeling is due in some measure to two provisions in the constitution that state the official language of Macedonia is Macedonian, and that the state religion is Orthodox Christianity.

Albanians are overwhelmingly Muslim and most speak—as their first language—Albanian. Hence, there are perceived distinctions between Macedonians and Albanians, that in fact are not present in law. The constitution and statutes of Macedonia provide for complete equality of all ethnic, linguistic, and religious groups in the Republic. The Albanians, however, tend to point to differences in economic advantages, the domination of the public service by Macedonians, and differences in educational opportunities for them in a country that honors equality only in the breach.

The team learned that instruction of Macedonian in minority schools does not exceed primary and secondary education. Ample evidence shows that, although the constitution allows (but does not require) primary and secondary education in a native language such as Albanian, classes are often taught by ill-prepared teachers. Moreover, non-native speakers, whose ability to effectively provide instruction in that “foreign” language is questionable, often provide the mandated instruction in Macedonian. In addition to questions of competence, the Team learned that classes in minority schools that study the Macedonian language do not exceed three hours per week. This approach does not appear to be intensive enough to adequately prepare secondary school students to take university entrance exams when their final high school year approaches.

Under the Yugoslav tutelage and into the early 1990s, ethnic Macedonians, as a rule, conducted the Macedonian language instruction in minority schools. The Ministry of Education later decided, however, that even the Macedonian language should be taught by the minority teachers in minority schools. The result of this decision is deficient proficiency in Macedonian among many ethnic Albanians. Interestingly, a former minister of education who is now an advocate of Macedonians teaching Macedonian in schools was the individual responsible for changing that erstwhile practice.

The Team also learned that cultural factors in rural-urban environments effected teaching and learning. Not surprisingly, the least accomplished of schools were located in rural areas, precisely where cultural factors would have the greatest impact on student performance. For example, the wide practice of withdrawing female students from the fifth to eight grade, to do work at home was found almost exclusively in the rural sector. While pandemic in the Albanian population, education officials pointed to similar trends in other parts of the population, including the majority Orthodox Macedonians.

Nonetheless, rural values have had a dramatic impact on the Albanian population in general, contributing to limited access to secondary—and ultimately university level—education for females, as well as limited participation in the economy and self-development activities.

At the center of the ethnic Albanian-Macedonian discourse on higher education in Macedonia lies the issue of the status of the Albanian language and the right of ethnic Albanians to have access to higher education in their mother tongue. In the past, Macedonia's Albanians had the opportunity to study at Pristina University in Kosovo, with instruction provided in Albanian (or Serbo-Croatian). That university was closed a decade ago, however, leaving “an Albanian language institution” a moot point in the region outside Tirana University.

In order to address this perceived deficiency, the ethnic Macedonian-Albanians established a private university in Tetovo, a predominantly Albanian city in western Macedonia, in 1994. The GOM declared this action unconstitutional and refused to recognize this university, creating a dilemma wherein Tetovo University has become the rallying cry for many ethnic Albanians and a litmus test for how far the “rights” of this minority group go within the Macedonian nation.

In fact, ethnic minorities are guaranteed generous minority rights under the constitution, with Article 48 stating, “The Republic guarantees the protection of the ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and religious identity of the nationalities. Members of nationalities have the right to instruction in their own language in primary and secondary education, as determined by law.” However, these rights to instruction are not extended to higher education, thus causing a problem for those looking to Tetovo University as a test case for Albanian rights.

TEAM FINDINGS

FINDING #1: THE OSCE PROPOSAL

In the letter addressed to Prime Minister Ljubco Georgievski dated 18 April 2000, High Commissioner on National Minorities Max van der Stoel outlined recommendations concerning the creation of a new “Institute of Higher Education” in Macedonia that would ameliorate ethnic Albanian demands for higher education in their language, at the same time proffering a solution acceptable to the ethnic Macedonian majority. Mr. van der Stoel proposed the establishment of a private institution of higher education under the following conditions:

- The quality of education must be in conformity with that of the existing Macedonian system of higher education, which in turn can be expected to take part in the evolving international framework of quality control;
- In principle, only the residents of the country may attend courses, and the courses would not be attended solely by students of Albanian ethnicity but also by interested students of Macedonian and other ethnicities;
- The curriculum would also include teaching of the Macedonian language, history, and culture; and

- The Board of the new Institute would decide on the name.

Initially, the new institution would establish three faculties – Pedagogy, Public Administration, and Business Management (according to an interview with Mr. van der Stoel) – thus trying to address three pressing needs for the Albanian community, and Macedonia in general. The proposal also emphasized the importance of developing close collaborative relations and formal cooperation agreements between Skopje University and the new institution.

