Guyana Education Access Project

Baseline Study

Paul Bennell
Ann Condy
Máiréad Dunne

May 1999

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The primary goal of the Guyana Education Access Project (GEAP) is to increase access to high quality secondary education in two impoverished regions of Guyana. The intention of the project is to establish a model that can be replicated on a national scale. The GEAP project memorandum clearly stipulates that a comprehensive baseline survey should be undertaken that will not only provide the basis for before- and after-project comparisons, but also can provide a valuable source of information for project monitoring.

This summary will provide an overview of the indicators developed by the GEAP Baseline study team as specified in their 'Terms of Reference' and in relation to the seven impact areas of the project framework. Further detail of these indicators, the data collected and some analysis may be found either in the main body of this report and / or within the relevant annexes.

Prior to the arrival of the consultant team (Dr Máiréad Dunne, Dr Paul Bennell and Dr Ann Condy) in Guyana, the terms of reference for the study were discussed with CfBT. Due to the contracted period allocated to this study it was agreed that the main objectives of the two week visit were to develop a set of baseline indicators and recommend how the required data should be collected and analysed. In the event, a very large proportion of the necessary baseline data was collected by the consultants during their two week visit. There remains some baseline data to be gathered and analysis of that which has already been collected. The discussions prior to arrival in Guyana, together with further consultations with local CfBT project staff in-country, redefined the terms of reference, reducing the breadth of the baseline from seven to five impact areas of the project framework. Indicators and / or data related to impact area 1, 'Improved School Infrastructure' and impact area 7, 'Strategy for Replication Established' were excluded from the baseline study.

The inclusion of training for local researchers was specified in both the 'scope of work' (1.1.3) and 'conduct of work'(1.1.4) of the terms of reference (See Annex 1). Apart from the community researchers in the two regions, there were no local researchers associated with the baseline study. We discussed with the Linden and Corriverton community researchers how they might best undertake pupil profile activities, and how they could develop action research activities with PTAs. We also provided some on-the-job training with the community researchers in Linden, where some of the researchers came to assist in the work in schools each day, followed by short sessions to discuss the working methodology. However, given the shortage of time available, it was agreed from the outset that training would have to become a subsidiary focus. The team of three consultants spent two weeks in Guyana in April 1999. Most of their time was spent visiting schools in the two project areas. As expected, a large part of the first week (in Corriverton) was spent working out which indicators to include in the baseline study and designing and piloting the survey instruments needed for data collection purposes. A considerable amount of data was, however, collected from the three project schools in Corriverton. During the team's second week in Linden, it was possible to spend a whole day in each of the four project schools and most of the recommended baseline information was collected.

2. BASELINE INDICATORS

A number of quantitative and qualitative indicators have been included in the baseline survey to provide a picture of the current situation and to allow measurement of the impact through the lifetime of the project. Indicators were selected to address impact in relation to:-

Access
Community Participation
School and Regional Management
Improved Teaching
Improved Learning

Table 1 below summarises the baseline indicators. As with the data in the baseline study, it is recommended that all the future data collections should, as far as possible, be disaggregated by gender.

2.1 Quantitative data

Each impact area has a set of quantitative indicators,

Access	Net enrolment rates, Transition rates, Enrolments, Drop outs, Socio-economic background.
Community Participation	PTA attendance, Money raised, Student report collection, Community use of school.
School and Regional Management	Management training days
Improved Teaching	Qualification and experience profiles Resignations Recruitment Qualification Upgrading Continuing Professional Development Absenteeism CXC results
Improved Student Learning	Examination results, Form 1 and CXC Attendance Repetition Class size

To a large extent this data is already being collected at the school or regional and national level. In the majority of these cases, where the quality can be assured the data should be gathered from these sources eg. School Annual Statistical Returns(ASR).

2.2 Qualitative data

Many of the quantitative indicators relate directly to an impact area whereas many of the qualitative indicators are cross cutting, producing data related to two or more impact areas. For example the teacher focus groups provide useful insights for four of the five of the impact areas ie. improvements in teaching, learning, management and community participation.

Using PRA style activities key stakeholder groups articulated and recorded their perceptions and views. Various students and teacher focus groups participated. These groups were, Form 2 students, Form 5 students, Senior teachers, Subject teachers (English, mathematics and science) and Unqualified teachers.

Employer interviews, Tracer surveys (2 year post-school Form 5s and Drop Outs), PTA Action Plans, Student Profiles and Systematic Classroom Observations complete the portfolio of qualitative baseline indicators for GEAP.

2.3 Control Schools

Two control schools selected from the Corriverton area will provide useful comparisons with the project schools. It is recommended that only a limited amount of quantitative data be gathered from these schools. This is mainly drawn from data already collected annually from the school by the regional office. In addition it is recommended that these schools are included in the baseline household survey framework and in the administration of the Form 1 socio-economic questionnaire.

3. DATA COLLECTION

Table 1 summarises the progress of the data collection, what remains to be collected for the baseline, data analysis status together with recommendations of the frequency of future data collection.

3.1 Outstanding baseline data collection

Development and piloting the indicators took place during the first week, this together with the limited time in the project schools has left Corriverton with some significant gaps in the baseline data. The following data needs to be collected and recorded,
<u>In Corriverton:</u>

- Access data (from the now available schools statistical returns)
- Drop out surveys
- Tracer surveys
- Form 2 prepared card exercise
- Form 1 socio-economic questionnaires
- Student profiles
- PTA action research
- Classroom observations

In Linden:

- Student profiles
- PTA action research
- Classroom observations

Before a comprehensive baseline study can be reported the above data needs to be collected. In addition the baseline house-hold survey also needs to be completed in both regions and in the control area. Together these form the basis against which project impacts may be measured.

3.2 Data Analysis

The outstanding baseline data once collected may be incorporated with the already collected and analysed data reported in Part II of the following report. There are also two large data sets that have been collected but have not been analysed as yet:

(i) the socio-economic background questionnaires for Forms 1 and 5 need to be coded, entered on a spreadsheet, and analysed using a suitable statistical software package (preferably SPSS);
(ii) The raw data from the Form 2 prepared card exercise has been coded for the four Linden schools, but it has only been possible to analyse the 'dislike a lot' responses.

3.3 Costing for outstanding data collection

The costs for the remaining baseline data collection has been estimated at
G$ 729 000. This includes student profiles, PTA action plans and classroom observations in both locations, as well as the drop-out tracer survey and Form 2 prepared card exercise in Corriverton.

4. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING AND IMPACT EVALUATION

4.1 Timing of Monitoring and Evaluation

After completion of the baseline data collection the next round should only take place at the end of 2001 followed in 2004 by a full impact evaluation. Some data, however, is easily accessible on an annual basis eg. ASR, and could provide a year on year up date on certain dimensions of the project impact. Table 1 summarises the recommended timing for monitoring and final impact evaluation.

4.2 Data Collection Responsibility

There are several groups who should share responsibility for the data collection. It is recommended that the project staff in each region should have the responsibility for the collection of the required M&E data, in particular, the annual quantitative data. At the same time counterparts and other appropriate central and regional MOE officers should be involved in the monitoring and evaluation process of the project.
Community researchers are another important resource although they clearly need some on-going training. They have an important potential contribution to make at the local community level through student profiles and PTA action plans.

The systematic observation of classrooms, centrally important data for M&E needs to be considered carefully as this must be done by experienced, legitimated professionals. There seems to be a rather limited local capacity. It is recommended that where appropriate the project staff, local counterparts, CPCE and UG accredited staff are engaged for the baseline, and that the same group take part in all subsequent periods of classroom observations.

Finally the overall responsibility for mid- and end of project monitoring and evaluation should be assigned to external consultants. The collection and analysis of all the recommended data is complex and external evaluators are obviously important in order to ensure maximum objectivity.Table 1: Summary of Baseline Indicators, Data Sources, Instruments and Status of Data Collection and Analysis

IMPACT AREA	PROJECT FRAMEWORK OVIs	BASELINE INDICATORS	DATA SOURCE / INSTRUMENT	DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS STATUS	MONITORING AND EVALUATION 2000-2004
2. Constraints to access reduced	2.1	Net enrolment rates	Baseline household survey	No	No	End of project
			SOLC/CBS/UNDP	By end May 1999	By end June	No
		Transition rates	PEIP database; school records	To obtain from MOE GT	No	End of project
	2.2	Enrolments	Annual statistical return (ASR)	Yes	To complete Corriverton	Annual up-date
		Drop-outs	ASR	Yes	Yes	Annual up-date
			School registers	No	No	End 2001 and end project
	2.3	Drop-out tracer survey	School registers	To complete-Corriverton	No	2001 and end project
	2.4	Socio-economic background	Form 1 intake questionnaire (50% sample)	To complete-Corriverton	No	Annual up-date
			Current Form 5 questionnaire (50% sample)	To do - SLP	No	Annual up-date
3. Greater community participation in schools	3.1	PTA attendance by gender	PTA attendance book	To do Corriverton	No	Annual up-date
		Money raised by PTAs	Minutes of PTA meetings /headteachers	No	No	Annual up-date
		Student term reports collected	Headteachers	No	No	Annual up-date
	3.2	Employer views (see All OVIs)	Interview employers	Some	Yes	End of project
	3.3	Community use of school facilities	School logbook/headteachers	No	No	Annual up-date
		PTA action plans	PTA survey by community researchers	No	No	End of project
4. Improved school and regional management	4.1	Number in training	Regional education office	No	No	Annual up-date
	4.2	Total days management training		No	No	Annual up-date
	4.3	Same as teacher and student				
	4.4	Improvement (see All OVIs)		Yes	Yes	End 2001 and end project

IMPACT AREA	PROJECT FRAMEWORK OVI's	BASELINE INDICATORS	DATA SOURCE / INSTRUMENT	DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS STATUS	MONITORING AND EVALUATION 2000-2004
5. Improved teaching	5.1	Classroom observations (see All	Observation and Evaluation Schedules	No	No	Now, 2001 and end of project
	5.2	Form 5 CXC examination results	CO instrument	No	No	Annual up-date
	5.3	Teacher qualification + experience	ASR	Yes	Yes	Annual up-date
		Teacher absences	Teacher attendance book	To do - SLP, SH, CW		Annual up-date
		Teacher resignations	ASR	Yes	Yes	Annual up-date
		Recruitment	CXC print out and headteachers	No	No	Annual up-date
	5.4	Qualification upgrading	Headteachers; CPCE, GUIDE	No	No	Annual up-date
	5.5	INSET/CPD	Headteachers	No	No	Annual up-date
		Teacher perceptions (see All OVIs)	Focus groups	Yes	Yes	End 2001 and end of project
6. Improved student learning	6.1	CXC English, maths, science and total	Headteachers-	To collect- Corriverton	Yes	Annual up-date
	6.2	Examination results incl. 1996-1998	CXC computer print-out	To collect - Corriverton	No	Annual up-date
		Repetition	ASR	To collect - Corriverton	Yes - Linden	Annual up-date
		Student Attendance Jan-Apr 1998	Headteachers			
			Monthly attendance returns to MOE	To collect - SLP, T, CW	Yes - SH, M, NS, LF	Annual up-date
	6.3	Form 1 examination results	Headteachers	To collect -Corriverton	Yes	Annual up-date
		Class size	ASR			
		Form 5 tracer survey	Tracer survey	Yes but needs revising	Yes	Annual up-date
		Employer survey (see All OVI's)	Employer interviews	Some	Yes	End of project
		Classroom observations	CO instrument	No	No	Now, 2001 and end of project
Qualitative data relates to all impact areas	All OVIs	Student profiles	Student interviews by community	No	No	Annual up-date
		Form 2 open-ended dislikes	Dislike ranking exercise	Yes	Yes	2001 and end of project
		Form 5 student dislike survey	Dislike ranking exercise	Yes	Yes	2001 and end of project
		Form 2 prepared card dislikes	Prepared card group exercise	To do Corriverton		2001 and end of project
		S. teacher and teacher perceptions	Focus groups	Yes	Yes	2001 and end of project
		Classroom observations	CO instrument	No	No	Now, 2001 and end of project
		Employer survey	Employer interviews	Some	Yes	End of project

ABBREVIATIONS

ASR	Annual Statistical Return
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CDS	Community Development Specialist
CHS	Community High School
CPCE	Cyril Potter College of Education
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CW	Christianburg Wismar, Linden
CXC	Caribbean Examinations Council
DFID	Department for International Development
EFM	Educational Field Manager
EOP	End of Project
GEAP	Guyana Education Access Project
GoG	Government of Guyana
GSS	General Secondary School
HIES	Household Income and Expenditure Survey
LF	Linden Foundation, Linden
M	Mackenzie, Linden
MOE	Ministry of Education, Guyana
MOF	Ministry of Finance, Georgetown, Guyana
NCERD	National Centre for Education Resources Development
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NS	New Silver City, Linden
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
PEIP	Primary Education Improvement Programme
PF	Project Framework
PS	Permanent Secretary
PT	Primary “Top” department of a primary school
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
REdO	Regional Education Officer
RExO	Regional Executive Officer
SDB	School Development Board
SEA	Senior Education Adviser
SH	Skeldon High, Corriverton
SIAC	School Improvement Advisory Committee
SIMAP	Social Impact Amelioration Programme
SIP	School Improvement Plan (IDA/GoG)
SLP	Skeldon Line Path, Corriverton
SOLC	Survey of Living Conditions
SSEE	Secondary School Entrance Examination
SSPE	Secondary School Proficiency Examination
SSRP	Secondary School Reform Project (IDA/GoG)
T	Tagore, Corriverton
TA	Technical Assistance
TCO	Technical Co-operation Office
TORs	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNICEF	United National Children’s Fund
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas (the UK volunteer organisation)

PART I

BASELINE INDICATORS AND FRAMEWORK

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 REPORT OBJECTIVES

The Guyana Education Access Project (GEAP) is a large and complex five year project which has as its overall goal the provision of good quality secondary education for all children in two regions in Guyana, Corriverton (Region 10) and Linden (Region 6). The detailed project framework sets out the project's objectives, inputs, activities and outputs. In addition, observable verifiable indicators have been clearly specified for all the projects key objectives.

A common failing of donor-funded education projects is that there is insufficient baseline information available that can be drawn upon at the end of the project in order to reach robust conclusions about project impacts in key areas. The GEAP project memorandum clearly stipulates therefore that a comprehensive baseline survey should be undertaken that will not only provide the basis for before- and after-project comparisons, but also can provide a valuable source of information for project monitoring.

The main purpose of this report is to: (i) identify a set of indicators which can be used to assess the performance of the project in five impact areas - access, community participation, school and regional management, teacher performance, and student learning. It was agreed that the two other key output areas specified in the project framework, namely improved infrastructure and project replication, should not be included in the baseline study; and (ii) present and, where appropriate, describe the baseline information that was collected and analysed in each of these five impact areas.

The terms of reference for the consultancy are reproduced in Annex 1.

1.2 PROGRAMME OF WORK

A team of three consultants, Dr Máiréad Dunne (educationalist and team leader), Dr Paul Bennell (economist) and Dr Ann Condy (sociologist) spent two weeks in Guyana in April 1999. Most of their time was spent visiting schools in the two project areas Annex 2 gives details of their itinerary. Prior to our arrival in Guyana, we had discussed the terms of reference for the study with CfBT and it was agreed that the main objective of the two week visit was to develop a set of baseline indicators and recommend how the required data should be collected and analysed. CfBT's project document indicates that a total of three months will be required in to complete the baseline study. In the event, a very large proportion of the necessary baseline data was collected by the consultants during their two week visit, although they are still some gaps that need to be plugged and there was not enough time to analyse all the data that was collected.

As expected, a large part of the first week (in Corriverton) was spent working out which indicators to include in the baseline study and designing and piloting the survey instruments needed for data collection purposes. A considerable amount of data was, however, collected from the three project schools in Corriverton. During the team's second week in Linden, it was possible to spend a whole day in each of the four project schools and most of the recommended baseline information was collected.

1.3 REPORT STRUCTURE

The report is divided into two parts. Part One focuses on the specification of indicators (Chapter 2), survey methodology (Chapter 3), data collection (Chapter 4), and the institutional framework for subsequent monitoring and evaluation activities (Chapter 5). Although not part of the terms of reference, we were also asked to comment on the project OVIs (Chapter 6). The second part of the report presents the data that has been collected for each of the main impact areas (Chapter 7). The main survey instruments and the actual data that was collected from the project schools and elsewhere is presented separately in annexes.

1.4 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank the many individuals who assisted during our visit. We are especially grateful to the headteachers, teachers and students at the seven project schools for their excellent co-operation. We acknowledge the assistance of the CfBT project managers, Helen O'Reilly, Paul Worral and Ed Denham, other project personnel in the two regions, officials from a range of GoG departments in Georgetown, Corriverton and Linden and Desmond Bermingham of DFID.

2. BASELINE INDICATORS

This chapter describes the main performance indicators that should be included in the baseline survey. Most indicators relate to only one impact area and for this reason each impact area is dealt with separately. However, some baseline information cuts across a number of impact areas.

The recommended baseline information should be collected for all the seven existing project schools as well as the three new schools that are to be constructed as part of GEAP. The numbers of students in primary-tops classes are expected to decline rapidly as the enrolment capacities of the secondary schools in Corriverton and Linden increase over the next two-three years. There seems little point therefore including the primary-tops schools in the baseline survey. A considerable amount of detailed information on primary-tops has also already been collected by the Primary Education Improvement Project. This should be adequate for GEAP evaluation purposes.

Conventional impact evaluations and accompanying baseline surveys tend to focus on the collection of mainly quantitative performance indicators relating to student access, and teacher and student performance. While we recommend that this data is fully incorporated into the GEAP baseline survey, it is also important to have more qualitative information that is based mainly on the views and perceptions of the main project stakeholders, especially managers, teachers, students, parents and the community at large. How these views change during the course of the project is just as an important source of information about project impacts as more conventional performance indicators.

2.1 ACCESS

The baseline survey should have the following gender-disaggregated access indicators for all project schools as well as a control group of schools (see Chapter 3): net enrolment rates and transition rates from primary to secondary schools in the two catchment areas, enrolments and drop-outs for each form in project schools, and information on socio-economic background of selected groups of students.

2.1.1 Net enrolment rates (NER)

The secondary school net enrolment rate is the number of children attending secondary school in main age cohort (12-16) expressed as a percentage of the total population of this age cohort. Obtaining accurate NERs for each of the two project catchment areas at the beginning and end of the project is therefore a key indicator of improved access.

2.1.2 Transition rates

A key related indicator is the percentage of children who complete primary school who then go on to secondary school (i.e. excluding primary tops). These transition rates should be obtained for each primary school in the project catchment areas as well as the control group in order to analyse how access to secondary education has changed, particularly for children from primary schools which have in the past only had low transition rates.

2.1.3 Enrolments

Increased enrolments are an explicit OVI of the project although they are not gender disaggregated. This data can be readily obtained from the schools.

2.1.4 Drop-outs

Ensuring that children who gain access to secondary schools complete the full five year secondary cycle is a key access indicator. Drop-out rates are the standard measure of student persistence. In addition, it is important to have information on the socio-economic background of students who drop-out and what they do after they have left school.

2.1.5 Socio-economic background

Given the project's overall goal of improving access to secondary education, particularly for students from disadvantaged households, the baseline survey must collect detailed and accurate information on the socio-economic background of students currently enrolled at the project and control schools.

2.2 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

2.2.1 Attendance at PTA meetings

There is a statutory requirement that schools hold a PTA meeting for all parents once a month during the academic year. The frequency of these meetings is not therefore a useful indicator of parental interest and overall community participation. However, PTA meetings for specific year groups are not compulsory and could be a useful indicator. The main PTA indicator that is recommended for the baseline survey is average monthly attendance of parents (gender disaggregated) at statutory meetings during the last full academic year (1997/98) expressed as a percentage of total student enrolment.