This collaboration could include common courses in foreign languages, such as English and German; training in human rights, minority rights, and civic education; and a program of European studies as an important mechanism for facilitating future integration within the European Union.

The van der Stoel proposal is well within the parameters of the current constitutional provisions. Article 45 gives citizens the right to establish private schools at all levels except for primary education. Also, as a signatory to the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Macedonia is legally bound to uphold its provisions. This is reflected in Article 118 of the constitution, that states that international agreements that have been ratified in accordance with the constitution are part of the legal order and cannot be changed by law.

Since Macedonia is also a signatory to the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, the government cannot interfere with individuals or bodies to establish and direct educational institutions and is held responsible for guaranteeing the rights embodied in the Covenant without discrimination of any kind, including language (Articles 13(4) and 2(2), respectively).

Although Macedonia ratified the Covenant, it does not have the appropriate legal instrument to implement the Covenant's provisions. The new law on higher education that currently awaits ratification should rectify this omission by the national parliament, as discussed *infra*.

The van der Stoel proposal, as stated, has very broad support. Among those entities interviewed by the Team in favor of it are: Skopje University's Faculty of Economics, Faculty of Law, and Faculty of Pedagogy; the Ministry of Education; the Higher Education Working Group Addressing Issues of National Education; the Macedonian ruling political party and the principal Macedonian opposition political party; the coalition Albanian political party; and diverse donor as well as non-profit organization multilateral agencies.

Nonetheless, while the proposal has received wide and enthusiastic support from the international donor/stakeholder community, no entity has stepped forward or has been identified to assume the leadership role in its implementation. Until such an entity is identified, it will be impossible to implement coordinated international assistance efforts. Absent a delineated implementation strategy from OSCE and/or other European donors, USAID/Macedonia must either wait for this component to fall into place or decide upon an independent course of action, including technical assistance.

Will the implementation of the van der Stoel proposal contribute to decreased ethnic tension in Macedonia? Much will depend on the chosen approach for its implementation. In the short run, there is little that the international community can do to alleviate tensions. If the proposed new law on higher education is ratified by parliament in June, July, or August 2000, it will provide the first step in the direction of allowing Albanian language instruction in all institutions of higher learning, and thus deflate the most explosive point of contention now facing Albanian-Macedonian relations.

FINDING #2: HIGHER EDUCATION LEGISLATION

The information on the contents of Macedonia's proposed legislation is based on two interviews: one with a deputy minister of the MOE and a second with the head of the working group responsible for the preparation of the draft legislation. Therefore, the points made here are tentative in nature, pending analysis of the contents of the actual law as passed (hopefully in June, July, or August 2000). The draft law, if adopted, would introduce various provisions for restructuring higher education in Macedonia and bring the country more into concert with European standards, a goal stated on numerous occasions by the current minister of education.

Some of the salient but not-central-to-the-Team's-work features of the draft law include:

- The possible dissolution of the existing University of Skopje, with the constituent faculties being recombined in diverse forms to create several new universities;
- The restatement of laws relating to faculty autonomy, granting much greater central administrative jurisdiction over their faculties, diminishing their importance at law; and
- The possibility of faculties within a university to engage further into private or other money-earning ventures.

For the Team, five very central issues of the draft reform law in higher education include:

- The freedom to create private universities in Macedonia, with instruction provided in languages of the country as well as major "world" languages with English, French, German and Russian most clearly identified;
- The ability of the GOM to support private universities to some extent, in line with national laws and as it deems appropriate;
- The creation of an accreditation board to approve requests and otherwise oversee new faculties and/or universities, per se;
- The creation of a resource center to further assist with the tasks of teacher preparation and upgrading for the country as a whole; and

- The commitment of the GOM to provide all Macedonian ethnic communities with opportunities for higher education.

From the perspective of the relevance for issues in higher education for minorities in minority languages, the law provides at least two additions. Firstly, it would permit not only the establishment of private institutions of higher education, but more importantly it would allow instruction in languages other than Macedonian. The current law stipulates that the primary language of instruction must be Macedonian, effectively barring guest faculty from teaching entire courses in another idiom.

Secondly, the law would enable the GOM to provide official support to private institutions, including those financed by an ethnic Albanian community. This could have political and practical applications in terms of future assistance to the GOM. On the one hand it would provide an instrument through which the GOM could show support for international educational endeavors should they be considered important contributions to educational development. Such would certainly be well received by the Albanian and other communities. On the other hand, it should not be assumed that even with the availability of funds (from a United States or European donor), the GOM would be willing to provide support for private educational institutions if such action could result in a considerable political fall-out on the domestic arena.

Although the new draft law does not mention Tetovo University by name, it would provide two avenues for this institution's legalization, a point of contention since its inception (Tetovo is discussed in Findings #6 *infra*). One approach for Tetovo would be to file for legal status as a private university. This would achieve the goal of state recognition but fall short of the demand that the university be classified as a public (and supported) institution.

The second approach would be to apply for a status as a public university immediately. In addition to meeting all the criteria stipulated by the newly created accreditation board, the university would have to provide parallel instruction in the Macedonian language. Considering the heated rhetoric surrounding the issue, it is unlikely that in the short term, the university administration would concede to this requirement.

FINDING #3: PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

As stated, the GOM draft law on higher education will permit private institutions or universities to operate in the country. These might use any of several languages, with most parties interviewed believing that English would be the most common if not universal language of instruction. This said, the benefits of private universities were pointed out as providing the long-sought competition for Skopje University, described (correctly) as having a monopoly of university-level training, and permit foreign faculty to actually teach classes in Macedonian classrooms.

Along with these welcomed changes, individuals interviewed pointed out further benefits of developing much closer linkages with American, European, and other universities, thus enhancing their own educational system. Foreign faculty were frequently described as being of

high quality, and as something of a fresh approach to some tired pedagogical approaches to education in Macedonia today.

The van der Stoel proposal provides for private higher education and advocates the establishment of a new institution that would initially focus on public administration, education, and business administration. These areas all represent dire needs for the country, in the first case to ensure better decentralization and municipal autonomy throughout the Republic (and particularly in Albanian regions), in the second case to address the shortcomings in primary and secondary education, and in the last case to induce more entrepreneurship in an area characterized by an old socialist mentality.

FINDING #4: PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS AND MINORITY ACCESS

For higher education purposes, according to the 1994 census, the population of Macedonia is 23 percent Albanian, 4 percent Turk, 2.3 percent Roma, 0.1 percent Croat, 2.0 percent Serb, 0.8 percent Macedonian Muslim, and 0.16 percent Bulgarian. Admissions committees utilize these official figures in admissions matters.

Minorities in Macedonia have access to higher education. The university system has in place a quota system that permits enrollments reflective of the percentage of any grouping within the national population. This law is based on the 1994 census, and resultant legislation ensuring such minority enrollment.

The lone qualifier is, all students must take an entrance examination (that is administered in the Macedonian language) that is graded blindly as a multiple choice test. It has two parts, each containing 30 questions. Then, scores for high school grade point averages (GPAs) are calculated in, with the requirement that all entering students must have at least a total of 60 points out of a total of 100.

The levels of qualification differ widely for all groups. For example, Macedonians tend to be admitted with scores at 95 and above, whereas an Albanian might have just over 60. Nonetheless, admissions that are limited (by law) in each faculty could be made up entirely by a minority group, since the best qualified come out of the admission allocation and then the nationality quota represents another “take.” If a faculty were permitted to admit 100 students, then 23 positions would be reserved for Albanians and x for other minorities. Thereafter, if the finest applicants were all Albanians with averages at (say) 95 and above, compared to the Macedonians with 90 to 94, then additional admittees would be Albanian or other minorities. The scores for all students sitting to take the entry exams are open to public scrutiny. The Team found no problems with admissions criteria, and concluded – as does virtually everyone else – that the low level of preparation for minorities (especially Albanians) is due to deficiencies in the primary and especially secondary levels and results in low passing levels for university admission. Moreover, this inadequacy in preparation, if not fatal in gaining admission, likely will be so once matriculated. Dropout rates are very high among Albanians, in particular.

FINDING #5: REVIEWS ON PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

The Team quickly discovered that the provision of higher education exclusively in the Albanian language would meet with a very dim reception among the majority Macedonian population. Such would tend to drive wedges between the majority and this minority, exacerbating any existing ethnic tensions that now exist. Moreover, the Team concluded that such a move would be highly detrimental to the national social and economic fabric.

The ability of any new (or existing) private institution to establish potential collaboration with Skopje University would have a tepid to chilly reception. The reasons for this lie in the matter of unwelcome competition, but also in the question of the language instruction. Certainly there would be resistance to any relationship with a single language institution other than Macedonian, but additionally so if the language were Albanian, as would be the case with the University of Tetovo. There also would be a particular anger with a situation in which the GOM gave financial support to a private institution, vis-à-vis the financially strapped public universities.

Lastly, there is a question about Macedonian citizens paying tuition to a private institution, and how this will effect public universities. There are serious questions of inequity raised by many university people in Macedonia on the details of the proposed legislation and the ultimate outcome of the Tetovo University controversy. Nonetheless, the Team felt that these details were minor, and could be resolved fairly easily and quickly over the next one to two years.