2.2.2 Fundraising by PTAs

One of the main functions of PTAs is to raise funds for school improvements. The amount of money raised during 1997/98, is therefore a potentially useful indicator of the level of activity and overall effectiveness of PTAs at the project schools. However, in some schools, it is clear that PTA fund-raising activities discourage parents from attending meetings. Moreover, as the PTAs at the project schools are encouraged to take on other roles and ensure broader community participation, it may be that fund-raising will become less important. A more useful indicator might be whether money raised by PTAs is used to address needs identified by PTAs. For the purposes of the baseline study, however, we recommend that information on fundraising is collected.

2.2.3 Collection of student term reports

In Linden, parents are requested to collect end-of-term reports from the schools. The proportion who did so during 1997/98 is a useful indicator of parental interest in their children's education. It needs to be established whether schools in Corriverton adopt the same practice.

2.2.4 Community use of schools

Community use of schools in one indicator of community involvement in schools, but it should be viewed in a broader perspective. More specifically, it is important to know not only how each school supports community events and other activities, but also how it is itself supported by particular community groups. This in turn will influence decisions about which groups the school might wish to encourage to use its facilities. At one school in Linden, for example, the headteacher wanted to reverse an earlier decision to allow political parties to use the school premises.

2.2.5 Employer views

An important indicator of the community relationship with schools centres upon the local employers perceptions of the relevance and quality of student learning outcomes to their business. (See **2.5.7**)

2.2.6 PTA action plans

PTAs are the first entry point for initiatives to increase and enhance better school-community relations. It is therefore recommended that the project (community researchers principally) develop a programme of activities to support the development of PTAs, which could feed into the development of an action plan. The main steps in this work would involve supporting PTAs to engage in the following:

- To identify main problems in schools and propose strategy/action to address the problems
- To develop and operationalise a strategy to encourage greater community participation in schools
- To develop rationale for school-employer relations and develop links with employers.

2.2.7 Indicators identified by PTA members

To encourage greater ownership and partnership, it is recommended that PTA members themselves identify a small number of key indicators which they consider could enable effective monitoring and evaluation of project objectives. It is suggested that these indicators are linked to PTA action plans in each school.

2.3 SCHOOL AND REGIONAL MANAGEMENT

2.3.1 Management training days

The extent and quality of in-service training is a key indicator of efforts to improvements management. Data should be collected on an annual basis on the number of workshops/training sessions attended by Regional education officers, supervisors, head teachers and senior teachers and the total number of person days of training undertaken. As with the other indicators this data should be disaggregated by gender.

2.3.2 Other indicators

Many of the proposed access, teacher and student performance indicators are likely to be influenced by improvements in regional and school management (in particular, teacher absenteeism, student attendance and drop-out, examination performance and PTA attendance and fund raising).

2.4 TEACHER PERFORMANCE

2.4.1 Qualification and work experience profiles of teachers

Percentage breakdowns of teachers in each project school during 1997/98 by experience cohort (five year intervals) and main academic and professional qualification levels are key indicators of teacher quality at the start of the project.

2.4.2 Teacher resignations

High teacher attrition seriously undermines the development of a well-qualified and experienced cadre of teachers. The percentage of teachers resigning in each of the main qualification categories in 1996/97 and 1997/98 has been used as the key indicator of teacher attrition for the baseline survey.

2.4.3. Teacher recruitment

Better access to secondary education in the project catchment areas will necessitate the recruitment of additional teachers. Project schools may also attract better qualified and experienced teachers in the future. Details of these newly recruited teachers should be added to the teacher database (see Chapter 3).

2.4.4 Qualification upgrading

Given the very high proportion of professionally untrained teachers at the project schools, it is crucial that they are upgraded as quickly as possible. The percentage of eligible, untrained teachers who were enrolled on QTS courses run by the Cyril Potter College of Education (CPCE) in Linden and Rose Hall is recommended as the main indicator for qualification upgrading. In addition, the percentage of teachers who are not yet eligible for these courses and are enrolled on the pre-qualification courses offered by the GUIDE project could also be included.

2.4.5 Continuing professional development

The extent and quality of in-service training (both school and outreach centre-based) is a key indicator of efforts to improve teaching quality. Data should be collected on an annual basis on the number of workshops/training sessions attended and total number of person days of training undertaken.

2.4.6 Teacher absenteeism

Teacher absenteeism is a useful indicator of teacher commitment/motivation. The total number of days absent due to sickness and 'urgent private affairs' in 1997/98 is the appropriate baseline measure. Teacher lateness is also recorded but, since it is not a major problem at most project schools, it has not been included as an indicator.

2.4.7 CXC results

The CXC results of Form 5 (Year 11) teachers who remain at their schools for the duration of the project provides some indication of changes in their performance as teachers over time. There is clearly an issue here about the extent to which better examination results are a reliable indicator of improved teaching. In particular, it is difficult to disentangle improvements in Form 5 teachers with changes in teacher performance in Forms 1 to 4. All other factors that influence student examination performance also have to be taken into account. Furthermore, as access to project schools is increased and the ability range of students will inevitably increase with the result that CXC examination results taken as a whole may not improve significantly.. Therefore, while CXC results for 1998 have been included as a baseline indicator, their use as an indicator of teacher and overall school performance must be treated with caution and qualification.

2.4.8 Staff appraisals

Annual and in some project schools, monthly teacher appraisals are undertaken.. However, the information provided is widely regarded as being a poor indicator of teacher performance and has not therefore been incorporated in the baseline survey.

2.4.9 Classroom observation

The most important information on teacher performance must be obtained from systematic classroom observation of groups of school teachers during the course of the project. There should also be follow-up interviews with observed teachers. As yet there has been no baseline data collected. This should be done as soon as possible, and the same teachers should be observed again in 2001 and at the end of the project.

The classroom observation should collect the following information:

◊ **Lesson development**: lesson structure (introduction, series of activities, lesson closure), indications of teacher planning and development into next lesson.
◊ **Teaching style**: differentiation /adaptability for all student learning, variety within and between lessons, student participation: peer co-operation, active response, involvement in discussion, assessment strategies.
◊ **Communication**: teacher talk, distribution and use of questioning (i.e. not just recall or rote responses required), discipline strategies.
◊ **Classroom organisation**: Group/individual/whole class work, organisation of practical work
◊ **Use of resources**: Teaching aids, resources in the lesson, classroom wall display

The teacher evaluation interview should cover the following areas:

◊ Lesson preparation,
◊ Rationale for the teaching approach used in the lesson
◊ Students responses to the lesson, quality of student work, levels of understanding
◊ Use of assessment strategies
◊ Evaluation of the lesson
◊ Developments for the next lesson

Examples of possible observation and interview schedules are available in Annex 3. This includes the observation instruments currently used by CPCE resource persons and the one specifically designed for project schools in Corriverton.

2.4.10 Teacher perceptions/views on teacher quality.

The baseline survey should include information on the perceptions of managers, teachers and students on current teaching performance and behaviour at each of the project schools. Suggestions from managers and teachers on how teacher effectiveness could be improved should also be obtained.

2.5 STUDENT LEARNING

2.5.1 Form 1 end-of-year examination results 1997/98

The end-of-year examination results for Form 1 students at project and control schools in 1997/98 is an important baseline indicator of student performance. The examination results of this same group of students should be monitored as they progress through Forms 2, 3 and 4. This will allow an assessment to be made of changes in the achievement levels of all students, including ‘slower learners’.

2.5.2 CXC examination results 1996-1998

CXC examination results for English, mathematics, science and overall subject performance by gender and grade (I to VI) should be collected for each project school for the three year period immediately prior to the start of the project i.e. 1996, 1997 and 1998.

2.5.3 Student attendance

Student attendance is a good indicator of student commitment and motivation which, in turn, is positively related to student performance. The baseline survey includes therefore the percentage attendance figures for boys and girls by form at each project school during the second term 1997/98. Attendance during the second term tends to lower than during the first and third terms.

2.5.4 Repetition

Promotion is automatic in Corriverton schools so repetition is minimal. In Linden, on the other hand, promotion is dependent on satisfactory performance in end of year examinations. Consequently, the repetition rate disaggregated by form and gender is a important indicator of student performance and should be collected for all project and control schools.

2.5.5 Class size

Increased access and enrolments could lead to increased class sizes which could negatively impact on student learning. Class size by form level needs, therefore, to be carefully monitored at the project and control schools.

2.5.6 Senior teacher and teacher perceptions/views on student learning.

The views of headteachers, heads of department and subject teachers concerning student performance at project schools should be sought in a systematic fashion.

2.5.7 Employer views on Form 5 school leavers

Wage employment in large-medium scale enterprises is confined to the Guyana Sugar Company (GUYSUCO) in Corriverton and Linmine in Linden. The views of senior managers on the overall quality of school leavers employed by these two major employers in recent years should be obtained along with any comments they may have on the relevance of the curriculum.

2.5.8 Classroom observations

The systematic collection of classroom observations will enable broad assessments to be made about changes in the quality of learning by students at the project schools. (see **2.4.8**)

2.5.9 Form 5 tracer surveys

Tracer information on the current economic activity of former students constitutes a more indirect indicator of both access and, to a lesser extent, improved student learning. It is, however, an indicator which needs to be treated with some caution because the employment opportunities available to students who complete secondary school depend on a number of factors in addition to how successfully they do in their final examinations. This is particularly true in Linden, where the main employer, Linmine, has not been taking on new employees since 1994. It is also not clear to what extent parental decisions about the opportunity costs of sending their children to secondary school are influenced by knowledge (if they had it) of an increase or decrease in employment opportunities at the end of schooling.

2.5.10 Student Profiles

Although as yet this data has not been collected systematically, another source of information about the project impact is to be traced using student profiles. (See **3.2.4**)

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses how the recommended baseline data should be collected. Table 1 lists all the impact indicators as well as the survey instruments and other activities that should be used to collect the data that is required for each indicator. The first part of the chapter describes how the quantitative data should be collected while the second part focuses on qualitative data collection.

3.1 QUANTITATIVE DATA

3.1.1 Access indicators

School-based information: Data on school and subject enrolments can be readily extracted from each school's Annual Statistical Return to the MOE Planning Department in Georgetown. Each return also contains a form on drop-outs, but the accuracy of this information needs to be checked carefully. This should be done by comparing the names of students on the 1997/98 class registers with the appropriate class in 1998/99 (e.g. Form 1s in 1997/98 with Form 2s in 1998/99, Form 2s with Form 3s, etc). A list of the names of the students who longer appear on any register in 1998/99 should then be compiled. Teacher and students respondents should be requested to confirm that these students have indeed completely dropped-out of school and to provide any information they have about each individual's whereabouts and work and other activities.

Individual data on the socio-economic background of the current (1998/99) Form 1 students should be collected using a simple one-page instrument (see Annex 4). Since the intention is to track the performance of these students as they progress through each project school during the next five years, it is important that the name of each student respondent is requested. Along with father and mother's occupations and highest level of education attained, the questionnaire also has questions on last primary school attended, distance to school, size of family and household membership.

A Cumulative Record Form for secondary school students has recently been designed by the Assistant Chief Education Officer Secondary and her colleagues and, assuming that donor funding is forthcoming, will be introduced in the 1999/2000 academic year. However, it only requests information on father and mother's occupation and is, therefore, not adequate.

The current (1998/99) Form 5 students should also complete the same socio-economic background questionnaire. The socio-economic profile of these students can then be compared with that of Form 5 students at the end of the project in 2004 in order to assess the extent to which increased access has resulted in more students from disadvantaged households to attend school.

Data from this baseline Form 1 questionnaire is a core component of the Student Database for the project. The other data that should be collected for each individual are end of year examination results for English, maths, science and overall mark for all subjects, CXC results in 2003/04, and progression (promotion/repetition). See Annex 5 for the student database fields.

Baseline Household Survey: Data collection for the UNDP-funded Survey of Living

Conditions (SOLC) is nearing completion and preliminary data analysis is expected to be completed by the end of June. The survey seeks detailed and comprehensive information on all household members (including their educational status), and household income, expenditure, consumption and assets. The survey instrument is 40 pages long and takes 2-3 hours complete. Only 10 households per enumeration district have been selected, making a total of 2100 households in all. Corriverton has six EDs and Linden has twelve. Consequently, too few households in the project catchment areas have been sampled in order for it to be possible to undertake a statistically robust analysis of the educational profile of all household members, and especially children of school age.

It is recommended, therefore, that a 10 percent household survey of all households in the Corriverton, Linden and Rose Hall (control) catchment areas is undertaken as soon as possible. The main objective of the survey is to obtain information on the education and occupation profiles of all household members and basic data on household income and assets. Expert assistance will be needed in designing the survey instrument. The sample frame from the national household income and expenditure survey should be utilised in order to select the sample population in each enumeration district. Permission has been given by UNDP and the Central Bureau of Statistics to do this.

The Community Research Teams should be employed to carry out the BHS. Two-three days training periods by CBS personnel will be required. Current rates of remuneration ($20,000 basic but $10,000 travel and subsistence) are adequate. In addition, there are three (two in Linden and one in Corriverton) SOLC enumerators who should be available.

The questionnaire for the Baseline Household Survey should take no more than 25-30 minutes administer to each household. Each enumerator should be able therefore to complete at least six households per day. Estimates of the time inputs and total costs for each catchment area are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Baseline Household Survey - Sample Size and Resource Commitments

Area	Number of Households	10% Sample	Interviews/ Day	Researcher/ Days	Training Days etc.	Total Days	Cost @ $30,000 per person month*
Corriverton	8000	800	6	133	5	138	207,000
Linden	6000	600	6	100	5	105	157,500
Rose Hall	6000?	600	6	100	-	100	150,000
Total	20,000	2000	10	333	10	243	514,500

* 1 person month = 20 working days

PEIP database: The recently compiled Primary Education Improvement Programme data base should be utilised as much as possible. In particular, it contains information on primary enrolments and SSEE pass rates that enable school-specific transition rates to be calculated.

3.1.2 Community participation

PTA attendance data can be extracted from the PTA Attendance Book kept by each school and the minutes of PTA meetings should also be scrutinised. Headteachers should be able to provide information on the numbers of student term reports not collected in 1997/98. If this information cannot be obtained, then 1998/99 data should be used.

3.1.3 Improved management

There are no straightforward quantitative indicators for measuring changes in management performance. Improved management will impact on all teacher and student performance indicators, but attributing, with any degree of confidence, the specific role of management is very difficult. In school effectiveness studies with large number of schools, it is possible to identify the role of school management by using various dummy variables, but this is clearly not possible when there are only a small number of schools. Ideally, periodic assessments (including rankings) of the overall management performance of project and non-project headteachers in each region could be made. However, there are no comparable non-project secondary schools in Region 10, Linden.

3.1.4 Improved teaching

Teacher database: A teacher baseline and monitoring database needs to be assembled. The main data fields for this teacher database are presented in Annex 6. For every teacher in the project and control schools, information should be inputted on gender, post, professional and academic qualifications, years of (untrained and trained) teaching experience, main subject taught, number of days absent, qualification upgrading, continuing professional development, and CXC examination results (for Form 5 teachers). Qualification upgrading and continuing professional development and form -specific CXC results will need to be obtained from school records. All the other information can be extracted from the Annual Statistical Return. Schools generally keep good records of teacher absences (by half day session).

A good start has been made in assembling the teacher data base. All relevant information contained in the annual statistical record for each project school has already been inputted as well as information from school on teacher absences (see Annex 7).

Classroom observations: It is essential that classroom observations are undertaken by respected and competent professionals. The difficulties of low local capacity in the project regions means that appropriate project personnel, regional project managers, VSO volunteers, CPCE tutors or University of Guyana lecturers would need to be involved in a systematic programme of visits. The reports of these observers would need to be collated and could also be used in the construction of professional development programmes, in the subject department school or region.

The conduct of the observation, feedback to the teacher, department and head are all important in maximising the positive outcomes of what could be presented in an inspectorial way. Nevertheless for the baseline and future M&E, this data is important. Valuable quantitative data about the conditions and quality of teaching and learning may be extracted from the observation data. Issues related to the tone of the classroom observation programme depend on the extent and capacity to utilise this as formative and developmental information in ways consistent with enhancing the levels of professionalism of the teaching staff in the two project regions.

3.1.5 Improved student learning

Examination results: End of year examination results and CXC results (computer printouts from CXC) can be readily obtained from most schools. Student attendance figures are summarised for MOE head office in monthly returns from each school. The Annual Statistical Return contains information on the number of repeaters by form and gender.

Post-school outcomes: A tracer survey was conducted in all the project school with respect to all Form 5 students who left school in July 1997. The two year gap was intended to allow a minimum period for school leavers to have searched for employment or settled into further education or marriage. It was hoped that teachers and the current fifth year students would remember the ex-students on the tracer list and be able to provide information about their current whereabouts and economic activity. However, the time limit of two years unfortunately underestimates our understanding of the longer term economic activities, particularly where students move into more professional-type activities, for which several additional years of study will be necessary. Information about the whereabouts of former students was, as far as possible, cross checked with teachers and fifth year students. Some schools were able to provide us with less detailed information than others. When this exercise is repeated, we would suggest that a little more time is spent exhausting every possible source of information on the former students (due to constraints on our time, this exercise was carried out in a fairly hurried way in between other more demanding exercises).

3.2 QUALITATIVE DATA

Most of the qualitative baseline data comes from individual and group responses of school managers, teachers and students. Unstructured participatory action research techniques have been used to obtain these information. Given that most questions are open-ended, the information that has been obtained can cover all five impact areas. This type of approach provides a more holistic view of project impact from the perspectives of different stakeholders.

3.2.1 Headteachers

In our visits to schools, we discussed the objectives of the baseline survey with headteachers and sought their advice on what data should be collected. In addition to organising meetings with teachers and students, headteachers were an important source of information on a variety of issues including the role of the regional education office, PTAs and community use of schools, teacher quality and student learning.

3.2.2 Senior Teachers

Small group activity. Focus group discussions were held with groups of senior teachers (these groups included heads of subject department and senior teachers with other management responsibilities) in each project school. They were asked to identify what needs to be done in order to improve significantly CXC examination results in their respective departments. This was a two phased activity with a brainstorming exercise followed by a ranking exercise agreed within their groups. From a long list produced by small group brainstorming, the groups were asked to agree their first 5 priority issues. These were reported back to the other groups in the final plenary session.

In Corriverton, this question was posed in general terms to each group. However, in Linden schools (with the exception of Mackenzie), each group was asked to answer this question first in their capacity as managers within the school and secondly as individual teachers who are managed by others (i.e. the headteachers and managers in the regional office)..

It is anticipated that the classroom observations (see **3.2.3**) will include the HoDs and provide another source of qualitative data about their work as classroom teachers and in their role as part of the school management..

3.2.3 Teachers

Small group activity A similar exercise was carried out with groups of English, mathematics and science teachers as well as group of untrained / unqualified teachers. As with the senior teachers the question about how they might improve their CXC results was posed. This generated important baseline data that related either directly or indirectly to all the project impact areas, ie. management, school ethos, teacher quality and student learning.

Classroom observation: There was only enough time to observe one or two teachers in each of the project schools. It will be necessary therefore to organise a proper programme of classroom observations during the lifetime of the project. This will provide vital baseline, monitoring and evaluation data on teacher performance. It will also be useful in assessing the training needs of teachers.