FINDING #6: TETOVO UNIVERSITY

Tetovo University was established at the end of 1994 as a response to the perceived need (and as a perceived right) of the Macedonian ethnic Albanians, pursuant to their seeking higher education in their native language. Previously, ethnic Albanians desiring to study in that language could do so at Pristina University in Kosovo. However, with the termination of that program in 1991 and the closing of Pristina, Albanians sought to establish a new institution in Macedonia.

Initially, the Macedonian government declared this creation, now described as a “civic initiative” illegal for diverse reasons. These included Macedonian laws that precluded establishing universities in languages other than Macedonian, creating private universities as such, and other reasons of a political and emotional but non-legal nature. As a result, the ethnic Albanian population was galvanized around demands for constitutional reforms making Macedonia a bilingual state, and declaring the university to be legal and public.

The University of Tetovo is located in the western city of that name. Tetovo is considered the unofficial capital of the Albanian minority. The university is funded by student tuition, contributions of ethnic Albanians in their diaspora, and a “voluntary tax” from national Albanians. The university claims to enroll 8,208 students who are almost all Albanian, but who include a smattering of Turks and Roma. Some 360 teaching faculty, mostly Albanians, are listed on their rolls. However, it is stated by some authorities that many of the faculty have left Tetovo for Pristina, since the international community auspices will see to it that the university

there is reopened. Others state that not more than 1,000-2000 students are actually attending Tetovo at the present time.

From the beginning, the university administration demanded legal recognition of the university as a public institution. Those demands spurred fears among ethnic Macedonians that separatism would be promoted, and that such could lead to a canton-like state or worse to a unified “Greater Albania.”

Although the van der Stoel proposal is designed to satisfy at least the most immediate needs of the ethnic Albanian community for university education in Albanian, it will add a new dimension to the debate over Tetovo University. The proposed new private institute will directly compete with Tetovo for Albanian students and for position within the ethnic Albanian community. Although it is not likely that Tetovo University will simply disappear (at least in the short run), the debate about the status and faith of the university will likely become a predominantly intra-Albanian one.

Based on the Team’s discussions with two groups of individuals, those who have first hand experience with Tetovo University and those who are seemingly well informed about it, the Team concludes the following:

- Whatever the institution is at this juncture, it has poor infrastructure and many faculty with questionable credentials;
- It is perceived – even by Albanians – as being of low quality;
- It is a politically motivated institution at this point in time;
- It reinforces separateness in the national society;
- It is small and has only limited visibility; and
- Its support from the Albanian community is mixed, at best.

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSION #1: OSCE PROPOSAL

While the van der Stoel proposal is a political solution for Macedonia, it also represents the basis for an educational solution for major issues in Macedonian higher education. It has provided the underlying rationale for drafting a new law on higher education, one that is far more realistic for the country at this point in time. Consequently, the Team, the USAID/Macedonia Mission, and the Embassy country team are all in support of this work, and insofar as they are informed, of the proposed new legislation.

The Team has recommended that the USAID/Macedonia Mission (and possibly the United States Embassy) should be present at the proposed 12 June 2000 meeting of donors in Skopje, called together by the World Bank and others, to discuss issues in education in general. The USAID Mission has the opportunity to call a rump session to discuss higher education in particular, to shed light on the next steps after passage of the new national law on higher education.

Clearly, the USAID Mission should seek clarifications on envisaged steps, and by 30 July 2000 work with potential donors and leaders to begin developing plans of action to implement the new law and the van der Stoel proposal as quickly as possible. Thus, the United States work in Macedonia in this matter will take on a distinctly educational program dimension, rather than a political agenda aura.

CONCLUSION #2: ALBANIAN ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Are Albanians given access to higher education? The Team concluded that the access mechanisms to higher education available to ethnic Albanians and other minorities are more than fair, and that actual practices on admissions provide substantial advantages to them.

The Team concluded that low enrollments are due principally to the deficiencies in primary and especially secondary education, as discussed supra, and that retention rates for all minorities suffer as well within existing universities due to the toll of inadequate preparation for university level work.

CONCLUSION #3: HIGHER EDUCATION IN ALBANIAN

Should Albanians have access to instructional programs in the Albanian language in higher education? The Team responded to this question with an affirmative vote, seeing it as a political issue, but cautions that this should be one of several languages available for instructional purposes. Similarly, it believes that there should be a mandate to learn Macedonian as the national language, and a component of that idiom should be contained in all higher education programs where a language other than Macedonian is the one of instruction.

Additionally, the Team cautions that all such learning should be done within the context of national laws and the constitution of Macedonia. Any institute established outside the laws of the land should be brought into conformity with same, or be closed.

If a language is used as a divisive issue and de facto has established a politically, culturally, socially segregated environment, these factors should be brought to the attention of authorities who can address shortcomings or other agendas, to ensure that the offending institution is brought into compliance with national laws or closed. Clearly, it is not in the interest of any Macedonian to condone the operation of an institution that is engaged in undermining national unity.

OPTIONS

OPTION #1: BUDGET SUPPORT TO THE GOM/MOE WITH CONDITIONALITY

An Option #1 approach involves the transfer of USAID/Macedonia funds in the amount of \$5 million to the GOM, to deposit the equivalent amount in denars to a fund that supports the start-up of a new institution of higher education, as outlined in the van der Stoel proposal. This approach might involve conditionality requiring signed agreements of support for this new institution from the Faculties of Pedagogy, Law, and Economics at Skopje University, but as stated, their reluctance to do so would virtually doom any forced agreement.

This Option of simple budget support with conditionality would be easy and quick to accomplish, particularly if “soft conditionality” were used. It would meet immediate United States desires for a quick response to ethnic tension issues with an early obligation of funds and would not entangle USAID/Macedonia in any long-term commitments.

On the other hand, a realistic approach clearly shows that there is little leverage in a \$5 million program commitment, particularly for eliciting conditionality. Moreover, there is no receiving fund yet in existence, and there are serious questions as to whether the GOM could (or would) make contributions to the proposal’s implementation requirements. And too, past conditionality has been highly problematic for the USAID and European Union programs. The OSCE does not recommend working through the Ministry of Education under any circumstances, reflecting suspicions about its operations voiced in many other quarters.

Although foreign policy goals might be impacted if disbursement of funds is delayed, as has been the case with other USAID and EU cash transfers (not to overlook the perception that the American government was more interested in helping the Macedonian government than addressing the “real issues” at play), it is incumbent to be realistic about the Macedonian situation in its broad sweep. Faculties at Skopje University are adamantly opposed to supporting a proposed new institution, or at best are indifferent to it. Conditionality could represent much more intensive management than the USAID Mission believe at present, and the record of the MOE is such that the \$5 million could well be a waste of resources.

The Team has NOT RECOMMENDED the Option #1 approach.

OPTION #2: DIRECT \$5 MILLION PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION (PIO) GRANT TO OSCE

Issuing a direct grant to OSCE would be the most straightforward way to accomplish the United States government’s promise to support educational activities in Macedonia that address long standing demands of ethnic Albanians for access to higher education in their language. At the same time, this approach would not require a direct involvement of a leadership role on the part of USAID/Macedonia.

The arguments for Option #2 include the fact that it would be a direct support for the OSCE proposal as such, and that it would involve technical assistance to support the new institution’s

development (through OSCE activities), thus increasing its chances of success. Additionally, it would be a reasonably simple process to prepare documentation for early obligation of funds, thus increasing chances for faster implementation, while avoiding the GOM bureaucracy and providing for greater accountability of resources. Lastly, Option #2 would not require conditionality from the OSCE (unless it were decided that select stipulations were desirable).

There are arguments against Option #2 as well. These include two: at this point in time, the OSCE has not expressed an interest in assuming the leading role in the implementation process, and its position must be clarified soon after the higher education law is passed; and a grant to the OSCE might become indirectly connected with activities of other European Union donors. Were the latter case to occur, it could slow down the implementation process and tie up USAID funds for an indefinite period of time.

The Team concluded that given American stated priorities, Option #2 would be the recommended approach, provided that the OSCE would be willing to assume the lead in developing and implementing an activity in Macedonia in this arena and/or accept the grant from USAID.

A grant to the OSCE could be implemented through a donor-funded cooperative agreement with a United States-European university consortium to provide technical assistance in areas such as the following: setting up the institution's board; developing a charter; acquiring space and facilities; finding and training faculty; establishing programmatic linkages with the University of Skopje; developing curricula; and incorporating distance learning technologies into instructional programs.

Option #2 IS RECOMMENDED as the most appropriate approach to the project at hand.

OPTION #3: DIRECT USAID COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH UNITED STATES IHE AND EUROPEAN PARTNER(S) FOR STARTING THE INSTITUTION

As with a PIO grant, Option #3 supports the OSCE proposal by establishing a board for the new institution. Keeping in mind the limited administrative resources at USAID/Macedonia, the primary administrative responsibility for the cooperative agreement could be placed with an organization such as the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO).