It is recommended that observation visits are made separately to the English, maths and science departments in each project school over a two day period each. This would provide high quality data about the teacher quality, teaching and learning, the classroom atmosphere as well as department and school infrastructure. There are already some observation protocols used by the teacher training providers for observing trainees (see Annex 3). The exact prototype is best decided by the project management and/or teams of observers once the criteria for high quality teaching intended by this project and consistent with other curriculum initiatives e.g. SSRP have been delineated. To maximise the utility of the observation data, alongside the time inside the classroom, there should also be a period of consultation with the teacher about the lesson observed. This can provide insights into the ways in which teachers conceptualise, plan and implement their lesson (See Annex 3 for an example of a teacher evaluation interview protocol).

The conduct of the observation, feedback to the teacher, department and head are all

important in maximising the positive outcomes of what could be perceived as inspection. The approach and tenor of the classroom observation programme should exemplify the degree of professionalism and collegial respect that characterise high quality education provision. Nevertheless, for the baseline survey and for monitoring and evaluation in the future, this data is critically important. The approach needs to be discussed with the team of observers and will depend on the extent and capacity to utilise this as formative and developmental information in ways consistent with enhancing the levels of professionalism in the teaching staff in the two project regions.

3.2.4. Students

Two types of group exercises were undertaken with groups of Form 2 and Form 5 students in the project schools.

Open-ended ranking exercise. In Corriverton, groups of students were asked to identify what they most liked and disliked about school and then rank the five most important likes and dislikes. They were also asked for their suggestions about how learning could be improved. However, most student groups found it very difficult to identify what they specifically liked about their school. In the Linden project schools, therefore, students were only asked to things they disliked about school.

Prepared card ranking exercise. This was conducted with groups of 40-70 Form 2 students in the project schools in Linden.

The main steps in this exercise are as follows:

1. Students are asked individually to think for one minute about the two things they most like about school. This is followed by a short, whole-class discussion.

2. Students are then divided into separate male and female groups of 6-7 students each. They are asked to discuss and try to agree as a group their five greatest dislikes about school/schooling and then rank.

3. 27 pre-written ‘dislike’ cards plus 2/3 blank cards are distributed to each group. One person in each group is assigned as ‘chairperson’. He/she holds up in card in turn and the groups discusses and decides whether: no problem, dislike a lot, dislike, dislike a little. Cards placed on appropriate piles.

4. Each group asked to rank top three from ‘dislike a lot ‘pile and indicate accordingly.

5. Finally, each group is asked to identify any other dislikes not so far identified and rate them.

Student profiles. Selected students from the project schools in each region will be identified and tracked for the duration of the project. The community researchers will each contact and interview approximately eight current Form 1 and 2 students from each project school. These interviews will take place outside the school context in the students' home. They will be repeated with the same researcher and student every year for the next five years in order to get their perceptions/views on 'what has changed at school?. Equal numbers of boys and girls will be selected for these profiles. The community researchers have been asked to include any new entrants to the secondary schools from primary-tops schools. All these transferring students should be included unless the numbers become too large in which case a sample will be selected.

The research objectives and methodology have already been discussed with researchers in Corriverton who agreed with our suggested revisions to their original student profile instrument and sample. Further training, particularly in interview techniques, is recommended for the community researchers. Issues related to the recording of the data during and after the interview also need to be addressed.

3.2.5 Community participation

The project has begun to address the issue of community involvement in schools. Community researchers had conducted some semi- and unstructured interviews with a number of families in Corriverton and Linden. These had focused upon socio-economic characteristics and participatory definitions of poverty. In both project sites, the consultants met with the project community researchers, and in Linden with the VSO Community Development Specialist. In both cases we discussed their research work and training to date, and how any future research could feed into the baseline and subsequent monitoring and evaluation of the project.

The consultants' overall evaluation of the earlier research activities was that these exercises had provided important research training for the researchers, and provided useful background (socio-economic and historic) information in the project areas. However, in terms of baseline data, the research activities have focused exclusively on the community whereas it is the school-community interaction which needs to be studied and developed further. It was therefore proposed that a useful entry point for the community researchers could be to start working with PTAs, since this involves drawing upon an institutional structure whose purpose currently is, to a more limited extent, to establish the school-community link.

The team of consultants had the opportunity to attend one PTA meeting of a primary school in Corriverton (No. 56 school). Given the short length of time spent in both project areas, it proved impossible to attend any of the (normally) monthly PTA meetings at the seven project schools. The consultants discussed with the community researchers in Linden the possibility of undertaking of working with the PTAs at the project PTAs in order to gather core baseline information, and help develop the both the commitment and capacity PTAs to achieve wider community-school link objectives.

Key areas for discussion and development with PTAs could be:

- ◊ What is the role of each PTA? How often are PTA meetings held? (is the statutory monthly requirement observed?); Who attends? Who does not attend, and why? What activities do the PTAs engage in (e.g. fund-raising, other)?

- ◊ What are the main problems that parents and teachers identify in their schools? Obtain the different perspectives of teachers and parents. Analyse the problems identified by category (for instance, management issues, financial resource issues) and identify who (parents, teachers, regional education office, broader community, combination of these) and what resources might be required to address the problems.

- ◊ What are the strengths of the school, and how might the PTA try to enhance these? This might be carried out, together with 2 above, as a SWOT exercise (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats).

- ◊ How might the PTA role be enhanced to encourage greater community involvement in schools (including greater community use of schools and involvement in management and school-community links)? A first step might involve the PTA promoting discussion of the purpose of education; disseminating information and encouraging broader discussion of how the schools are aiming to improve teaching, learning outcomes etc; and becoming informed about other community organisations through, for instance, inviting representatives to address PTA meetings. A second step might involve drawing up an action plan (or school improvement plan).

Before undertaking these activities, the following points need to be considered:

- ◊ All community researchers need further training before embarking on activities with PTAs. We suggest that they receive training in research processes (a focus on translating concepts into measures, rather than the use of methodological tools, for which they have already received some instruction) and communication and facilitation skills and techniques. Could the University of Guyana provide some of this training? We gather that there may not be any NGOs in country with these sorts of training skills. The VSO in community development in Linden may need to play a role in training of researchers from the two areas.

- ◊ The community researchers have different levels of skills and confidence, which need to be taken into account; these differences could be to some extent minimised through encouraging them to work in small groups.

- ◊ Project field managers, with support from the VSO in community development, need to consider very carefully how to approach PTAs in order to introduce the community researcher teams (This may be a little sensitive, in particular because teachers may not ‘recognise’ the researchers).

3.3 CONTROL SCHOOLS

Ideally, a control group of schools should be selected in each region so that schooling outcomes in project and non-project schools can be compared. In Corriverton, there are 14 secondary schools from which to select a control group of three schools. After consulting the Regional Education Officer and the secondary school supervisor, it was agreed that the following three schools in Rose Hall should be selected: Corentyne Comprehensive, Lower Corentyne, and J. C. Chandisingh. These schools are in the same catchment area and have similar SSEE cut off entry points as the three project schools (340-390) and thus have similar quality of student intakes.

There are only two other secondary schools in Region 6. Neither are suitable for comparative/control purposes, mainly because they are mainly attended by Amer-Indian children who have special learning needs. It would be possible to select four similar schools to the project schools in Linden in other regions, but we did not have enough time to pursue this option.

We recommend that only a limited amount of quantitative baseline data should be collected from the control schools (see Annex 8) and that no teacher and student interviews should be undertaken. Much of this data can be obtained from Annual Statistical Returns, but other data will probably have to be collected from the schools themselves (in particular CXC results, student and teacher attendance). Current Form 1 students should complete the socio-economic background questionnaire (although this could be done anonymously).
Furthermore, baseline data on community-school links should not be gathered from the control schools. The contextual specificity of each school makes each community (including its business community) very different and the data required for baseline and subsequent monitoring involves considerable interaction with schools, PTAs and local community organisations. Such interaction could raise expectations of support and resources for the control schools, which would not be realised.

4. DATA COLLECTION

4.1 PROGRESS TO DATE

Table 1 summarises what data was collected by the consultants with respect to each baseline indicator, what has been processed and what data remains to be collected. Corriverton schools still have a number of gaps, this results mainly from the limited time we could spend in the schools, two days in the three project secondary schools, but also that the development and selection of the specific indicators and survey instruments took place whilst in Corriverton.

There are two large data sets that have been collected but have not been analysed:
(i) the socio-economic background questionnaires for Forms 1 and 5 need to be coded, entered on a spreadsheet, and analysed using a suitable statistical software package (preferably SPSS);
(ii) The raw data from the Form 2 prepared card exercise has been coded for the four Linden schools, but it has only been possible to analyse the 'dislike a lot' responses (see below).

4.2 OUTSTANDING BASELINE DATA

4.2.1 Access

Copies of the outstanding Annual Statistical Returns for schools in Corriverton
have now been obtained from the MOE Planning Department. It is possible therefore to extract the missing access for these schools (enrolments, drop-outs).

4.2.2 Classroom observations

A programme of classroom observations should be undertaken as a baseline indicator. Local CPCE lecturers are already heavily committed and will not therefore be able to undertake the classroom observations. However, the headteachers who are currently employed to supervise in-service teacher trainees could be used. There is a also a possibility that staff members of the Faculty of Education at the University of Guyana could be involved. Similarly existing project staff eg. VSOs could also have a role to play.

4.2.3 Drop-out surveys

Drop-out surveys were piloted at two schools in Corriverton (Skeldon High and Tagore). However, they need to re-done more carefully. If properly supervised, this would be an appropriate activity for the community researchers. All students who have dropped-out school since the beginning of the 1997/98 from schools should be identified and then their current whereabouts and work/activity details should be ascertained by asking key informants in the schools themselves (fellow students, class teachers) as well as the local community.

4.2.4 Tracer surveys

In some of the schools, a significant amount of data was missing and/or the information provided lacked precision (for instance, we were just given 'employed' rather than the nature of the student's employment). We have already informed the project field managers which school tracer surveys require some follow-up. However, we have provided tables on the tracer surveys in this report, based on the available information to date.

4.2.5 Form 2 prepared card exercise

This exercise was only designed at the end of the first week so it remains to be done in all three project schools in Corriverton. Properly supervised and with the agreement of headteachers, the community researchers could be given the responsibility for managing the data collection and analysis. One of the community researchers in Linden (Nigel Williamson) acted as a resource person for this exercise in all four schools and could, therefore, assist his colleagues in Corriverton.

4.2.6 Form 1 questionnaire

The Form 1 socio-economic background questionnaire has still to be administered in Corriverton

4.2.7 Student profiles

This activity is being undertaken by Corriverton community researchers. We have recommended that Linden undertake a similar exercise.

4.2.8 PTA Action Research

This exercise will both provide baseline data and feed into project activities in support of the Greater Community Participation in Schools impact area. The exercise was discussed with Linden community researchers. We have recommended that Corriverton undertake a similar exercise.

4.3 COSTINGS FOR OUTSTANDING DATA COLLECTION

4.3.1 Student profiles

In Corriverton, 56 students will be profiled across the three schools. Each researcher will be responsible for annual interviews with eight students between now and the end of the project. In Linden, 80 students should be sampled. Costings are based on one day per interview (which includes locating the student's home, conducting the interview, and writing-up as well as attendance at periodic meetings).

Community researchers are currently paid G$ 30,000 per month (G$20,000 basic and G$10,000 for travel and subsistence). The total annual cost for the student profiles is approximately G$200,000. Over the five years of the project, the total cost will be G$1.0 million (in constant 1999 prices).

4.3.2 PTA meetings to develop action research

It is proposed that the activities outlined in section 3.2.5 (excluding further work involved in supporting implementation, monitoring and evaluating subsequent PTA action plans or school improvement plans) would involve four meetings with PTAs in each of the seven schools. Teams of up to four community researchers should work with each PTA (in Corriverton, the research teams may need to be smaller since there are fewer community researchers and possibly less time available). Either the same team of four or different teams could work with each PTA. Each PTA meeting would constitute a day's work of the community researchers, and would include preparation, attending the PTA meeting, writing up notes and any project meetings related to this research activity.

Corriverton: 12 meetings x 4 researchers = 48 working days = 2.5 months = $ 75,000
Linden: 16 meetings x 4 researchers = 64 working days = 3.25 months = $ 98,000
Including other miscellaneous expenses, the total budget for the survey should be $200,000.

The project management team, with advice from the community development VSOs, will need to consider the further involvement and costings for community researchers' involvement in supporting implementation, monitoring and evaluating subsequent PTA action plans or school improvement plans.

Training for community researchers: one week to be provided by VSO Community Development Specialists. Funding for travel and subsistence budget will be required costs may be necessary if community researchers have travel to one of the two locations (project management team to provide these costings); alternatively, the VSO could give the training at different times separately in the two locations.

4.3.3 Classroom observations

Assuming two days for each (English, mathematics, science) at each of the seven project schools and that it will cost $5000 per day, then the total personnel cost of the classroom observations for the baseline survey will G$210,000 (Linden G$120,000 and Corriverton G$90,000). With travel and other contingencies, the total cost will be G$250,000.

4.3.4 Form 2 prepared card exercise in Corriverton

Two days for each school should be allowed for preparing and doing the exercise and processing the data collected (which is time-consuming). Total personnel for Corriverton researchers will be therefore G$9000 (six person days). Using Nigel Williamson as a resource person will cost approximately G$25,000 (six days honoraria, travel and subsistence). Total budget = G$34,000.

4.3.5 Drop-out tracer survey in Corriverton

Five days should be allowed for each school in order to collect names, trace them, and write a short report with a table. Two community researchers will be required. Total cost=G$45,000.

Table 3 summarises the total costs of collecting the outstanding baseline data, including the Baseline Household Survey.

Table 3: Summary Costs for Collection of Outstanding Data & Baseline Household Survey

Data to be collected	G$
Classroom observations	250,000
Student profiles	200,000
PTA survey	200,000
Form 5 drop-out survey - Corriverton	45,000
Form 2 prepared card exercise - Corriverton	34,000

5. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING AND IMPACT EVALUATION

The recommended data collection activities and timing for monitoring and a final impact evaluation are shown in Table 1. The rehabilitation of the project schools will take at least two years to complete so there is little point in undertaking another round of data collection until the end of 2001 followed by a full impact evaluation at end of project in 2004. It is important that schools are disrupted as little as possible.

Responsibility for collecting this data should be assigned as follows:

5.1 1 Project personnel (including VSOs)

Project staff should be responsible for collecting and processing all the quantitative data that is required on an annual basis (in particular from the Annual Statistical Returns, and attendance figures for teachers, students and at PTAs).

5.1.2 Central and regional MOE

It is important that the appropriate staff (especially secondary school supervisors) from the MOE's central and regional office are involved in the monitoring and evaluation process. In particular, this should help to develop a greater sense of project ownership.

5.1.3 Community researchers

The community researchers are an important resource. With appropriate training and supervision, they have the skills and commitment to undertake a range of monitoring and evaluation activities.

5.1.4 CPCE resource persons

Depending on the outcome of the baseline classroom observations, the same group of CPCE resource persons should be used for the mid and end of project observations.

5.1.5 External consultants

Overall responsibility for mid- and end of project monitoring and evaluation should be assigned to external consultants. The collection and analysis of all the recommended data is complex and external evaluators are obviously important in order to ensure maximum objectivity. The fairly intensive use of external consultants to monitor and evaluate the Andra Pradesh Primary Education Project provides useful lessons for other large and complicated projects such as GEAP.

6. PROJECT OVIs

6.1 CONSTRAINTS TO ACCESS

Enrolments: The OVI states that 'Government secondary school enrolment increases by 59 percent in target areas by Year 3'. Enrolment projections have been prepared by the project managers. These show that in order to achieve secondary education for all, enrolments at the project schools will have to increase by 94.6 percent by the end of the project in 2004/05 and will rise still further to 9513 (an increase of 145 percent over current enrolments) by 2010/2011 when projected enrolments are expected to level off.

Drop-out rates : The relevant OVIs state that 'secondary drop-out rates in target areas are reduced to 10 percent by Year 4' and 'improve retention rates for boys in Linden and girls in Corriverton' . Drop-out is reported to be already close to zero at the project schools in Linden (although gender imbalances worsen considerably in Forms 4 and 5). Drop-out rates for girls in Corriverton do not appear to be significantly higher than those for boys. As the ability range of students widens at each project school, drop-outs may in fact increase unless appropriate learning environments are created.

Transition and enrolment rates: In view of GEAP's overall objective of improving access, the inclusion of (explicit) OVIs for target transition/enrolment rates would be advisable.

6.2 GREATER COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOLS

With regard to school-employer links, the project may be limited in how much it can encourage these links. In Linden, Linmine is the main employer, but is in decline and has not been recruiting new employees since 1994 (see section 7.2 below).

6.3 IMPROVED EDUCATION MANAGEMENT

As pointed out in 2.3.2, the project has limited influence on a number of key factors which affect management, such as financing of regional education offices, incentive and sanctions, and information management systems.

The OVI 4.2 does not take into account the chronic funding situation at the regional level. This should be addressed in the risks/assumptions of the project framework. If further resources are not made available, the regional education offices will not be able to manage schools more effectively, so their increased capacity to manage may serve only a limited purpose. In Linden, for example, the regional office did not even have sufficient funds to pay the salaries of security guards in the schools.

6.4 IMPROVED TEACHING

Teacher absenteeism: The OVI states that ‘teacher absenteeism reduced by 50 percent by Year 2’. There seems little likelihood that the project will have impacted sufficiently on the schools after two year for this to be a realistic target.
Qualification upgrading: The OVI states that ’60 percent of unqualified teachers in target areas are undergoing in-service training by Year 2’. In Corriverton, this is unlikely to be attainable given the high transport costs and time commitment needed to attend classes in Rose Hall. The turnover of untrained teachers is high in Corriverton and teachers must serve a minimum of two years before they can enrol on the TTC course.

6.5 IMPROVED LEARNING

CXC passes: The OVI states that ‘absolute number of CXC passes increased by 25 percent by Year 5’. It is the very poor examination performance in English and maths that is of particular concern. A definition of a passing grade is needed.

PART II

BASELINE DATA ON KEY INDICATORS

7. BASELINE INDICATORS

7.1 CONSTRAINTS TO ACCESS

7.1.1 Transition rates, enrolments, and drop-outs

The available data on transition rates, enrolments and drop-outs is presented in Annex 9. Large disparities in female and male enrolments exist in all project schools, but are particularly marked at New Silver City (18.4% more girls than boys), Skeldon Line Path (12.5%), Skeldon High (11. 7%) and Christianburg Wismar (12.3 percent). Only at Mackenzie High School is this figure less than 5 percent (See Annex Table 9.6). The gender imbalance in enrolments increases progressively from Form 1 to 5 in Linden schools, but remains largely unchanged in Corriverton.

Drop-out rates are high at Skeldon Line Path and Skeldon High. They are particularly high in Form 4 for both girls and boys. Annual statistical returns from Linden schools report negligible drop-outs but, given increased gender enrolment imbalances in higher forms, this needs to be investigated further. In Linden, students are allowed to repeat twice. If they still are not promoted, then they are 'superannuated' (transferred to another school or leave altogether if they have already reached the school leaving age). The reasons for relatively high drop-outs in Corriverton requires further research. It has been suggested that girls are withdrawn from school when it becomes apparent that they will 'not do well' and many get married. Among boys, considerable income-earning opportunities induce many to leave school early.

7.1.2 Drop-out survey

The preliminary results of the drop-out survey in Corriverton are presented in Annex 10.

7.1.3 Form 2 prepared card exercise

The 'dislike a lot' responses of Linden boy and girl students are analysed in Annex 11. The table shows, for example, that only 25 percent of the girl groups and none of the boys groups at Christianburg Wismar indicated that

(a) teachers are not interested in them, and
(b) they dislike this 'a lot'.

Highlighted factors are consistently rated as 'disliked a lot' by high percentages of students across all schools or are particularly disliked at individual schools (e.g. 'not enough practical subjects' at Linden Foundation and Mackenzie). It can be observed that two key access factors, namely journey to school and school costs are consistently rated as 'dislike a lot' by large proportions of students across the for schools (especially Linden Foundation and Christianburg Wismar. It is unlikely that GEAP will itself result in significant changes in these access responses. Similar tables need to be produced for the three other response categories, 'no problem' and 'dislike' and 'dislike a little'. These can then be compared with the results of this exercise when it is undertaken again in 2001 and at the end of the project.

7.1.4 Form 2 and Form 5 open-ended ranking exercise

In some areas, student responses from the open-ended ranking exercise contradicted or were inconsistent with those from the prepared card exercise. For example, the access dislikes, 'cost of schooling' and 'transport' were hardly mentioned by either Form 2 or Form 5 students (see Annexes 12 and 13).

Another significant access factor relates to school infrastructure conditions and the surrounding environment. These are objectively worse in Linden, and this is reflected in the students' perceptions. Among Linden Form 2 students (see Annex table 12.1), 'poor conditions/environment' ranks as both the most frequently cited first and second dislike. A high percentage of Form 5 Linden students mentioned 'poor conditions/ environment' (24 per cent as first dislike; 32 per cent as second dislike), whereas no Corriverton students mention it (see Annex table 13.1),.

There are significant gender differences in the dislike responses of students at the project schools in Linden (see Annex tables 12.3-12.6 and 13.3-13.6). The differences are slightly greater within each school, but less so across the schools. For instance, boys were much more likely to mention a dislike of conditions and environment in one school, whereas the girls mentioned this as a greater dislike in another school. However, disaggregation by gender reduces the number of groups per school too much to enable meaningful comparisons of gender differences to be made. In some schools, there were as few as two groups of boys or girls who undertook this exercise. This information will, nevertheless, be useful for later comparison purposes.

7.2 GREATER COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

7.2.1 Community involvement in schools

Only a limited amount of data on PTA attendance was collected (see Annex table 14). However, poor attendance at PTA meeting was commented on by most headteachers which is symptomatic of widespread parental apathy. Nearly 75 percent of term reports were not collected at one school in Linden. Parents who do attend PTA meetings are mainly mothers and other female relatives and guardians. While PTAs have an important fund-raising role, only small amounts are raised. Parents tend to adopt a passive role in relation to headteachers and teachers who hold most of the power.

Community use of school facilities is generally quite limited. However, this is likely to increase significantly as new are schools built and existing ones are rehabilitated.
There are relatively few active NGOs and CBOs in either Corriverton or Linden. The scope for increased employer involvement is also quite limited. Linmine is the only large employer in Linden. Total employment at the mine has fallen from over 6000 during the early 1980s to 1200 today, and further redundancies are likely. The Guyana Sugar Company is the only sizeable employer in Corriverton.

7.2.2 Teacher perceptions

The senior teacher and subject teacher focus groups (See Annexes 15 and 16) referred to home and community support as having an influence on their teaching outcomes. Although this category comprised only between 4 - 12 percent of their responses, it was a recognition of the need to improve school, parent and community relations as an important element to improved school quality. Notably the untrained teachers did not mention parental or community relations as significant in their work.

7.3 IMPROVED REGIONAL AND SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

7.3.1 Form 2 open-ended ranking

This exercise revealed that the majority of the dislikes identified by students were related to school management issues. Among Form 2 students in Corriverton, 'poor student behaviour' is both the first and second dislike expressed, with 'poor teacher behaviour/attitudes' and 'harsh teacher discipline' being ranked second and third. Form 2 Linden students also dislike both 'harsh teacher discipline' and 'poor teacher behaviour/attitudes', although these concerns come second to some access issues (see Annex table 12.1). Much smaller percentages of students in both schools mention a dislike of 'student bullying and fighting'.

Interestingly, whereas in the mainly Afro-Guyanese Linden schools, there is a considerable dislike of school rules (including the wearing of school uniform), the tendency within the mainly Indo-Guyanese Corriverton schools is to dislike of poor student behaviour (including a lack of "appropriate" dress).

Form 5 students in Linden also mention 'dislike of 'school rules', which reflects the same dislike expressed by Linden only Form 2 students. The number one dislike in Linden it is 'poor teacher behaviour/attitudes'. 'Harsh teacher discipline' and 'cost of schooling' is mentioned by a smaller percentage of Linden students, but not by Corriverton students.

7.3.2 School improvement plans (SIP)

The project proposes that school improvement plans be set up to address a number of project objectives, covering management, involvement of the community, gender dimensions and teacher performance. There may be a risk of overloading the objectives of the SIPs, which the project team should consider. To act as an effective indicator of improved school management, we suggest that school improvement plans address key management issues identified through the baseline data gathering exercise. These are:

- Improved management support provided by regional education offices to Head Teachers, based on consultation over support policy and practices.
- Improved or effective practices (including the introduction of new practices in some schools) of consultation within schools, between Heads, Heads of Departments and Senior Teachers, Class teachers, untrained teachers and school prefects, to combat the negative authoritarian culture and practices widely complained about in schools.
- Introduction of management practices which address gender dimensions of management.

- Active role of parents in supporting school management, for instance, encouraging and assisting students to do their homework, respect teachers etc.
- Improved co-ordination with primary schools through the appointment of a primary school liaison manager
- A programme of in-house professional development session addressing emergent issues of staff concern.
- Development of a student council, a representative body to address and communicate student concerns.

7.3.3 Regional education office capacity

The regional education office has an important role to play in school management, and there is a need to strengthen their capacity to manage. However, there are a number of key management issues which lie outside the scope of the project, but which have a major impact on regional education office effectiveness and impact on school management. These are: effective policy on incentives (e.g. salary increments, a reward structure for CPD) and sanctions (e.g. dismissal for serious bad practice); a comprehensive strategic re-examination of requirements for information collection at school level for the purposes of management, monitoring and evaluation; and effective financial resourcing of regional education offices. Unless these questions are addressed, it is likely that capacity building alone will not constitute a significant indicator of improved management. The project team with MoE, REdO counterparts might consider how they should encourage policy debate on these issues.

7.3.4 School inspection system

The school inspection system needs to address a broader range of issues in schools. Our understanding is that school inspection currently happens infrequently and only addresses a limited number of items. It does not include classroom observation. In order for the regional offices to have a comprehensive overview of all aspects of school monitoring, there needs to be liaison between REdO officers and NCERD, according to the Linden REdO.

Alongside a system of school inspection there is a need for the development of a school advisory service related to the curriculum subjects. This would be particularly useful for the three core subjects, English, maths and science. Such a service would have multiple functions including a subject centred focus upon improving the CXC results, development of greater collegiality through subject teacher groups, support for teachers in training or up-grading and a network exchange or sharing of ideas and resources. Given the implementation of SSRP even in their non-project schools some consultation with project managers would be advisable.

7.3.5 Senior Teacher perceptions

The teacher focus groups also raised issues related to management. Just over five percent of Group A senior teacher responses referred to educational administration issues, specifically concerning communication between schools and education offices and low school budgets (see Annex tables 15.1 and 15.2). The questions addressed to the Group B teachers were couched to address their own roles as managers. Interestingly as teachers managed by regional and national education offices nearly 40 percent of all the responses referred to administrative issues (see Annex tables 15.3-15.4). Communication, school budget and unplanned disruptions were key issues. As managers issues of administration were not among the responses.

Fifteen percent of the responses from Group B senior teachers, who focused specifically on management issues, described their lack of consultation, acknowledgement and a minimal decision making roles from school management (See Annex table 15.4). The subject teachers and untrained teacher focus groups also referred to poor management as contributing to the difficulties they perceived in their work. This was mainly in reference to in-school management support (See Annex tables 16.2, 16.4, 16.6 and 17.2).

7.4 IMPROVED TEACHING

The data for the teacher performance indicators is presented in Annex 18.

A clear distinction needs to be made between the potential and actual impacts of improved curriculum and improved pedagogy on teacher performance. The extent to which the SSRP revised curriculum has been adopted in project schools also needs to be clarified since GEAP is largely piggy-backing on the SSRP curriculum.

7.4.1 Qualification and experience profiles

The qualification profiles of teachers are poor in most of the project schools. Only 17.5 percent of teachers have degrees. Mackenzie (51.4 percent), Tagore (16.6 percent) and Linden (21.6 percent) have the highest proportions of university graduates. With respect to professional teaching qualifications, all schools have high proportions of untrained teachers. This exceeds 50 percent in five of the seven schools. Only Mackenzie High School has a relatively well qualified teaching force.

Nearly one-third of English teachers and almost a half of maths teachers are untrained. For some subjects (particularly in commerce/business), over three-quarters of teachers are completely untrained. Over half of all teachers at most schools (Skeldon High and Mackenzie are the only exceptions) have five years or less work experience.

7.4.2 Absenteeism, resignations and recruitment

Apart from high turnover among untrained teachers in Corriverton, attrition among teachers employed at the project schools is relatively low. This is largely due to the limited employment opportunities in both locations. However, very large numbers of trained teachers are being recruited to work in Botswana and other overseas countries, which could have a major impact on the staffing situation over the next 2-3 years.

7.4.3 Qualification upgrading and INSET

Eighteen teachers were enrolled on CPCE upgrading courses in Linden in 1998/99. (This information for both locations needs to be included in the teacher data base.) The outreach centre in Linden is in a fairly central location. The premises are shared with the GUIDE project and a resource centre. Limited capacity in Linden has meant that a new cohort of students have not been taken on every academic year. In Corriverton, the Rose Hall outreach centre is a considerable distance from the project schools (especially Skeldon High and Skeldon Line Path). This factor combined with the poor scheduling and high intensity of the training course itself discourage most untrained teachers from enrolling.

Only a very limited amount of in-service training is currently undertaken at the project schools. There are no real incentives for teachers to improve their skills.

7.4.4 Teacher perceptions

All the senior teacher groups and the untrained teachers saw teacher related issues as key to improving outcomes. This category represented from just below 40% to well above 50% of these groups responses. The majority of the issues identified were related to poor training, skills and practices. Clearly this is an area in which the project could have a significant impact. Later data collection, through focus groups, during M&E over the lifetime of the project should register a considerable change away from this group of concerns. Other issues related to poor pay and incentive structures will be more difficult to address through the project.

The lack of adequate and appropriate resources was a high priority issue for the subject teachers and the untrained teachers. It featured as first or second priority area in all these groups. For the science and English teachers this category represented 47% and 42% respectively of their responses. Again this is key area for project impact and the proportion of responses in this category would be expected to decline over the project period.

7.4.5 Student perceptions

Form 2 prepared card exercise: The poor classroom management of many teachers is strongly reflected in student dislike responses (See Annex 11). Most Form 2 students in Linden consistently point to teachers shouting at them and teachers having favourites as their most serious complaints with regard to teacher behaviour. Again, it will be interesting to see whether any improvements in classroom management result in changes in these student responses over the next five years.

Form 2 and Form 5 open ended ranking exercise: Among Form 5 students, the number one dislike in Corriverton is 'lack of computing facilities' (28 per cent of students). Complaints about being taught by inexperienced or untrained teachers is mentioned frequently by Corriverton students (25 per cent as first dislike; 33 per cent as second dislike), and to a lesser extent by Linden students (12 per cent as first dislike; 16 per cent as a second dislike). (See Annex table13.1)

A second order concern among the Form 5 Corriverton students is related to poor facilities, including laboratories, libraries, recreational, sports and social facilities (19, 12 and 8 per cent give these three factors respectively as first order dislikes), whereas the Linden students emphasise the overall very poor facilities or lack of any facilities at all (12 per cent).

Form 2 students were less likely to mention as a major dislike, issues relating to teaching, such as the lack of facilities or text or library books.

7.5 IMPROVED LEARNING

The data for student performance indicators is presented in Annex 19.

7.5.1 CXC examination results

A detailed analysis of the 1996-1998 CXC results in English, mathematics, and science will enable performance trends among both boys and girls in recent years to be identified.

Among the Linden project schools, with the exception of Mackenzie High School, examination results in English and maths are extremely poor (See Annex table 16.1). No student obtained a Grade III or higher in either subject at New Silvercity and Linden Foundation. Results at Christianburg Wismar were only fractionally better. The number of candidates for mathematics is also very low. Generally, girls are performing better than boys.

The gender disaggregated CXC results need to be collected for Corriverton schools.

7.5.2 Repetition

Repetition rates are a key performance indicator in Linden. Overall repetition rates for boys are twice as high than those for girls at Mackenzie High and Linden Foundation and slightly higher at Christianburg Wismar. This is reversed in New Silvercity but only by a very small margin (see Annex table 16.3).

Schools in Corriverton have a de facto policy of automatic promotion. This is probably because drop-out rates are already high and keeping children back would aggravate this still further.

7.5.3 Class size

It is important to monitor changes in class sizes at the project and control schools. In overall terms, 43 percent of classes have under 30 students. Most of the project schools, Tagore being the key exception, do not have very large class sizes. In terms of the prevailing resource constraints, smaller classes might be difficult to justify. From the perspective of teaching and learning quality, however, class sizes of near and above 30 can make a significant difference especially in practical subjects.

7.5.4 Teacher perceptions

For all the teachers improvements in teaching have a direct bearing upon improvements in learning. The focus group teachers strongly indicate the teacher and resource related issues are high priority targets in efforts to improve schooling outcomes. A third order priority for the subject and untrained teachers was student related issues. A key point is made by these responses in relation to project outcomes. These teachers are already concerned with the appropriateness of the curriculum for the existing ability range within their respective schools. Increasing access, inevitably widening the ability range, will exacerbate this problem. As a preliminary, this is an explicit indicator that approaches to mixed ability teaching need to be addressed with the teachers. Their concern also raises a number of central issues to be addressed by the project management in consultation with other educational initiative managers (eg. SSRP) and local educational personnel at all levels. Several sets of concern will need to be considered which are fundamentally related to curriculum development in its broadest meaning. These include questions about the appropriateness of the CXC syllabus for all students, alternative curricula, student selection, differentiated teaching and learning, teacher education etc. More specifically, in terms of the project monitoring and evaluation, it is evident that heavy reliance upon outcomes measures must always be qualified using a range of other indicators.

7.5.5 Student perceptions

Form 2 students at Linden schools see improvements in resources and facilities as the most important factor in improving learning outcomes. Fighting and bullying is also a major problem that could affect learning outcomes for this age group. The Form 5 students were concerned with teacher-student relations and low levels of teacher training as key factors in improved learning (See Annex table 13.1). Their concern with school rules, in at least two of the schools, was elaborated more informally as related to their perceptions of an authoritarian school atmosphere in which their interests were not adequately represented and which produced poor conditions for learning.

7.5.6 Tracer survey

A total of 217 school leavers in Corriverton and 402 in Linden were covered in the tracer surveys (See Annex tables 20.1 and 20.2). Although no information was available for approximately one quarter of the Linden students, this category is likely to have a higher proportion of individuals who are not in employment or (in the case of females, of whom there are more) who have married and are having children (and who may, therefore, be less ‘visible’ than, say, teachers). 26 percent and 33 percent of the school leavers in Corriverton and Linden respectively are either in wage employment or self-employed. The most

commonly cited occupation is ‘teacher’ (approximately 15 percent of all school leavers in both locations). Students from Linden are slightly more likely to be studying, either in further/higher education or retaking exams (21 percent and 15 percent of all students in Linden and Corriverton respectively).

The tracer surveys also show some important gender differences. In particular, a significantly higher percentage of boys are employed (49 percent in Corriverton and 41 percent in Linden) compared with girls (28 per cent in Corriverton and 27 per cent in Linden).

ANNEX 1

Terms of Reference
Guyana Education Access Project

Terms of Reference

1.1.1 Background (Selected)
The baseline study will provide a set of data to give an accurate picture of the state of secondary education provision at the start of the project. These indicators will be based on the outputs and the OVIs from the project logframe. Particular attention will be paid to measures of quality improvement in teaching and learning.
The project is adopting a strong process approach, which demands the development of strong monitoring and evaluation procedures to assess impact and guide project directions. A comprehensive baseline study is required to determine the most appropriate set of indicators against which impact assessment of project objectives can be made.
The outputs and OVIs from the project logframe will form the basis of the baseline study. The indicators will therefore augment the OVIs by providing the additional determinants necessary to fully gauge the extent of the impact of project initiatives.

1.1.2 Overall objectives
The consultants will identify valid and reliable indicators and data to determine current levels of access, quality of teaching and learning, retention and equity, which can be used to inform the development of the project to target areas of need and in subsequent follow-up surveys or impact studies to assess the effect of the GEAP project.

- To provide a comprehensive set of qualitative and quantitative indicators that will measure impact of project activities against desired outputs
- Provide against each indicator a baseline reading against which progress may be measured
- Develop the necessary protocol for periodic assessment of progress using the indicators and setting data against the baselines established through this study

1.1.3 Scope of work[1]
1. The consultants will provide a comprehensive set of baseline qualitative and quantitative indicators that enable both qualitative and quantitative measures of impact in answer to the following broad questions based on the project's desired outputs:
To what extent has access to secondary education in General Secondary Schools (GSS) been improved through the project, in particular that of poor people?
(Outputs 1, 2) **(2)**
In what ways and to what extent has community participation in schools increased, and what benefits has this brought, particularly to the poor? (Output 3) **(3)**
In what ways and to what extent has overall educational management practice at central and regional levels changed to promote the reforms initiated by the project? (Output 3) **(4)**
In what ways and to what extent has school management practice changed for the better? (Output 4) **(3/4)**

[1] The emboldened number at the end of each of these projects outputs relates to the output areas in the project framework document. These were identified by the consutant team as the key focus of the baseline study within the final terms of reference.

Are GSSs offering an appropriate curriculum that meets the needs of learners and increases the chance of gaining employment or securing further education and training upon leaving school? (Output 5) **(5/6)**
Have teachers become more effective facilitators of learning, particularly of those learners of lower academic ability ? (Output 5) **(5)**
Have levels of student achievement improved, particularly those of lower academic ability and in subject areas targeted through the project ? (Output 6) **(6)**

all data to be disaggregated by gender

2. The consultants will devise a system for ongoing collection, analysis and evaluation data
3. The consultants will provide training for local researchers

1.1.4 Conduct of work

The consultants are expected to use participative approaches to data collection to elicit both qualitative and quantitative data. Local personnel, including researchers from the local community and postgraduate students in the Faculty of Education in the University of Guyana, will be involved in all activities carried out by the consultants and will be given any training necessary to facilitate their full participation in the collection, analysis and evaluation of data.