Arguments in favor of Option #3 include the extensive experience of ALO in management of USAID grants, with its cooperative agreement already in place (and with a high ceiling for awards). The ALO could implement a quick RFP competition among American institutions, in some six months or possibly less. This would take the form of a technical assistance activity call, something that could be described and accounted for in terms of actual achievements and impact.

Additionally, the approach in Option #3 would directly involve a United States institution, most likely with a European partner. Nonetheless, it still does not place the United States and USAID in the leadership role for the OSCE proposal. It would also avoid both GOM and OSCE

bureaucracies, and should ensure a faster starting date, in which case it could be appropriately designed and implemented independently of other donor activities. Lastly, this approach could be designed to have a limited project life of perhaps three years, thus not committing USAID/Macedonia to an open-ended involvement.

Arguments against this Option #3 include the fact that this approach would – at least initially – require additional USAID involvement to prepare guidelines for desired activities, and that such would involve USAID directly or indirectly in a multi-year activity.

Option #3 IS RECOMMENDED if the OSCE is unable to receive a PIO grant from USAID.

OPTION #4: DIRECT GRANT TO GOM IN ADDITION TO OPTIONS #2 AND/OR #3

Political considerations may require that the United States government and USAID/Macedonia show timely and tangible support to GOM activities bolstering the new private institution. This could be accomplished by providing a direct grant to GOM/MOE or another appropriate government agency to support development and activities of the newly established accreditation board or committee (this being stipulated in the new draft law on higher education that is awaiting passage). This grant could finance, for example, training for the board members related to their new activities, in either Europe or in the United States.

The arguments in favor of this approach include the fact that the United States and USAID/Macedonia would be directly identified with the GOM efforts benefiting not only the ethnic Albanian population but also the country's educational institutions in general. The grant could be implemented immediately (that is, within the USAID requirements for preparation of documents) upon the passage of the new law and independently of other activities by the donor community. Moreover, depending on the American preferences, the grant does not require conditionality.

The arguments against Option #4 include a powerful one: this approach would encounter similar difficulties as those outlined in Option #1. The GOM bureaucracy, the lack of transparency, and difficulties in enforcing conditionalities all mitigate against this approach.

Option #4 is RECOMMENDED WITH RESERVATIONS, although it can be postulated that it would be worth the money even if USAID could not control the results. The grant would not have to involve much funding, but it would achieve an immediate political purpose of showing United States support for GOM activities as stated earlier.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Team concludes its presentation with five specific recommendations, reflecting its work on this project. These include the following.

RECOMMENDATION #1

Once the proposed new legislation on higher education is enacted, there should be a USAID review and analysis of the law to determine its impact on:

- The future structure and quality of higher education in general;
- The processes that must be established and followed in establishing new public and private institutions of higher learning;
- The opportunities for establishing a higher education system in Macedonia based on a comprehensive information technology infrastructure, including distance learning;
- Business management and public administration program improvements and/or redevelopment;
- Improvements to elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs for the entire country;
- Access to higher education opportunities for ethnic minorities, particularly the ethnic Albanians;
- The recommended OSCE proposal on private higher education opportunities for Albanians and others; and
- The prospects of the new law for contributing to a socially and ethnically stable society.

RECOMMENDATION #2

USAID should establish in the very near future procedures to provide the GOM with appropriate technical assistance to implement various features of the new law, including:

- The founding and implementation of an accreditation board (despite an apparent contradiction in Option #4);
- The establishment of an information technology infrastructure and related distance learning capabilities for the country;
- The creation of a National Resource Center for Education, to serve the entire country;

- The utilization of English as a language of instruction in higher education classes throughout Macedonia; and
- The preparation of elementary and secondary education teachers to teach in Macedonian, Albanian, and other languages.

RECOMMENDATION #3

The USAID/Macedonia Mission should seek to collaborate with the OSCE before the Macedonian higher education law passes, in order to establish procedures to implement the OSCE proposal for a new private institution of higher education in the country.

RECOMMENDATION #4

The USAID/Macedonia Mission should collaborate with the OSCE in providing technical assistance and in monitoring the progress of the new institution of higher education, once it is established.

RECOMMENDATION #5

The USAID/Macedonia Mission should investigate the possibility of utilizing the Association Liaison Office to provide technical assistance through a Partnership (or other) arrangement that would do the following:

- Assist the OSCE in establishing implementation procedures for the new institution of higher education;
- Help the GOM in implementing features of the new law on higher education, once enacted; and
- Aid the OSCE in establishing and monitoring the progress of the new institution for higher education, in general.