ANNEX 2

Itinerary of Meetings

Date	Itinerary / Meetings	People met	
Saturday 10 April	Consultant Team Planning		MD, AC
Sunday 11 April	Project Manager	Helen O' Reilly (HOR)	MD, AC,
Monday 12 April	Consultant Team Planning		MD, AC, PB
	Project Manager	HOR	MD, AC, PB
	H/H survey planning	Everton Pollard (CBS) / HOR	MD, AC, PB
	MoE Planning Office	Evelyn Hamilton	MD, AC, PB
		Calvin (HOR counterpart)	MD, AC, PB
	DFID	Desmond Bermingham	MD, AC, PB
	Consultant Team Planning		MD, AC, PB
Tuesday 13 April	Travel to Corriverton		
	GEAP Regional Advisor	Paul Worrall (PW)	MD, AC, PB
	Regional Education Office team	Nusrella Khan REdO	
		Bashir Khan (PW counterpart)	
		4 regional supervisors	
		PW	MD, AC, PB,
	Community Researchers	Savitri Ramdass, housewife	
		Keshwar Jairam, clerk	
		S Ramnarain, teacher	
		Alfa Mohamed, head teacher	
		Bhoge Outar, teacher	
		Beverly Daniels, housewife	
		Georgina Charles, housewife	
		PW	MD, AC, PB,
	Consultant Team Planning		MD, AC, PB
Wednesday 14 April	Primary School visits	Crabwood Creek Teachers and pupils	PB, AC
		Corriverton Primary Teachers and pupils	MD
		Mr Harry Paul (Teachers Union)	MD
		Bernadette Higgins (VSO)	MD
	Consultant Team Planning		AC, PB
	Regional Supervisor	Claudette Pestano (regional supervisor / Resource Centre manager)	MD
	Community Researchers	As Above 13 April	

Date	Itinerary / Meetings	People met	
Thursday 15 April	Skeldon Line Path School	Head, Teachers and students	MD, AC
	Regional Education Office	Bashir Khan (PW counterpart)	PB, PW
	Various GoG Offices	Various officers	PB
	New Amsterdam	Mr Khan (REdO)	PB
	CPCE centre / sub station Rose Hall	Mrs Ramsammy (regional supervisor)	PB
	Tagore Secondary School	Deputy Head	PB
	VSO	B. Higgins, M. te Plate and N. Wallace	MD, AC, PB.
Friday 16 April	Skeldon High School	Head, Teachers and students	AC,PB
	Tagore Secondary School	Head, Teachers and students	MD
	PTA meeting (Primary School No 56)	Various teachers and parents	AC,MD
Saturday 17 April	Consultant Team Planning		MD, AC, PB
	Local Chamber of Commerce Employer / business representative		AC
Sunday 18 April	Return to Georgetown		
	Consultant Team Planning		MD, AC, PB
	DFID/CfBT progress meeting	Desmond Bermingham, HOR	MD, AC, PB
Monday 19 April	MoE Planning Office	Evelyn Hamilton	MD, AC, PB
	MoE	Mrs Singh	PB, MD
	NCERD	Inquiry Officer	MD, AC
	CBS	Everton Pollard	MD, AC, PB,
	SSRP	Ken Hunte rep	MD, AC, PB
	Permanent Secretary and Special Advisor	Haydi Ali, Hector Patterson, Calvin, HOR,	MD, AC, PB,
	Dean of Education, University of Guyana	Mr Weaver, HOR	MD, AC, PB,
	Principal CPCE Travel to Linden	Savitri Balbahador	MD PB,
	GEAP Regional Advisor	Ed Denham (ED),	MD, AC, PB

Date	Itinerary / Meetings	People met
Tuesday 20 April	Regional Education Office	Gloria Briton, (Deputy Education Officer / ED's counterpart), ED MD, AC, PB,
	Christianburg Wismar Secondary School	Gwen George-Albert (Head), teacher groups, student groups MD, AC, PB
	Rural District Council	Basil Ben, Regional Executive Officer MD, AC, PB
	Community researchers and VSOs	Yvonne Joseph, VSO Community Stephen J Williamson, VSO computer / pastoral Jean Hales, VSO English teacher Nigel Williamson, geography teacher CWSS Keith Long, unemployed Ulric Harmen, freelance writer/researcher Rochelle Richmond, teacher, Coomacka School Yumona Vansluytman, training as secretary Janice Duke, computer training Jellien Stuart, health centre worker, Vanessa McGregor, unemployed Wendy Wellington, facilitator/teacher Ernestine Logan, housewife/ project worker Rona Dowden, nursing Doreen Langhorne, teacher Mackenzie Primary ED MD, AC, PB
Wednesday 21 April	Mackenzie High School	Janice Gibson, (Head), teacher groups, student groups MD, AC, PB
	Linmine	Leslie Hopkinson, Maurice Drakes, E.S. London AC, PB
	VSO	Yvonne Joseph Stephen J Williamson Jean Hales MD, AC, PB ED
Thursday 22 April	New Silvercity Secondary School	(Miriam Gillis), Head, teacher groups, student groups MD, AC, PB
	GUIDE Centre	Juliet Alexander MD
	CPCE Centre	Martin Porter MD
	Rotoract President	Lana Roberts AC, PB
Friday 23 April	Regional Education Office	Lloyd Mac Bean Regional Education Officer MD, AC, PB
	Linden Foundation Secondary School	(Daphne Walcott), Head, teacher groups, student groups MD, AC, PB
	NCERD Resource Centre	Miriam Zephyr MD
Saturday 24 April	Consultant Team Planning Return to London	MD, AC, PB

ANNEX 3

Classroom Observation Schedules

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

SCHOOL		**YEAR**	
SUBJECT		**TEACHER CODE**	
EVALUATORS		**DATE**	

1. PHYSICAL CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

Number of students in class _____

Seating arrangement (rows, groups, other) _____

Comment on seating (crowded, space to move/work/move desks) _____

_____

Room for teacher to visit students _____

Comment on wall displays (teacher/student/commercial made posters) _____

_____

Chalkboard (condition, size) _____

Condition of walls, windows, doors _____

2. LESSON ACTIVITY

Length of lesson _____ Lesson topic _____

Clear introduction _____ Body _____

Conclusion _____

Time	Teacher Activity	Student Activity
0-10 mins		
10-20 mins		
20-30 mins		

3. LESSON PREPARATION

Lesson planned – written evidence; evidence of preparation of resources/activities

_____

Lesson planned with clear achievable objectives _____

_____

Evidence of reflection of previous work in planning

_____

Objectives articulated in outcomes based terms _____

_____

4. TEACHING METHOD

General teaching style (teacher interesting, confident, motivating etc.) _____

_____

Method appropriate to lesson _____

Clear, effective use of chalkboard _____

Teacher circulates among students _____

Method to check understanding _____

Teacher responsive, uses positive reinforcement & teacher uses student's names _____

_____

Teacher understanding & explanation of content clear _____

Teacher use of student prior knowledge & local environment_____

Use of teaching aids/resources _____

5. COMMUNICATION

Teacher facilitates effective interaction between students _____

Teacher creates interactive environment (encouraging, relaxed, activity based) _____

_____

Teacher encourages student participation _____

Teacher asks for range of questions which allow for full participation of class _____

_____

Example of questions asked to the class _____

_____

Teacher response to incorrect answers _____

_____

6. REINFORCEMENT OF LEARNING

Type of written work set _____

_____

Written work checked (regularity, constructively) _____

Difficulties revealed in written work addressed _____

7. GENERAL STUDENT OBSERVATIONS

Students on task_____

Students participate in lesson _____

Students interested _____

8. COMMUNICATION SKILLS – with teacher

Students ask questions (confidently, able to convey meaning)

_____

Students respond to questions (short, one word responses; more involved explanations)_____

- with each other

Interaction with fellow students re: task _____

Interaction in group re: task _____

Boys and girls equally involved _____

9. PROBLEM SOLVING

Students confident, open in attitude towards solving problems_____

Students able to consider various approaches/solutions_____

_____

Students able to rationalise, reflect upon actions critically, logically_____

_____

Students able to persevere with task_____

Students able to organise attempts at solving problems and findings _____

10. REFLECTION

Teacher able to rationalise, justify, reflect upon appropriacy and benefit of methods in that lesson_____

Teacher able to assess Students' understanding of lesson _____

Teacher able to plan/strategise from reflection _____

LESSON EVALUATION FORM

(To be discussed with the teacher after a lesson observation)

Grade _____ Date _____ Subject_____

Objectives/outcomes of lesson

_____

_____

1. **Did you enjoy teaching this lesson?**
   Did the pupils enjoy this lesson?

_____

_____

2. **What went well?**

_____

_____

3. **What would you change if you taught this lesson again?**
   Would you change any of the methods you used?

_____

_____

4. **How did you find out whether the pupils understood the lesson?**

_____

_____

5. **Did all the class understand the lesson?**
   Which parts did they find difficult?
   What will you do to help them?

_____

_____

6. **What will you do in the next lesson?**

_____

_____

ANNEX 4

Socio-Economic Background Questionnaire

Form 1 Background Questionnaire

1. Your name: **2. Boy/Girl**

3. Your school **4. Form**

5. Your home address:

6. Your last Primary School:

7. Father's main work:

8. Who does he work for?

9. Mother's main work:

10. Who does she work for?

11. Father's education:

Did not go to school	❑	**Primary but did not complete**	❑
Completed primary	❑	**Secondary but did not complete**	❑
Completed secondary	❑	**University/college**	❑

12. Mother's education:

Did not go to school	❑		
Primary but did not complete	❑		
Completed primary	❑	**Secondary but did not complete**	❑
Completed secondary	❑	**University/college**	❑

13. Number of brothers and their ages:

14. Number of sisters and their ages:

15. Write the names of the adults who live with you and their relationship to you (e.g. father; aunt):

16. Number of children who live with you:

17. How do you normally come to school? Taxi/Bus/Private car/Walk/Ferry

18. If you were to walk to school, how many minutes would it take?

Annex table 5: Student database fields for first year intake at project schools

1. Form 1 Intake Questinnaire 2. SSEE Result 3. End of year Examination Results 4.Promotion 5. CXC Examination Results

Name

1999

School

2000

Primary School

2001

Father Work

2002

Employer

2003

Mother Work

2004

Employer

Father Education

Mother Education

Brothers

Bage1

Bage2

Bage 3

Bage 4

% Year Eng Math Science Agg

Eng 98

Eng 99

Eng 2000

Eng 2001

Eng 2002

Eng 2003

Eng 2004

Math 98

Math 99

Math 2000

Math 2001

Math 2002

Math 2003

Math 2004

Bage 5

Sisters

Sage 1

Sage 2

Sage 3

Sage 4

Sage 5

Tot Adult

Tot Chn

Transport

Mins Walk

Sci 98

Sci 99

Sci 2000

Sci 2001

Sci 2002

Sci 2003

Sci 2004

Agg 98

Agg 99

Ag 2000

Ag 2001

Ag 2002

Ag 2003

Ag 2004

Annex table 6 – Variables fields for teacher database

Name
School
Sex
DOB
Status
Qualp
Expun
Expt
Totexp
Subject
Abdays
INSET99
INSET200
INSET200
INSET200
INSET200
INSET200
INSET200
QU99
QU2000
QU2001
QU2002
QU2003
QU2004
CXC99
CXC2000
CXC2001
CXC2003
CXC2003

ANNEX 7

Teacher Database for Project Schools

Codes for Teacher Database

Male	1
Female	2

Teacher Qualifications			
Professional		Academic	
MEd	1	BEd/BA	1
Ded	2	BSc	2
BEd	3	BSocSci	3
Cert Ed	4	Other Qual	4
TTC	5	Unqualified	5
Untrained	6	Other Dip	6
		Cert Ed	7
		DipEd	8
		VSO	9

Status	
Head	1
Deputy	2
SM	3
HoD	4
AM	5
AT	6
PTT	7
TAM	8
SAM	9
TQM	10
PT?	11
GM?	12
TQM?	13
TUM?	14

School	
SLP	1
SH	2
T	3
CW	4
M	5
CS	6
LF	7

Subject	
English A	1
English B	2
Maths	3
Science	4
History 5	
Social Studies	6
PE	7
POB	8
Biology	9
Accounting	10
TD	11
OP	12
Chemistry	13
Physics	14
Geography	15
Spanish	16
Agriculture	17
Home Economics	18
Craft	19
Ind Arts	20
??	21
Building Tech	22
Music	23
Typewriting	24
Art	25
Woodwork	26
Spanish	27
Accounts/POA?	28

Annex table 7 Teacher database for project schools

NAME	School	Sex	DOB	Status	Qualp	Quala	Expun	Expt	Totex	Subjec	ABday
B MAHADED	1	1	49	1	2	2	12	19	31	9	
S RAMNARAYAN	1	1	62	2	5	4	0	15	15	3	
R SOOKRAM	1	1	57	4	5	1	18	1	19	6	
R NANDRAM	1	1	56	4	5	4	4	16	20	11	
A RAGNAUTH	1	2	56	4	5	4	0	21	21	12	
J GAJADHAR	1	1	58	3	5	4	4	18	22	3	
T MAHAMOOD	1	1	58	4	5	4	5	17	22	3	
T SHIAMSUNDAR	1	1	63	4	5	4	0	14	14	1	
A CHOW	1	2	56	3	5	4	2	20	22	5	
E JACKSON	1	1		4	5	4	7	20	27	7	
C KANDASAMI	1	1	51	4	5	4	7	18	25	4	
V SINGH	1	2	56	5	5	4	3	9	12	1	
G JEWRAM	1	1	75	5	6	2	1	0	1	13	
A YUSAF	1	1	54	9	5	4	0	20	20		
N SOMAIA	1	2	77	10	6	4	4	0	4	4	
S DASS	1	2	71	6	6	4	6	0	6	10	
M CHUNG	1	1	76	6	6	4	5	0	5	8	
A SOMAN	1	2	79	11	6	4	2	0	2	3	
B DEANDRADE	1	1	80	11	6	4	2	0	2	1	
V SUKHDANAN	1	2	78	6	6	4	2	0	2	6	
B BALKARRAN	1	1	80	11	6	4	2	0	2	3	
B GUMANI	1	1	81	11	6	4	1	0	1	12	
A GEENARINE	1	2	81	11	6	4	0	0	0	1	
H RAMSAMUT	1	2	80	11	6	4	0	0	0	8	
L RAMBALLY	1	2	80	6	6	4	0	0	0	2	
V RAMDASS	1	1	81	6	6	4	0	0	0	3	
S NARINE	2	2	44	1	5	4	5	29	34	1	
A STEPHEN-NEWLAND	2	2	50	3	5	4	5	24	29	1	
I JAGNANAN	2	1	52	3	5	4	9	18	27	4	
B SHIWNARAIN	2	1	53	3	5	4	5	22	27	14	
B RASUL	2	2	51	4	6	1	21	0	21	12	
D BHOJ	2	1	58	4	6	1	20	2	22	15	
A JATTAN	2	2	58	4	5	4	3	14	17	1	
A PERSAUD	2	2	56	4	5	4	4	19	23	4	
A POONAI	2	1	48	12	6	2	12	0	12	9	
R RANJIEWAN	2	1	59	12	6	1	15	0	15	5	
B BUDRAN	2	1	48	12	6	3	13	0	13	7	
S THOMAS	2	2	60	13	6	4	3	0	3	2	
D DIARAM	2	1	52	5	5	4	1	7	8	8	
G PANCHU	2	2	70	13	6	4	10	0	10	1	
U SANGSTER	2	2	69	6	5	4	10	0	10	1	
U PERSAUD	2	2	78	5	5	4	4	1	5	4	
L MOTI	2	2	75	14	6	4	7	0	7	6	
R SUKHDEO	2	1	75	6	6	4	4	0	4	3	
O JOHNSON	2	2	76	5	6	4	6	0	6	6	
C SINGH	2	2	76	6	6	4	3	0	3	2	
R RANDASS	2	2	77	5	5	4	7	1	8	3	
S WILLIAMS	2	2	70	5	5	4	0	2	2	4	

K AUTAR	2	2	79	14	6	4	2	0	2	10	
M SUMASAR	2	2	76	13	6	4	2	0	2	3	
PRANANAND	2	2	79	13	6	4	2	0	2	3	
W JOHNSON	2	2	78	14	6	4	4	0	4	1	
B BALRAJ	2	1	78	13	6	4	2	0	2	8	
R MITHU	2	2	80	14	6	4	1	0	1	6	
D BHOLA	2	1	80	13	6	4	1	0	1	15	
D NANKOAR	2	2	59	6	6	4	1	0	1	1	
NEW HEAD	3										
P SEERAM	3	1	47	2	5	4	5	29	34	1	
R BHIM	3	1	53	4	5	4	2	21	23	6	
M GAJADHAR	3	2	58	4	5	4	1	16	17	4	
G SOUKRAM	3	2	58	4	5	4	5	16	21	1	
S ADHAN	3	1	51	3	5	4	2	16	18	1	
P SAWH	3	1	51	3	5	1	20	2	22	12	
N BUBHUDIAL	3	2	58	9	5	4	1	20	21	4	
C MAHADEO	3	1	69	5	5	4	2	4	6	3	
V DAVID	3	2	65	9	3	1	2	11	13	6	
J DEYOUNGE	3	2	68	5	5	4	2	6	8	10	
V BHYRO	3	1	58	5	5	4	4	17	21	16	
A LATIF	3	2	74	5	5	4	6	0	6	3	
D MAKHUL	3	1	68	5	5	4	5	0	5	4	
A POOVAN	3	2	76	5	5	4	4	0	4	1	
P MOORE	3	1	49	5	5	4	2	28	30	7	
O JIRBENI	3	1	73	8	6	4	3	0	3	3	
N RAMAN	3	2	78	8	6	4	2	0	2	8	
V ETHLAROO	3	2	78	8	6	4	4	0	4	1	
S RANNARINE	3	2	78	8	6	4	2	0	2	5	
D JAGDAT	3	1	80	11	6	4	1	0	1	6	
Y HANSRAM	3	2	76	11	6	4	1	0	1	8	
S SOMAN	3	2	81	11	6	4	1	0	1	3	
Y SEWDIAL	3	2	81	11	6	4	1	0	1	3	
A HARSAWAK	3	2	80	11	6	4	0	0	0	12	
B JOSEPH	3	1	79	11	6	4	0	0	0	4	
L BAIJNAUTH	3	1	43	5	6	1	5	0	5	2	
G GEORGE-ALBERT	4	2	52	1	3	1	2	24	26	7	0
W HERCULES	4	1	49	4	5	6	11	17	28	17	0
L RIMONDA	4	2	53	4	5	4	1	23	24	1	
I BARNES	4	2	48	3	5	4	8	22	30	1	
M DYER	4	2	58	4	7	4	1	18	19	4	
C BENJAMIN	4	2	59	4	5	4	8	13	21	18	
M HEADLEY	4	2	65	4	5	4	0	12	12	3	
B GEORGE	4	1	51	3	5	4	5	20	25	3	
S RHIUS	4	2	60	4	5	4	6	13	19	1	
C SMITH	4	2	70	4	5	4	1	7	8	6	
J JUNER	4	1	58	4	3	1	2	19	21	3	
V PORTER	4	2	50	4	5	4	9	6	15	19	
J BOURNE	4	2	61	4	5	4	2	8	10	20	
J SINCLAIR	4	1	61	3	5	4	3	13	16	3	
M HUNTA	4	2	58	5	7	4	3	16	19	3	
C MCBEAN	4	2	71	5	5	4	2	6	8	3	
K HOLDER	4	1		5	6	3	5	0	5	13	
M ANDREWS	4	2	72	5	5	6	1	4	5	17	

M BARCLAY	4	2	72	5	5	4	3	4	7	6	
D DION	4	2	73	5	5	4	0	4	4	18	
R BOURNE	4	1	66	5	5	4	3	5	8	1	
N WILLIAMSON	4	1	74	5	5	4	2	2	4	15	
L MANLEY	4	2	73	5	4	4	2	1	3	5	
K LUKE	4	2	78	5	6	4	3	1	4	3	
N PARK	4	2	76	5	6	4	2	3	5	6	
K COPPIM	4	2	77	5	6	4	3	0	3	6	
S HALL	4	2	78	5	6	4	2	0	2	1	
C ROBERTS	4	2	57	8	6	4	3	0	3	3	
R BYNOE	4	1	74	8	6	4	1	0	1	21	
Z ALLEYNE	4	1		8	6	4	1	0	1	22	
E JONES	4	2		8	6	4	3	0	3	19	
E CHAPMAN	4	1	76	8	6	4	1	0	1	22	
L NEDD	4	2	54	6	6	4	6	0	6	19	
A SAMPSON	4	2	76	6	6	4	4	0	4	19	
C THORMAN	4	1	56	6	6	4	4	0	4	23	
C RICHARDS	4	2	76	6	6	4	2	0	2	24	
M GEORGE	4	1	77	6	6	4	2	0	2	25	
G CLARKE	4	1	79	6	6	4	2	0	2	11	
M MATHEWS	4	2	80	11	6	4	2	0	2	1	
O MASON	4	1	44	6	6	5	3	0	3	23	
A ALERT	4	2	70	6	6	4	4	0	4	18	
T MORIAN	4	2	73	6	6	4	5	0	5	17	
S SCOTT	4	2	79	6	6	4	2	0	2	18	
S PARKINSON	4	1	79	6	6	4	1	0	1	26	
S BYASS	4	2	78	6	6	4	0	0	0	7	
A BRIGGS	4	2	78	6	6	4	0	0	0	7	
L MOSELEY	4	2	76	5	6	4	1	0	1	18	
J JOSEPH	4	2	79	6	6	4	0	0	0	17	
M HALE	4	2	80	6	6	4	0	0	0	8	
K FRASER	4	1	78	6	6	4	0	0	0	4	
L JONES	4	1	75	5	5	4	2	0	2	11	
D ARCHIBALD	4	1	73	6	6	4	0	0	0	21	
S ALLEYNE	4	1	78	6	6	4	0	0	0	25	
D STREEFA	4	2	80	6	6	4	0	0	0	2	
J BRAITHWAITE	4	1	81	6	6	4	0	0	0	14	
S GEORGE	4	2	78	6	6	4	0	0	0	18	
L BURGES	4	1	73	6	6	4	0	0	0	21	
C BELLAMY	4	2	74	5	6	4	1	0	1	4	
K GRENVILLE	4	1	72	6	6	4	1	0	1	8	
R ALERT	5	1	77	8	6	4	2	0	2	3	21
S ANTHONY	5	1	79	8	6	4	0	0	0	3	
J BAYLEY	5	2	75	8	6	4	4	0	4	5	1
G BEBB-ARCHER	5	2	65	4	5	4	3	7	10	11	12
M BEBB	5	2	74	3	5	4	0	1	1	18	8
L CALLENDER-HENRY	5	2	53	12	3	1	5	4	9	1	17
S CARRYL	5	2	80	8	6	4	0	0	0	27	
S CHASE	5	2	70	12	6	2	3	0	3	4	13
J CRAIG	5	1		5	5	4		0	0	7	
G DANIELS	5	1	55	8	6	4	0	17	17	17	
J GIBSON	5	2	50	1	5	1	5	13	18	5	9

E GITTINGS	5	2	49	5	5	4	2	1	3	24	6
O GRANT	5	1	47	12	6	3	4	0	4	8	
G HAMILTON	5	2	59	4	3	1	4	16	20	6	12
C HARRY-ROSS	5	2	66	3	5	3	3	10	13	6	
M JAMES	5	2	65	5	3	4	4	10	14	1	17
W JERRIS	5	2	58	4	5	1	4	19	23	1	13
C KASSIM	5	2	57	12	6	1	3	0	3	1	
A LEVINE	5	2	72	5	5	4	0	6	6	17	17
C MCDONALD	5	2	56	4	8	2	4	8	12	13	7
J NEWTON-LAMAZON	5	2	67	3	5	1	0	11	11	1	22
Y NICHOLSON	5	2	69	12	6	3	0	0	0	6	
R OSBORNE	5	1	57	12	8	1	3	0	3	1	2
E PAYNE	5	2	45	4	3	4	4	17	21	18	9
Y PHILIPS	5	2	52	2	5	1	2	22	24	27	15
G ROBERTS	5	1	66	4	5	3	4	10	14	3	28
J RUTHERFORD	5	1	74	5	5	4	1	4	5	15	2
H SMALL	5	1	71	12	6	2	0	0	0	17	
M SMITH	5	2	72	5	5	4	3	4	7	6	4
M SOLOMON	5	1	62	12	3	4	21	7	28	9	
C THOMAS	5	1	65	12	3	1	4	12	16	9	8
J THORNE	5	1	66	9	7	2	0	6	6	3	
C TODD	5	2	51	12	8	3	2	15	17	1	10
L TODD	5	2	75	12	5	4	0	0	0	28	
S WHITTAKER	5	1	75	5	5	4	4	0	4	11	
M GILLIS	6	2	49	1	8	4	7	24	31	6	11
M AGEDA	6	2	52	2		4	8	24	32	4	
E ANTHONY	6	2	65	4	3	1	0	13	13	1	15
G ANTOINE	6	2	62	4	3	1	5	14	19	6	14
M KAIZER	6	2	63	4	5	6	5	12	17	17	15
G CAREW	6	2	52	3	5	4	6	21	27	1	8
T JOHNSON	6	2	55	5	5	4	4	21	25	3	20
J NURSE	6	2	70	5	6	1	8	0	8	5	16
D BINGLEY	6	2	71	5	5	4	7	2	9	1	
P WAGNER	6	2	73	5	5	4	2	2	4	8	20
J SEAFORTH	6	2	67	5	5	4	8	1	9	14	18
N CIRT	6	2	75	5	5	4	1	1	2	6	17
E MCDONALD	6	1	75	5	5	4	1	1	2	17	5
S RIGBY	6	2	76	5	5	4	1	1	2	17	15
D WILLIAMS	6	2	59	5	5	4	6	1	7	1	7
V PETERS	6	2	71	5	5	4	1	0	1	6	
M MUNROE	6	2	76	5	5	4	0	1	1	18	
H RICHARDSON	6	2	58	5	5	4	5	0	5	1	
A WILSON	6	2	74	8	6	4	5	0	5	1	20
L RUMSINGH	6	2	77	8	6	4	4	0	4	3	20
M EMMERSON	6	2	78	8	6	4	2	0	2	1	16
U PETERS	6	2	77	8	6	4	2	0	2	6	11
D JOHNSON	6	2	77	8	6	4	2	0	2	25	8
C MCGARREL	6	2	80	8	6	4	0	0	0	1	
P SMITH	6	2	72	8	6	4	5	0	5	19	14
D PERRY	6	2	61	6	6	4	2	0	2	19	4
A GREAVES	6	2	81	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	
R LONDON	6	1	79	6	6	4	0	0	0	11	

C SEMPLE	6	2	86	6	6	4	0	0	0	15	
D WALCOTT	7	2	44	1	3	1	9	29	38	6	5
T CHICHESTER	7	1	54	3	5	4	0	21	21	25	17
M DORIS	7	2	4	4	3	1	3	14	17	1	15
A CHAPMAN	7	2	53	3	5	4	2	21	23	1	
S DORSETT	7	2	61	4	5	4	1	15	16	8	14
S CRAIGWELL	7	2	57	4	3	1	6	18	24	3	18
V PITT	7	2	68	4	5	3	0	9	9	6	16
H GRAY	7	2	60	5	5	4	4	14	18	1	28
P OBERMULLER	7	2	66	5	5	4	0	4	4	3	21
H CRAIG	7	2	75	5	5	4	0	3	3	1	24
R THOMPSON	7	2	69	5	6	2	2	0	2	4	19
V BROWNE	7	1	70	5	6	4	10	0	10	25	7
L FRANCE	7	1	75	10	6	4	2	0	2	2	7
S HENSFORD	7	2		10	6	4	4	0	4	17	4
D BISHOP	7	2	73	10	6	4	5	0	5	3	19
0 BLAIR	7	1	76	13	6	4	2	0	2	10	5
S GOODLUCK	7	1		5	5	4	4	1	5	6	8
A ARTHUR	7	1	77	14	6	4	1	0	1	7	0
A CAMPBELL	7	2	79	13	6	4	1	0	1		
S MILLER	7	2	79	6	6	4	1	0	1		
N PELLEW	7	2	75	13	6	4	3	0	3	1	
K SINGH	7	2	79	6	6	4	1	0	1	17	
A FORDE	7	2	77						0		
I POOLARD	7	2	50	6	6	4	2	0	2	12	
T LEWIS	7	1		6							7

Annex table 8 - Data to be Collected at Control Schools

Data required from Rose Hall Control Schools+

Enrolments
Drop-outs
Net Enrolment rates
Socio-economic background Form 1 intakes (50 sample)
Repetition
Student attendance
CXC English, Mathematics, Science Exam results and for all subjects
Teacher experience and qualification profiles Coverall
Teacher recruitment and resignations
Number INSET days
Number days of Management Training
PTA attendance

Annex table 9.1

	TOTAL			LEVEL			PROG			TRANS		
PRIMARY SCHOOL	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**Overall**
CORRIVERTON												
SIPARUTA			70									
OREALLA			180									
CRABWOOD CREEK			738									
SKELDON			525									
CORRIVERTON			1170									
MESSIAH			995									
NO 68			339									
NEW MARKET			480									
NO 59			165									
NO 56			263									
NO 48			223									
LEEDS			310									
NO 43												
TOTAL			5458									
LINDEN												
ONE MILE	428	374	802	46	45	91						
ST AIDANS	283	251	534	19	27	46						
CHRISTIANBURG	188	185	373	18	20	38						
WISMAR HILL	447	440	887	47	51	98						
NEW SILVER CITY	204	302	506	45	59	104						
CHRISTIANBURG WISMAR	347	458	805	43	61	104						
MACKENZIE	297	275	572	57	48	105						
REGMA	210	215	425	22	16	38						
AMELIAS	199	167	366	30	26	56						
COOMACKA	76	59	135	3	6	9						
WATOOKA HILL	276	294	570	43	57	100						
TOTAL	2955	3020	5975	373	416	789						

Annex table 9.2 Male enrolments at project schools 1994/95-1998/99

FORM	94/95	95/96	96/97	D-OUT	97/98	D-OUT	98/99
SKELDON LINE PATH							
1					0	50	4	53
2					3	49	10	45
3					0	65	15	39
4					1	67	17	53
5					0	46	5	52
					4	277	51	
SKELDON HIGH							
1				59	2	64	6	57
2				55	9	69	0	57
3				61	17	52	3	63
4				43	8	53	14	52
5				24	2	35	11	36
				242	38	273	34	
TAGORE							
1			83	79		61		67
2			50	51		72		59
3			44	40		67		65
4			38	33		52		50
5			31	37		43		41
CHRISTIANBURG WISMAR							
1		106		68		81		83
2		71		99		78		70
3		82		63		83		92
4		50		71		74		75
5		53		55		46		33
MACKENZIE							
1		63	68	47	0	47	0	34
2		62	62	76	3	55	0	59
3		45	55	61	0	69	0	65
4		80	60		2	69	0	62
5		44	44	52	0	44	0	33
NEW SILVERTOWN							
1		59	38	30	2	34	0	34
2		38	54	44	0	38	0	36
3		62	50	46	4	41	0	33
4		23	24	72	4	60	2	49
5		37	20	25	1	45	3	46
				217		218	5	
LINDEN FOUNDATION							
1		27	32	21	0	20	0	28
2		35	31	26	0	19	0	18
3		25	29	33	0	23	0	26

Annex table 9.3 Female enrolments at project schools, 1994/95 - 1998/99

FORM	94/95	95/96	D-OUT	96/97	D-OUT	97/98	D-OUT	98/99
SKELDON LINE PATH								
1						2	76	3	55
2						2	89	16	71
3						3	78	18	75
4						1	68	23	60
5						2	67	3	50
							378	63	
SKELDON HIGH								
1				0	89	5	83	6	71
2				18	75	10	71	18	78
3					88	26	69	14	75
4					56	8	68	6	53
5					34	5	41	4	58
					342	54	332	48	
TAGORE								
1		82			77		71		94
2		74			64		75		76
3		59			57		57		66
4		61			59		52		46
5		52			67		52		49
LINDEN									
CHRISTIANBURG WISMAR									
1	157				87		83		86
2	105				124		102		91
3	102				107		98		118
4	80				89		109		102
5	69				87		61		55
MACKENZIE									
1	73	68	0	63	0	58	0	48
2	77	62	1	58	0	67	0	58
3	75	55	1	66	1	50	0	60
4	84	60	7		1	82	0	54
5	56	44	6	70	0	84	0	59
NEW SILVERTOWN								
1	54	58	4	61	2	48	0	46
2	41	50	2	61	1	63	0	54
3	91	45	0	45	1	56	1	63
4	52	52	2	82	12	57	4	79
5	55	51	1	48	2	53	3	45
				297	18	277	8	
LINDEN FOUNDATION								
1	29	17	0	19	0	20	0	47
2	30	29	0	17	0	19	0	20
3	35	36	0	31	0	23	0	23

Annex table 9.4 Male and female drop-out rates among project schools, 96/97 and 97/98

		1996/97						1997/98					
SCHOOL	Gender	1	2	3	4	5	Overall	1	2	3	4	5	Overall
CORRIVERTON													
SKELDON LINE PATH	Male							8	6.1	0	1.5	0	18.4
	Female							3.9	18	22.8	33.8	4.5	16.6
SKELDON HIGH	Male	3.4	16.4	26.2	18.6	4.8	15.7	9.4	0	5.8	26.4	20.7	14.4
	Female	5.6	13.3	29.5	14.3	14.7	15.8	7.2	25.4	20.3	8.8	9.8	15.8
TAGORE	Male												
	Female												
LINDEN													
CHRISTIANBURG WISMAR	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MACKENZIE	Male	0	3.9	0	2/?		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	1.5	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEW SILVERCITY	Male	6.7	0	8.7	5.6	4	2.3	0	0	0	3.3	6.7	2.3
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	6.1	0	0	1.8	7	5.7	2.9
LINDEN FOUNDATION	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Annex table 9.5 **Enrolments by subject at the project schools**

	SHELDON LINE PATH		SHELDON HIGH		TAGORE		KRISTIANBURG		MACKENZIE		SILVERCITY		LINDEN HIGH	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
FORM 1														
POA														
OP														
POB														
HOME ECONOMICS							83	86						
FOOD & NUTRITION									34	50	35	47	28	46
HISTORY	53	55	57	51							35	47		
GEOGRAPHY			57	51			83	86	34	50				
SOCIAL STUDIES	53	55	57	51	67	94	83	86	34	50	35	47	28	46
METALS	53	55					83	86						
TD							83	86	34	50				
ENGLISH A	53	55	57	51	67	94	83	86	34	50	35	47	28	46
ENGLISH B	53	55	57	51	67	94	83	86	34	50	35	47	28	46
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE					67	94	83	86	34	50	35	47	28	46
SPANISH									34	50	35	47		
BIOLOGY														
CHEMISTRY														
INT SCIENCE	53	55	57	51	67	94	83	86	34	50	35	47	28	46
MATHS	53	55	57	51	67	94	83	87	34	50	35	47	28	46
PHYSICS														
PE	53	55			67	94	83	87	34	50	35	47	28	46
BUSINESS EDUCATION														
HEALTH EDUCATION			57	51										
ART							83	86	34	50	35	47	14	24
CRAFT													14	23
METALS							83	86						
WOODS							83	86						

CLOTHING & TEXTILES									34	50				
READING									34	50				
FORM 5	**SLP**		**SH**		**T**		**KRISTIANBURG**		**MACKENZIE**		**NEW SILVERCITY**		**LINDEN FOUNDATON**	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M 1997/98	F 1997/98	M	F
POA	30	27	21	38	28	30	5	15	20	38	5	8	19	26
OP	38	39	36	58	28	30	0	3						
POB	52	50	36	58	28	30	25	40	20	38	13	24	19	26
TYPEWRITING							0	21	9	30	3	7		
HOME ECONOMICS							2	10						
FOOD AND NUTRITION							2	10	17	24	2	7		
HISTORY	18	21			22	24	5	9	15	49	4	6	9	15
GEOGRAPHY					9	9	11	17	37	62	5	9	19	26
SOCIAL STUDIES	33	24	36	58	28	30	18	30	15	49	7	20	9	11
ELECTRICITY							5	0	5	0				
METALS							7	1						
TD	15	0					18	7	15	18	7	0		
WOODS							10	3						
ENGLISH A	52	50	36	58	42	50	44	59	37	62	45	53	19	26
ENGLISH B			15	20	24	24			17	24			9	15
AGRIC SCIENCE							9	14	2	4	2	6	9	11
SPANISH									2	5				
BIOLOGY	14	11			9	9	2	14	11	5				
CHEMISTRY	14	11			9	9	2	4	11	5				
INT SCIENCE	7	9	21	38	15	15	31	35	26	57	8	9	19	26
MATHS	52	50	36	58	42	50	40	60	37	62	45	53	19	26
PHYSICS	14	11			9	9			11	5				
PE	53	55									45	53		
ART							3		1	0	11	7	4	3

CRAFT				1	3		0	1		
MECH ENG				3	0					
BUILDING TECH				3	0					
ELECT ENG				4	0					

Annex Table 9.6 Male and Female Enrolments at All Project Schools.