A FINAL APPRAISAL BY THE TEAM

Macedonia's higher education system can be improved dramatically with little financial input from donors. Along with those changes, a significant upgrading in higher education achievement by Albanians, as well as other minorities, can be achieved in the coming five to ten years. There should be emphases on learning in English as well as in languages of the Republic, with a distinct emphasis on nontraditional classroom approaches. Both of these thrusts – English and learning through informational sciences – will ameliorate present conditions of ethnic tension in Macedonia.

The Team cautions and reiterates the point made supra that donors and the GOM/MOE must address severe deficiencies in primary and especially secondary school teaching and in the teaching corps.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. LIST OF PRINCIPAL CONTACTS IN MACEDONIA FOR USAID EDUCATION TEAM

01. Refet Abazi, Associate of Open Society Institute, Professor at Skopje University and country's leading theatrical figure
02. Dusko Acovski, Undersecretary, Ministry of Education Rajna Cemerska, World Bank/Skopje
03. Tito Belicanec, Head, Working Group for the Law on Higher Education, Faculty of Law, Skopje University
04. Rajna Cemerska, World Bank/Skopje
05. Branco Crvenkovski, President, Social Democratic Union of Macedonia
06. Borce Davitkovski, Vice Dean, Faculty of Law, Skopje University
07. Eran Fraenkel, Executive Director, Search for Common Ground
08. Ljubomir Frckoski, Faculty of Law
09. Slavica Indzevska, Deputy Executive Director for Joint Programs, Open Society Institute
10. Zvonimir Jankuloski, Director, Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, Skopje University
11. Fani Karanfilova, Program Coordinator, Open Society Institute
12. Boro Michajlovski, Vice Dean of Faculty of Pedagogy
13. Sara Mierke, Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services
14. Vladimir Milcin, Executive Director, Open Society Institute, Macedonia
15. Djevdet Nasufi, Minister of Justice
16. Suzanna Pecakovska, Program Coordinator, Higher Education, Open Society Institute
17. John Penny, First Counselor for the European Commission, Office of the Resident Envoy
18. Jan Plantinga, First Counselor, Royal Netherlands Embassy
19. Aleksa Poposki, Dean, Faculty of Philology, Skopje University

20. Tito Rado, OSI-Budapest, Hungarian Team for Macedonian Education Planning
21. Harald Schenker, OSCE Spillover Monitoring Mission
22. Janos Setenyi, Director for Educational Policy, Budapest, Hungarian Team for Macedonian Education Planning
23. Emilija Simovska, Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, Skopje University (former Minister of Education)
24. Bobek Suklev, Dean, Faculty of Economics, Skopje University
25. Sefejdin Sulejmani, Dean of Faculty of Pedagogy
26. United States Ambassador, Embassy staff and USAID/Macedonia Director and staff
27. Nadezda Uzelac, Senior Law Advisor, Ministry of Education
28. Max van der Stoel, OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, The Hague
29. Helen Wheeler, Director, United States Peace Corps
30. Arben Xhaferi, President, Democratic Party of Albanians

APPENDIX 2. APPOINTMENT SCHEDULE

02 May 2000 Tuesday
Max van der Stoep, OSCE, High Commissioner on National Minorities

03 May 2000 Wednesday
USAID/Macedonia, Skopje

04 May 2000 Thursday
USAID/Macedonia, Skopje

05 May 2000 Friday
Eran Fraenkel, Search for Common Ground
Harald Schenker, OSCE
Djevdet Nasufi, Minister of Justice
Arben Xhaferi, Democratic Party of Albanians

08 Monday 2000 Monday
Borce Davitkovski, Vice Dean, Faculty of Law, Skopje University

09 May 2000 Tuesday
Brad Fujimoto, USAID/Macedonia
Helen Wheeler, United States Peace Corps

10 May 2000 Wednesday
Vladimir Milcin, Open Society Institute
Suzana Pecakovska, Open Society Institute
Slavica Indzevska, Open Society Institute
Jan Plantinga, Dutch Embassy
Fani Karanfirova, Open Society Institute
Janos Setenyi, World Bank/Dutch Embassy Education Team
Branco Crvenkovski, Social Democratic Party

11 May 2000 Thursday
John Penny, European Union
Faculty of Philology dean and staff
Diane Ponasik, USAID/Macedonia

12 May 2000 Friday
Nadeza Uzelac, Senior Law Advisor, Ministry of Education
Dusko Acovski, Undersecretary of the Ministry of Education

14 May 2000 Sunday
Janos Setenyi, World Bank/Dutch Embassy Education Team
Peter Rado, World Bank/Dutch Embassy Education Team

15 May 2000 Monday

Emilija Simovska, Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research
Ljubomir Frekovski, Faculty of Law, Skopje University
Sara Mierke, Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services