School	Girls	Boys	% More Girls
Skeldon Line Path	311	242	12.5
Skeldon High	335	265	11.7
Tagore	331	282	8.0
Christianburg Wismar	452	353	12.3
Mackenzie	279	253	4.9
New Silvercity	287	198	18.4
Linden Foundation	148	127	7.6

Annex Table 9.7 Enrolments by Region

Form 1

Region	Boys	Girls	Total	% Boys	% Girls
Corriverton	177	220	397	44.6	55.4
Linden	179	227	406	44.1	55.9

Form 5

Region	Boys	Girls	Total	% Boys	% Girls
Corriverton	129	157	286	45.1	54.9
Linden	134	186	320	41.9	58.1

Total

Region	Boys	Girls	Total	% Boys	% Girls
Corriverton	789	977	1766	44.7	55.3
Linden	931	1166	2097	44.4	55.6

ANNEX 10 (Drop-out Survey) Preliminary Results for Corriverton

Skeldon High School Admission 1994 (dropped out Form 4 => Form 5 or earlier)

Name	What are they doing now?	Where are they now?
A Sheneiza (F)	At home	Corriverton
A Shaneeza (F)		
B Rajkumarie (F)		
B Oujar (M)	In School	
B Avinash (M)	Tapir Conductor	At home
B Osanesh (M)	Tapir Conductor	At home
B Hemwattie (F)		
C Nazeela (F)		At home
D Thameshwar (M)	Tapir conductor	At home
D Nareema (F)	Migrated	USA
D Annette (F)	Married	At home
E Shakuntala (F)		At home
E Runika (F)	Migrated	USA
F Mahesh (M)	Bus Conductor	At home
F Fazal (M)	Apprentice	At home
G Ramroop (M)		
G Dooma Devi (F)		
G Seerojanie (F)	At home	
H Ommar Shariff (M)	Apprentice	
I Terrence Paul (M)		
J Andrew (M)	Cricketer	At home
K Dhanwattie (F)		
L Yaswanti (F)		
M Chandance (F)	Married	At home
M Bhojwattie Devi (F)	Married	At home
M Hari (M)		
M Devika (F)		
N John Nathon (M)		
N Farzana (F)	Mechanic	
O Velda	Working	
O Norman		
P Dillon (M)	At home	
P Queika Angela (F)		
Q Amrita (F)		
R Lalita (F)		
R Badewantie (F)		
R Sabita (F)	At home	
S Churaman (M)		
S Abool Wazir (M)		
S Radat Chandrawattie (F)		
S Raj Savita (F)		

S Badewattie (M)	CXC	
S Leon A (M)	CXC	
S Wazim (M)	Mechanic	Corriverton
S Alicia (F)		
S Ameena (F)		
S Latchmi (F)		
S Kelvin (M)		
S Anita (F)		
S Suriya (F)	Migrated	USA
T Sunita (F)		
T George (F)		
U Luke (M)		
V Purnema (F)		
V Omeshwar (M)	In School	
W Shaun (M)	Private School	At home

ANNEX 10.1 TAGORE SCHOOL - LIST OF STUDENTS WHO LEFT SCHOOL

Name	What the person is doing now?	Where are they?
A Abhudial (M)	?	Removal from District
A Takhur (M)	?	Removal from District
M Sunita Devi (F)	?	Transferred to Georgetown
P Vashti (F)	Attending School	Transferred to Skeldon High
V Sarojini (F)	Attending School	Transferred to Skeldon Line Path
R Marvin (M)	Attending School	Transferred to Skeldon High
E Salim (M)	Attending School	Removal from District
U Fayeann (F)	Attending School	Transferred to Georgetown
M Monique (F)	Attending School	Transferred to Skeldon High
P Kashma (F)	Attending School	Transferred to Georgetown
S Ronald (M)	Learning Trade	
H Lilmattie (F)	Learning Trade	Migrated to Canada
C Sonowattie (F)	Learning Trade	Migrated to USA
T Terry (M)		Transferred to Georgetown
C Mohabir (M)	?	Removal from District-Surinam
G Antonio (M)		Joined G.N.S
E Herawattie (F)	Learning Sewing	Drop Out
K Latisha (F)	Schooling	Transferred to Winifred Gaskia
Y Doodnauth (M)	?	Migrated
Y Flosel (F)		Drop Out

ANNEX 10.2 SKELDON LINE PATH

Drop outs in Form 1

1. E Chahdradeo (M)	Migrated to Surinam
2. G Roshan (M)	Migrated to USA
3. S Delon (M)	Transferred to another region
4. L Romel (M)	At Home
5. H Sharomanie (F)	Do not know
6. K Lilawattie (F)	At Home
7. K Sultana (F)	Migrated
8. R Rashmee (F)	Migrated

ANNEX 10.3 CHRISTIANBURGH WISMAR SECONDARY SCHOOL

A. Number of sessions for the month of January 1998: 39 sessions

B. Drop outs from FORM 2 –3

1.	Marvin Sanch	Attending L.T.T.I – Linden Technical Training Institutes
2.	Clifford Laud	Not known – child lives on the Highway
3.	Marvin Josiah	Attending L.T.T.I
4.	Fiona Williams	Not Known
5.	Kurwin Hatton	Not Known

Annex table 11 - Form 2 prepared cards exercise **Summary of student 'dislike a lot' responses, Linden April 1999**

	CHRISTIANBURG		MACKENZIE		NEW SILVER CITY		LINDEN FOUNDATION	
DISLIKE	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
TEACHERS:								
Are not interested in us	25%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%
Talk too much	50%	0%	20%	0%	29%	25%	0%	0%
Shout at us	75%	80%	80%	100%	100%	75%	0%	100%
Are too strict	25%	20%	0%	20%	14%	0%	0%	0%
Do not mark our work	25%	20%	0%	20%	29%	0%	0%	0%
Are not well trained	0%		0%	60%	14%	25%	0%	0%
Have favourite pupils	75%	100%	60%	60%	57%	50%	67%	50%
Hit us*	0%	0%	20%	40%	43%	0%	0%	0%
STUDENT BEHAVIOUR								
Pupils are rude to teachers	25%	20%	40%	40%	43%	0%	0%	50%
Fighting and bullying	100%	80%	80%	80%	57%	100%	33%	50%
Boys misbehaving	100%	20%	60%	0%	57%	0%	33%	0%
Girls misbehaving	25%	40%	0%	40%	14%	25%	0%	50%
SUBJECTS/CURRICULUM								
English	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Maths	0%	20%	0%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%
Science	0%	0%	0%	40%	14%	0%	33%	0%
Social Studies	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%
Not enough practical subjects	25%	40%	100%	80%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Too much homework	0%	20%	0%	20%	29%	0%	33%	0%
RESOURCES/FACILITIES								
Not enough books	75%	20%	60%	60%	57%	75%	67%	100%
Poor science labs	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Not enough computers	100%	60%	100%	100%	71%	100%	67%	100%
Classrooms are dirty	0%	20%	20%	20%	14%	25%	33%	100%
Poor buildings	25%	40%	0%	60%	86%	50%	100%	100%
Poor sports facilities	25%	0%	20%	60%	57%	75%	100%	50%
Too many pupils in each class	0%	0%	40%	20%	0%	0%	33%	0%
Toilets are not clean	100%	80%	60%	80%	86%	50%	33%	50%
HOUSEHOLD								
Journey to school	75%	60%	40%	20%	71%	0%	100%	100%
	50%	80%	40%	40%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Annex table 12.1: "What we most dislike about school" Form 2 pupils,

Corriverton and Linden schools

Category of dislike	1st dislike (%)		2nd dislike (%)	
	Corriverton	Linden	Corriverton	Linden
Poor pupil behaviour	35	2	51	2
poor teacher behaviour/attitudes	28	12	10	9
poor conditions/environment	16	35	8	40
harsh teacher discipline	12	24	13	20
pupil bullying/fighting	4	5	11	3
school rules	0	5	0	10
too few library/text books	0	3	0	5
too much homework	5	7	7	5
lack of facilities (esp. computers)	0	7	0	0
costs of schooling	0	2	0	3
transport (distance, time, cost)	0	0	0	3
Totals	100	100	100	100

Note: percentages derived from tables with numbers for each individual school.

Annex table 12.2: "What we most dislike about school" Form 2 pupils,

Corriverton schools

Category of dislike	1st dislike			2nd dislike			3rd dislike		
	SLP	SH	Tag	SLP	SH	Tag	SLP	SH	T
poor pupil behaviour	0	4	3	2	5	5	2	7	3
poor teacher behaviour/attitudes	5	0	3	3	0	0	1	1	1
harsh teacher discipline	4	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	1
poor environment/conditions	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	2
pupil bullying/fighting	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	1	0
too much homework	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0

Notes:
Column totals not given because this exercise was undertaken in groups of varying numbers in each different school; not every group produced at least three top "dislikes"; some groups mentioned two issues under a particular dislike, which has led to multi-scoring. Group exercise took place with separate groups of girls and boys, but in these 'trial' schools, we did not take separate note of girls versus boys dislikes. A total of approximately 160 pupils undertook this exercise from the three schools, with a rough ration of girls to boys of 2:1.

Annex table 12.3: "What we most dislike about school" Form 2 pupils,

Christianburg Wismar School, Linden

Category of dislike	1st dislike		2nd dislike		3rd dislike		totals (weighted)		
	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	to
harsh teacher discipline	1	1	2	1	0	1	7	6	13
poor environment/conditions	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	3	10
school rules	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	10	10
pupil bullying/fighting	0	2	1	0	1	0	3	6	9
poor teacher behaviour/attitudes	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	6	6
too much work	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
costs of schooling	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2
poor pupil behaviour	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
teacher favouritism	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1

Note:
Column totals not given because this exercise was undertaken in groups of varying numbers in each different school; not every group produced at least three top "dislikes"; some groups mentioned two issues under a particular dislike, which has led to multi-scoring.
Approximately 60 pupils took part in this exercise.

Annex table 12.4: "What we most dislike about school" Form 2 pupils,

MacKenzie High School, Linden

Category of dislike	1st dislike boys	girls	2nd dislike boys	girls	3rd dislike boys	girls	totals (weighted) boys	girls	to
poor environment/conditions (esp. toilets)	4	1	4	1	1	2	21	7	28
too few library/textbooks	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	7	8
poor teacher behaviour/attitudes	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	3	7
lack of facilities (esp. computers)	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	6
harsh teacher discipline	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	4
transportation to school (costly, difficult, lengthy)	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2
poor pupil behaviour	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
lack of teachers	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1

Note:
Column totals not given because this exercise was undertaken in groups of varying numbers in each different school; not every group produced at least three top "dislikes"; some groups mentioned two issues under a particular dislike, which has led to multi-scoring.
Approximately 75 pupils took part in this exercise.

Annex table 12.5: "What we most dislike about school" Form 2 pupils,

New Silvercity School, Linden

Category of dislike	1st dislike		2nd dislike		3rd dislike		totals (weighted)		
	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	to
poor teacher behaviour/attitudes	2	3	1	1	2	4	10	15	25
poor conditions (toilets, classrooms)	0	2	3	4	2	1	8	12	20
harsh teacher discipline	2	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	11
poor environment (bauxite dust, water)	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	6
poor pupil behaviour	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	5
costs of schooling (contingency fees)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
transportation to school (costly, difficult, lengthy)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2

Note:
Column totals not given because this exercise was undertaken in groups of varying numbers in each different school; not every group produced at least three top "dislikes"; some groups mentioned two issues under a particular dislike, which has led to multi-scoring.
Approximately 75 pupils took part in this exercise.

Table 12.6: "What we most dislike about school" Form 2 pupils,

Linden Foundation School, Linden

Category of dislike	1st dislike		2nd dislike		3rd dislike		totals (weighted)		
	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	t
harsh teacher discipline		2	2				4	6	10
poor environment/conditions	1	1		2		2	3	11	14
poor teacher behaviour/attitudes					1		1	0	1
too much work	1			1			3	2	5
lack of text/library books						1	0	1	1
transport difficulties					1		1	0	1

Note: percentages derived from tables with numbers for each individual school.

Annex table 13.4: "What we most dislike about school" Form 5 pupils,

MacKenzie High School, Linden

Category of dislike	1st dislike		2nd dislike		3rd dislike		totals (weighted)		
	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	to
poor teacher/head	4	5	2	0	1	0	17	15	32
behaviour/attitudes	2	1	2	3	1	2	11	11	22
school rules (inc. uniform)	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3	5
harsh teacher discipline	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	4
poor environment/conditions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2
lack of social activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
lack of equipment (esp. computers)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
costs of schooling	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
teacher favouritism									

Note:
Column totals not given because this exercise was undertaken in groups of varying numbers in each different school; not every group produced at least three top "dislikes"; some groups mentioned two issues under a particular dislike, which has led to multi-scoring.
Approximately 80 pupils took part.

Annex table 13.5: "What we most dislike about school" Form 5 pupils,

New Silvercity School, Linden

Category of dislike	1st dislike		2nd dislike		3rd dislike		totals (weighted)		
	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	to
poor or no facilities (library, canteen sports/recreation)	1	1	1	1	1	0	6	5	11
poor environment (bauxite dust, water)	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	7	7
inexperienced/untrained teachers	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
poor teacher behaviour/attitudes	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	3
poor conditions (classroom size, noise, furniture)	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	3

Note:
Column totals not given because this exercise was undertaken in groups of varying numbers in each different school; not every group produced at least three top "dislikes"; some groups mentioned two issues under a particular dislike, which has led to multi-scoring.
Approximately 30 pupils took part.

Annex table 13.6…: "What we most dislike about school" Form 5 pupils,

Linden Foundation School, Linden

Category of dislike	1st dislike		2nd dislike		3rd dislike		totals (weighted)		
	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	boys	girls	to
poor environment (toilets, flooding)	1	1	1	2	0	1	5	8	13
poor teacher behaviour/attitudes	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	3	5
poor conditions (stairs, furniture)	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	5
rules	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
lack of text/library books	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
inexperienced/untrained teachers	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2

Note:
Column totals not given because this exercise was undertaken in groups of varying numbers in each different school; not every group produced at least three top "dislikes"; some groups mentioned two issues under a particular dislike, which has led to multi-scoring.
Approximately 30 pupils took part.

Annex table 14 **Parental attendance at statutory (ie. whole school) PTA meetings at project schools 1997/98**

SCHOOL	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Total	No. meetings	Av	% enrolment
CORRIVERTON															
SLP															
SH															
T															
LINDEN															
CW	151	24	80	40	44	115		47	28	23	48	600	10	60	7.1
M															
NS		91	72	31	90	46	66	76	23	42	114	651	10	65	12.6
LF			46		41	37	16	66	27			233	6	25	9.1

Annex table 15.1: Senior Teachers - Group A[1] **Summary**

"What are the biggest barriers to improved CXC results?"

Group A : Skeldon Line Path; Tagore; Mackenzie

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage [2]
Educational Administration	**5.34**
Teacher - related	**39.76**
Resources	**19.44**
Student-related	**21.96**
Curriculum	**2.23**
Home /Community	**8.31**
Buildings	**2.97**

[1] Group A senior teachers were asked a similar question to the class teachers. The Group B teachers were asked to respond separately as educational managers and as teachers managed. (see Annex table15.3-15.6.

[2] These figures were calculated from the senior teachers response to the above question. The first to fifth priority issues were scored with 6-2 points respectively. All other issues recorded but not in the first five priority list were allocated 1 point. These scores were added and a percentage was calculated based on all the senior teachers' responses in their appropriate school group.

Annex table 15.2 Senior Teachers - Group A Breakdown

"What are the biggest barriers to improved CXC results?"

Group A : Skeldon Line Path; Tagore; Mackenzie

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Educational Administration	**5.34**
Poor communication with Ministry of Education	2.97
School budget is too low	2.37
Teacher - related	**39.76**
Low incentives	9.94
Lack of trained teachers	6.23
High staff turnover	2.97
Poor working conditions	4.45
Poor working practices	2.97
Poor Teacher attitude	1.48
Poor student assessment practices	1.48
Teaching used as stepping stone to other professions	1.48
Need more training	0.59
Too many extra-curricular disruptions	5.19
Teaching has become too bureaucratic	2.97
Resources	**19.44**
Inadequate teaching materials	15.58
Insufficient text books	2.97
Poor library facilities	0.89
Student-related	**21.96**
Are disinterested	8.31
Lack discipline (incl. lateness)	5.19
Too many in each class	2.52
Poor reading capabilities	1.78
Are low achievers	1.78
Produce poor quality work	1.48
Lack rewards	0.89
Curriculum	**2.23**
Overloaded	2.23
Home /Community	**8.31**
Poor parental support	8.31
Buildings	**2.97**
Poor classroom conditions	2.67
Poor recreational facilities	0.30

Annex table 15.3 Senior Teachers - Group B Summary

"As senior teachers, managed within the system, what do you consider to be the biggest problems for improved school quality / CXC results?"

Group B : Christianburg-Wismar; New Silvercity; Linden Foundation

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Educational Administration	39.32
Teacher - related	50.43
Resources	3.42
Student-related	0.00
Curriculum	0.00
Home /Community	6.84
Buildings	0.00

Annex table 15.5 Senior Teachers Group B Summary

"As senior teachers managers within the system, what do you consider to be the biggest problems for improved school quality / CXC results?"

Group B : Christianburg-Wismar; New Silvercity; Linden Foundation

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Educational Administration	0.00
Teacher - related	56.20
Resources	18.25
Student-related	1.46
Curriculum	2.92
Home /Community	0.73
Buildings	20.44

Annex table 15.6 Senior Teachers Group B Breakdown

"As senior teachers managers within the system, what do you consider to be the biggest problems for improved school quality / CXC results?"

Group B : Christianburg-Wismar; New Silvercity; Linden Foundation

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Educational Administration	**0.00**
Teacher - related	**56.20**
Teachers are not committed	12.41
No time to assess junior teachers	7.30
Too many untrained teachers	16.79
Teachers have poor subject knowledge	2.92
Teachers are unprepared	3.65
Teachers use inapproriate methods	4.38
There are too few teachers	5.84
Poor teacher-teacher relations	1.46
Inappropriate teacher - student relationships	1.46
Resources	**18.25**
Poor resources	11.68
Shortage of reference material	5.84
No student texts	0.73
Student-related	**1.46**
Poor attitude	1.46
Curriculum	**2.92**
Too many subject areas	2.92
Home /Community	**0.73**
Poor parental / community relations	0.73
Buildings	**20.44**
Lack of space	2.92
Poor classroom conditions	7.30
Lack of staffroom /departmental office	10.22

Annex table 16.1 English Teachers **Summary:**

"What are the biggest problems you face as English teachers?"

All sampled schools[3].

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage[4]
Teacher - related	**21.1**
Resources	**42.1**
Pupil - related	**20.2**
Curriculum	**0.8**
Home / Community	**4.2**
Buildings	**11.0**

[3] This includes all Linden schools and Skeldon High

[4] This percentage was calculated from the sum of weighted scores across all schools. Weightings were given according to the priority order of each response.

Annex table 16.2 English Teachers
<u>Breakdown</u>: "What are the biggest problems you face as English teachers?"
All sampled schools[5].

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage[6]
Teacher - related	**21.1**
All subject teachers need training in English	9.3
Need more trained teachers	0.8
Trained teachers need upgrading	3.4
Need whole school support	1.7
Need to appoint a story-teller	3.4
Need a special resource person	2.5
Resources	**42.1**
Need more appropriate/interesting reading books	18.6
Need more and better teaching aids	6.8
Need a reading lab	5.0
Need a proper library	4.2
Should teach standard English	3.4
Need a reading programme	1.7
Some existing materials are incorrect	0.8
Need structured workbooks	0.8
Need model answer books for Forms 4-5	0.8
Pupil - related	**20.2**
Remedial work is needed	5.0
Poor ability students on entry	3.4
Too many students in each class	9.3
Students need more guidance	1.7
They need a scholarship incentive	0.8
Curriculum	**0.8**
CXC curriculum needs reform for average/poor abilities	0.8
Home / Community	**4.2**
Poor community support	3.4
Poor parental support to students	0.8
Buildings	**11.0**
Poor classroom conditions	10.2
Poor toilet conditions	0.8

Annex table 16.3 Mathematics Teachers

[5] This includes all Linden schools and Skeldon High
[6] This percentage was calculated from the sum of weighted scores across all schools. Weightings were given according to the priority order of each response.

<u>Summary</u>: "What are the biggest problems you face as mathematics teachers?"

All sampled schools[7].

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage[8]
Teacher - related	**30.8**
Resources	**28.1**
Pupil - related	**19.4**
Curriculum	**11.4**
Home / Community	**6.2**
Buildings	**4.4**

[7] This includes all Linden schools and Skeldon High

[8] This percentage was calculated from the sum of weighted scores across all schools. Weightings were given according to the priority order of each response.

Annex table 16.4 Mathematics Teachers Breakdown

"What are the biggest problems you face as mathematics teachers?

All sampled schools,.

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Teacher - related	**30.8**
Need more training	11.4
Need to be more experienced	4.4
Mathematics content knowledge is poor	3.5
Need a closer training centre	2.6
Need more school management support	5.3
Poor management	1.8
Heads of Department should be graduates	0.9
Need more incentives	0.9
Resources	**28.1**
Need more teaching materials	11.4
Need more mathematics books	14.0
Need computers	1.8
Curriculum modules should be available	0.9
Pupil - related	**19.4**
Too many pupils in each class	5.3
Need more remedial teaching	3.5
Lack the basic mathematics skills	5.3
Don't like maths	2.6
Should be ability streamed	0.9
Need to be more mature	0.9
Need individual attention	0.9
Curriculum	**11.4**
Needs to have more applications of mathematics	6.1
Is too packed	4.4
All schools should follow the same work scheme	0.9
Home / Community	**6.2**
Need to improve relations with parents	5.3
Need to improve community participation	0.9
Buildings	**4.4**
Poor physical conditions	4.4

Annex table 16.5 Science Teachers Summary

'What are the biggest problems you face as science teachers?'

All sampled schools[9].

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Teacher - related	**16.50**
Resources	**47.09**
Student - related	**12.14**
Curriculum	**6.80**
Home / Community	**8.74**
Buildings	**8.74**

[9] This includes Skeldon High, Christianburg Wismar, New Silvercity and Mackenzie.