16 May 2000 Tuesday

Bobek Suklev, Dean, Faculty of Economics
Tito Belicanec, Faculty of Law, Skopje University, Head of Working Group on the Law on
Higher Education

17 May 2000 Wednesday

Zvonimir Jankuloski, Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, Skopje
University

18 May 2000 Wednesday

Refet Abazi, Albanian actor and theatrical figure, Open Society Institute
Sejfedin Sulejmani, Dean, Faculty of Pedagogy
Boro Michajlovski, Vice Dean, Faculty of Pedagogy

19 May 2000 Friday

USAID Mission debriefing

20 May 2000 Saturday

Working Meeting at Deputy Chief of Mission with Ambassador and Embassy and USAID staff

22 May 2000 Monday

Formal debriefing of Ambassador and USAID Mission Director

24 May 2000 Wednesday

Formal USAID/Washington debriefing

APPENDIX 3. DATA ON OTHER DONOR PROJECTS IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR

Donor	Title	Start Date	End Date	Committed (in US\$)
Austria				0.32% - \$ 180,254
	Vocation & Citizenship	Feb 99	Dec 00	180,254
European Union				24.97% 14,080,000
	PHARE TEMPUS (SOP '96)			2,200,000
	PHARE Vocational Education and Training (SOP '97)	Apr 98	Sept 00	3,080,000
	PHARE Public Investment Management & Project Preparation Facility (SOP '97) Phase 1	Nov 98	May 00	4,400,000
	PHARE TEMPUS (SOP '97)			2,200,000
France				0.6% - 339,076
	Donations for the Culture, Science, and Education Sector	Jan 97		339,076
Germany				2.86% - 1,613,966
	Small-scale Projects	Jan 96	Dec 97	73,922
	Strengthening the Education Process of Adults in the Republic of Macedonia	Jan 97	Jan 00	1,540,044
World Bank				8.87% - 5,000,000
	Education Rehabilitation Project	Jan 97	Dec 00	5,000,000
Italy				12.02% - 6,776,195
	Training for Trainers (CEI)	Jan 99	Jan 99	
	Training for Countries in Transition (CEI)	Apr 99		
	Sustainable Territorial and Participatory Integrated Approach from Emergency to Development in Macedonia			6,776,195
Japan				2.51% - 1,413,756
	Improvement of Education Process	May 97		15,000
	Technical Cooperation	Sept 95		1,034,146
	Scholarship Program	May 95		21,659

	Japanese Bilateral Aid	Apr 95		37,951
	Small Projects	May 96		265,000
	Modernisation and Delivery of Equipment for Primary Schools	Apr 97		40,000
Netherlands				9.31% - 5,250,000
	Transitional Programmes	Jan 97	Dec 00	350,000
	Education Rehabilitation Project	Jan 98	Dec 98	4,400,000
	Assessment of Examinations and Students	Jan 99	Dec 01	500,000
Sweden				0.12% 65,238
	Cross-ethnic Conflict Resolution Project	Jan 96		52,337
	Youth Education	Jan 96		12,900
	Peaceful Conflict Resolution Project	Jan 97	Jun 99	816,029
	Education Rehabilitation Project	Jun 98	Jan 00	1,092,896
Taiwan				11.7% - 6,600,000
	Establishment of Information System in High Schools	Oct 99	Apr 00	500,000
	Building New Schools			
	Reconstruction of Child Homes			
	Finance the Local Government for Various Infrastructures			
	Scholarship for Pupil * in Primary Schools	Sept 99	Sept 99	100,000
	Training of Professionals	Sept 99		6,000,000
UNICEF				14.3% 8,062,600
	Active Teaching – Interactive Learning	Sept 94	Jun 00	1,750,000
	Education of Children with Disabilities	Sept 95	Dec 03	274,500
	Early Childhood Care and Development Opportunities	Mar 97	Dec 03	1,405,000
	School Rehabilitation and Provision of Teaching and Learning Supplies to Schools and Kindergartners	Jan 93	Dec 00	1,327,500
	Support to the Education Process of Children Refugees	Jan 94	Dec 01	2,782,600

	Education for Healthy Lifestyles	May 96	Dec 03		358,800
	Support for Designing of Reformed and Innovations in Educational Policy	Jun 95	Dec 01		164,200
UK				0.2%	111,221
	Macedonia Vets Training	Jan 97	Sept 98		6,108
	Media Training	Oct 94	Jan 97		105,114
USA					
	Participant Training	Jan 93	Dec 01		
USAID				4.08% -	2,300,000
	Civic Education: Path to Civil Society	Sept 98	Sept 03		2,300,000

Source: Donor Assistance Data Base/European Integration Office (as provided by the World Bank/Skopje), 2000.