Annex table 16.6 Science Teachers Breakdown

'What are the biggest problems you face as science teachers?'

All sampled schools.

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Teacher - related	**16.50**
Too many untrained teachers	4.85
Need more training in methodology	0.97
Science teachers should only teach science	0.97
Need more school management support	2.91
Need more incentives	5.83
Need to work co-operatively	0.97
Resources	**47.09**
Need teaching resources	12.62
Need chemicals	6.80
Need laboratory equipment	9.22
Need scientific models	5.83
Need more science books	9.71
Need a duplication machine	1.94
Need a slide projector	0.97
Student - related	**12.14**
Have a poor attitude to school work	4.85
Need more motivation	3.40
Need parental support	2.91
Should be informed of the school history	0.00
Are low ability	0.97
Curriculum	**6.80**
Need more prepared science modules	0.97
Is too rigid for all abilities	3.88
There is too little time-table time to cover syllabus	0.97
Science concepts are too difficult	0.97
Home / Community	**8.74**
Community need to be informed of the importance	1.46
Parents/community need to be more involved	7.28
Buildings	**8.74**
Need laboratories	6.80
Need lighting	0.97
Need more space	0.97

Annex table 17.1 Untrained Teachers **Summary**

'What are the biggest problems you face as teachers?'

All sampled schools[10].

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Teacher - related	**53.7**
Resources	**22.2**
Student - related	**14.8**
Curriculum	**3.7**
Home / Community	**0**
Buildings	**5.6**

[10] This includes all school except Skeldon High School, Corriverton.

Annex table 17.2 Untrained Teachers Breakdown

'What are the biggest problems you face as teachers?'

All sampled schools.

Category of Problem	Average Weighted Percentage
Teacher - related	**53.7**
Poor pedagogical skills	14.8
Poor subject knowledge	9.3
Poor motivation / salary	10.2
Lack of support from Headteachers	6.5
Lack of information from HoDs	3.7
Poor management	3.7
Large class are difficult to teach	3.7
Training with study and work is too difficult	0.9
Lesson should be more practical	0.9
Resources	**22.2**
Limited teaching materials available	22.2
Student - related	**14.8**
Have a poor attitude / behaviour in school	8.3
Have very low skill levels	6.5
Curriculum	**3.7**
Is inappropriate for all abilities	3.7
Home / Community	**0**
Buildings	**5.6**
Insanitary conditions	2.8
Poor working condtions	2.8

Annex table 18.1 Professional qualification profiles of teachers at project schools, 1998/99 (%)

SCHOOL	M/F	In-post	Cert.Ed.	Dip.Ed	B.Ed	TTC	Untrained
CORRIVERTON							
SKELDON LINE PATH	M	16	0	6.3	0	56.3	37.5
	F	10	0	0	0	30	70
	T	26	0	3.8	0	46.2	50
SKELDON HIGH	M	10	0	0	0	30	70
	F	20	0	0	0	40	60
	T	30	0	0	0	36.7	63.3
TAGORE	M	12	0	0	0	66.7	33.3
	F	14	0	0	7.1	42.9	50
	T	26	0	0	3.8	53.8	42.3
LINDEN							
CHRISTIANBURG	M	22	0	0	4.5	27.3	68.2
WISMAR	F	37	8.1	0	2.7	32.4	56.8
	T	59	5.1	0	3.4	30.5	61
MACKENZIE	M	13	14.4	7.7	15.4	30.8	38.5
	F	22	0	9.1	18.2	50	22.7
	T	35	2.9	8.6	17.1	42.9	28.6
NEW SILVER CITY	M	2	0	0	0	50	50
	F	0	0	3.8	7.7	46.2	42.3
	T	28	0	3.6	7.1	46.4	42.9
LINDEN FOUNDATION	M	6	0	0	0	33.3	66.7
	F	17	0	0	0	46.2	42.3
	T	23	0	0	13	34.8	52.5

Annex table 18.2 Qualification profiles of teachers by main subject taught at project schools1998/99 (%)

Subject	In-post	B.Ed	TTC	Untrained
English	42	9.5	54.8	31
English Lit	6	0	0	100
Maths	32	6.3	40.6	46.9
Science	15	0	53.3	40
History	7	0	28.6	57.1
Social studies	24	16.7	41.7	37.5
Geography	5	0	40	60
Physical education	8	12.5	37.5	50
Principles of business	11	0	27.3	72.7
Principles of accounting	4	0	25	75
Technical drawing	6	0	66.7	33.3
Biology	4	50	0	25
Chemistry	3	0	0	66.7
Physics	3	0	66.7	33.3
Agricultural science	12	0	50	50
Home economics	9	11.1	44.4	44.4
Industrial arts	1	0	100	0
Typewriting	2	0	50	50

Notes: Education diplomas and certificates make up residual. Other minor subjects excluded

Annex table 18.3 Work experience profiles of teachers at project schools, 1998/99 (%)

		YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE						
SCHOOL		0	1 TO 5	6 TO 10	11 TO 15	16 TO 20	21 TO 30	31+
CORRIVERTON								
SKELDON LINE PATH	M	6.3	31.3	0	12.5	18.8	25	6.3
	F	30	30	10	10	0	20	0
	T	15.4	30.8	3.8	11.5	11.5	23.1	3.8
SKELDON HIGH	M	0	30	10	30	0	30	0
	F	0	50	25	0	5	15	5
	T	0	43.3	20	10	3.3	20	33.3
TAGORE	M	8.3	33.3	8.3	0	8.3	33.3	8.3
	F	7.1	50	14.3	7.1	7.1	14.3	0
	T	7.7	42.3	11.5	3.8	7.7	23.1	3.8
LINDEN								
CHRISTIANBURG	M	22.7	54.5	4.5	0	4.5	13.6	0
WISMAR	F	16.2	45.9	13.5	5.4	8.1	10.8	0
	T	18.6	49.2	10.2	3.4	6.8	11.9	0
MACKENZIE	M	23.1	38.5	7.7	7.7	15.4	7.7	0
	F	13.6	22.7	18.2	18.2	13.6	13.6	0
	T	17.1	28.6	14.3	14.3	14.3	11.4	0
NEW SILVER CITY	M	50	50	0	0	0	0	0
	F	11.1	48.1	14.8	3.7	7.4	7.4	7.4
	T	13.8	48.3	13.8	3.4	6.9	6.9	6.9
LINDEN FOUNDATION	M	0	66.7	16.7	0	0	16.7	0
	F	5.6	55.6	5.6	0	16.7	11.1	5.6
	T	4.2	58.3	8.3	0	12.5	12.5	4.2

Annex table 18.4 **Teacher recruitment at project schools, 1996/97 and 1997/98**

	1995/96				1996/97				1997/98			
	Intake		In-post Oct 96		Intake		In-post Oct 97		Intake		In-post Oct 98	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
TRAINED GRADUATES												
Skeldon Line Path	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0				
Skeldon High	0	0	5	1	0	0	2	1				
Tagore	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0				
KW	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
M	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	3	10
NS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
LF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
UNTRAINED GRADUATES												
Skeldon Line Path	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0				
Skeldon High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Tagore	0	0	5	2	0	0	3	1				
KF	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1
M	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	1	2
NS	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
LF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TRAINED OTHER QUALIFIED												
Skeldon Line Path	1	0	9	2	0	1	7	2				
Skeldon High	2	0	4	4	1	0	6	6				
Tagoore	0	0	4	5	0	0	4	5				
KF	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	1	1	7	18
M	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	8	0	0	1	8
NS	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	0	0	1	9
LF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
UNTRAINED OTHER QUALIFIED												
Skeldon Line Path	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Skeldon High	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Tagore	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
KF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
M	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
NS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
LF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
TAM												
Skeldon Line Path												
Skeldon High	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1				
Tagore	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	14				
KF	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	3	6
M	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	5	0	0	4	6
NS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	6
LF	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
UNQUALIFIED												
Skeldon Line Path	2	7	5	10	0	0	6	12				
Skeldon High	1	4	5	5	4	0	3	5				
Tagore	0	1	2	7	0	0	1	0				
KF	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	7	7	9	8

M	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NS						2	1	4				1	4	
LF									1	5	1	1		

Notes: In-post at 1 october

Annex table 19.1 1998 CXC results for Linden project schools by gender and grade

SCHOOL	SUBJECT	MENTRY	MGD1	MGD2	MGD3	MGD4	MGD5	F ENTRY	FGD1	FGD2	FGD3	FGD4	FGD5
CHRISTIANBURG	ENG	48	0	0	2.1	16.7	60.4	65	0	0	4.6	16.9	70.8
WISMAR	MATH	18	0	0	5.6	27.8	61.1	19	0	0	5.3	5.3	84.2
	TOTAL	231	0.9	10.8	26.4	29.4	27.7	311	0.3	3.2	12.9	33.1	47
MACKENZIE	ENG	39	2.6	5.1	20.5	53.9	18	74	2.7	9.5	37.8	41.9	8.1
	MATH	25	8	16	40	24	12	60	0	11.7	37.7	34.1	12.9
	TOTAL	211	2.4	24.6	44.1	22.3	6.6	442	1.6	21.3	38.9	31.9	6.3
NEW SILVER CITY	ENG	28	0	0	0	21.4	78.6	46	0	0	15.2	21.7	63.1
	MATH	28	0	0	0	21.4	78.6	43	0	0	0	0	100
	TOTAL	125	0	3.2	22.4	34.4	40	182	1	6	17.6	27.7	47.8
LINDEN FOUNDATION	ENG	17	0	0	0	23.5	76.5	31	0	0	19.4	51.6	29
	MATH	8	0	0	0	0	100	20	0	0	10	5	85
	TOTAL												

Annex table 19.2 CXC examination results by grade at Corriverton schools, 1998 (%)

		GRADE				
SCHOOL		**I**	**II**	**III**	**IV**	**V+VI**
SLP	Eng	1.2	3.5	16.3	32.6	46.5
	Math	4.7	5.8	14	10.5	64.8
	All	2.1	10.5	20.1	32.7	34.6
SH	Eng	0	0	0	9.4	90.5
	Math	0	0	6.1	12.2	81.6
	All	0.4	5.6	18.8	24.3	56
Tagore	Eng	1.1	0	5.6	23.3	70
	Math	0	1.2	7.1	10.7	80.9
	All	0.8	3.3	10.3	21.1	64.6

Source: Examinations Division, NCERD

Annex table 19.4 Students per class, 1998/99

	STUDENTS PER CLASS			
	11 TO 20	21 TO 30	31 TO 40	40 TO 50
FORM 1				
SLP		4		
SH			4	
T			1	3
CW			5	
M		3		
S		2	1	
L	2			
FORM2				
SLP		3	1	
SH			4	
T			4	
CW			5	
M			3	
S		2	1	
L	1	1		
FORM 3				
SLP		4		
SH			4	
T		1	3	
CW		3	4	
M				3
S		4	1	
L			2	
FORM 4				
SLP		4		
SH		3	1	
T	1		1	1
CW	2	3	2	
M	2	2	1	
S		4	1	
L			1	1
FORM 5				
SLP		3	1	
SH		1	2	
T	2	2		
CW		4		
M	1	2	1	
S		2	1	
L	1			1
TOTAL	12	57	55	9
%	9	42.9	41.4	6.8

Annex table 19.5 Student attendance at project schools during second term (1998/99)

CHRISTIANBURG
WISMAR

	SESSIONS	ENROLMENTS		ATTENDANCE		MAXIMUM ATTEND		% ATTEND	
JAN		B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
	1	40	81	86	2689	3004	3240	3440	83.0	87.3
	2	40	67	96	2221	3280	2680	3840	82.9	85.4
	3	40	89	118	2787	3824	3560	4720	78.3	81.0
	4	40	68	96	1991	3114	2720	3840	73.2	81.1
	5	40	43	62	1570	2089	1720	2480	91.3	84.2
FEB							0	0		
	1	37	81	87	2610	2951	2997	3219	87.1	91.7
	2	37	67	96	2153	3141	2479	3552	86.8	88.4
	3	37	89	118	2719	3608	3293	4366	82.6	82.6
	4	37	68	96	2068	3016	2516	3552	82.2	84.9
	5	37	43	62	1394	1895	1591	2294	87.6	82.6
MARCH							0	0		
	1	25	81	87	2155	2616	2025	2175	106.4	120.3
	2	25	66	95	1778	2656	1650	2375	107.8	111.8
	3	25	87	115	2235	3015	2175	2875	102.8	104.9
	4	25	66	91	1716	2496	1650	2275	104.0	109.7
	5	25	42	59	1334	1869	1050	1475	127.0	126.7
APRIL										
	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									
	5									

MACKENZIE

	SESSIONS		ENROLMENTS		ATTENDANCE		MAXIMUM ATTEND		% ATTEND	
JAN		B		G	B	G	B	G	B	G
	1	40	54	53	2010	1994	2160	2120	93.1	94.1
	2	40	48	63	1801	2360	1920	2520	93.8	93.7
	3	40	76	55	2544	1832	3040	2200	83.7	83.3
	4	40	71	77	2240	2773	2840	3080	78.9	90.0
	5	40	48	83	1374	2802	1920	3320	71.6	84.4
FEB										
	1	38	54	53	1926	1926	2052	2014	93.9	95.6
	2	38	46	64	1726	2282	1748	2432	98.7	93.8
	3	38	76	55	2477	1778	2888	2090	85.8	85.1
	4	38	71	77	2226	2642	2698	2926	82.5	90.3
	5	38	48	83	1382	2706	1824	3154	75.8	85.8
MARCH										
	1	38	54	53	1951	1973	2052	2014	95.1	98.0
	2	38	48	64	1890	2340	1824	2432	103.6	96.2
	3	38	76	55	2579	1870	2888	2090	89.3	89.5
	4	38	71	77	2018	2530	2698	2926	74.8	86.5
	5	38	48	83	1177	2124	1824	3154	64.5	67.3
APRIL										
	1	32	54	53	1401	1381	1728	1696	81.1	81.4
	2	32	48	64	1183	1548	1536	2048	77.0	75.6
	3	32	76	55	1641	1140	2432	1760	67.5	64.8
	4	32	71	77	1361	1871	2272	2464	59.9	75.9
	5	32	48	83	968	1684	1536	2656	63.0	63.4

NEW SILVER CITY

	SESSIONS	ENROLMENTS		ATTENDANCE		MAXIMUM ATTEND		% ATTEND	
JAN		B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
	1	40	39	49 12 18	1733	1560	1960	78.1	88.4
	2	40	39	63 10 52	2142	1560	2520	67.4	85.0
	3	40	43	64 13 84	2072	1720	2560	80.5	80.9
	4	40	55	61 13 27	1971	2200	2440	60.3	80.8
	5	40	37	49 94 9	1261	1480	1960	64.1	64.3
FEB									
	1	38	34	51 93 6	1809	1292	1938	72.4	93.3
	2	38	38	63 11 69	2109	1444	2394	81.0	88.1
	3	38	43	65 13 36	2197	1634	2470	81.8	88.9
	4	38	55	61 17 65	1966	2090	2318	84.4	84.8
	5	38	37	49 89 9	1177	1406	1862	63.9	63.2
MARCH									
	1		34	51 12 64	1949				
	2		38	63 10 53	1989				
	3		43	65 12 30	2139				
	4		55	61 19 09	2073				
	5		37	49 89 4	1124				
APRIL									
	1 ?		34	51 64 7	1008				
	2		38	63 58 5	1112				
	3		43	65 61 9	1074				
	4		55	60 94 8	1044				
	5		34	47 49 1	676				

LINDEN FOUNDATION

	SESSIONS	ENROLMENTS		ATTENDANCE		MAXIMUM ATTEND		% ATTEND	
JAN		B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
	1	40	19	19	629	705	760	760	71.5	92.8
	2	40	22	19	752	670	880	760	62.7	88.2
	3	40	30	27	964	907	1200	1080	86.1	84.0
	4	40	28	30	918	1097	1120	1200	82.0	91.4
	5	40	18	33	607	1076	720	1320	84.3	81.5
FEB										
	1	38	19	19	617	665	722	722	70.6	92.1
	2	38	23	19	795	671	874	722	63.4	92.9
	3	38	33	27	994	900	1254	1026	93.4	87.7
	4	38	28	30	856	1013	1064	1140	80.5	88.9
	5	38	18	33	543	1003	684	1254	79.4	80.0
MARCH										
	1	42	19	19	701	752	798	798	72.6	94.2
	2	42	23	19	901	749	966	798	65.0	93.9
	3	42	33	29	1149	1099	1386	1218	97.7	90.2
	4	42	28	30	928	1125	1176	1260	78.9	89.3
	5	42	18	33	627	1094	756	1386	82.9	78.9
APRIL										
	1	24	19	19	340	384	456	456	74.6	84.2
	2	24	23	19	440	394	552	456	79.7	86.4
	3	24	33	29	500	507	792	696	63.1	72.8
	4	24	27	30	497	579	648	720	76.7	80.4
	5	24	18	32	354	604	432	768	81.9	78.6

Annex Table 19.6 Student attendance at project schools during second term 1998/99

	FORM 1		FORM 2		FORM 3		FORM 4		FORM 5	
SCHOOL	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
CORRIVERTON										
SKELDON LINE										
PATH										
SKELDON HIGH	75.6	82.1	74.4	73.2	75.6	74.3	70.4	96.9	70.8	80.7
TAGORE										
LINDEN										
CHRISTIANBURG WISMAR										
MACKENZIE										
NEW SILVER CITY										
LINDEN										
FOUNDATION										

Annex table 20.1: Tracer Survey, All Corriverton schools

Activity	Skeldon Line Path boys	Skeldon Line Path girls	Skeldon High boys	Skeldon High girls	Tagore boys	Tagore girls	Total boys	Total girls	**Total**
Employed									
Teacher	4	8	1	3	6	11	11	22	33
Farmer	2	0	0	0	4	0	6	0	6
artisan (skilled worker)	1	0	2	0	2	0	5	0	5
shop/salesperson	0	3	0	1	3	2	3	6	9
clerk (including in bank)	1	1	0	3	1	2	2	6	8
military/police	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	3
librarian	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2
labourer	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
driver/conductor	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
chemist/nurse/doctor	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	2
administrator	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2
Guyana Sugar Company	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2
Other	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Self-employed/family	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2
Studying									
university/college	5	13	5	2	2	0	12	15	27
private/secondary/"repeating"	0	1	1	2	0	3	1	6	7
Housekeeper/married/at home	0	4	0	20	0	2	0	26	26
Unemployed/"doing nothing"	9	2	2	9	9	20	20	31	51
Migrated			1				1	0	1
Georgetown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Overseas	0	0	2	2	0	11	2	13	15
other/unknown where	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	8	1	4	0	0	1	12	13
Totals	23	42	18	50	32	52	73	144	217

Annex table 20.2 Tracer Survey: All Linden schools

Activity	Christianburg W. boys	Christianburg W. girls	MacKenzie High boys	MacKenzie High girls	New Silver City boys	New Silver City girls	Linden Foundation boys	Linden Foundation girls	Total boys	Total girls	Total total
Employed	2	3	15	7	4	0	0	0	21	10	31
Teacher	11	8	10	22	3	5	0	5	24	40	64
artisan (skilled worker)	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	4
shop/salesperson	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	6	6
clerk (including in bank)	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3
military/police	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2
labourer	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
farmer	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
chemist/nurse/laboratory ass't	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4
administrator	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	5
other	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Self-employed/family	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	3	8
Studying											
university/college	6	6	18	16	5	1	9	7	38	32	70
private/secondary/"repeating"	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	16	17
Housekeeper/married/at home	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	4	5
Unemployed/"doing nothing"	6	21	1	3	5	4	3	15	15	43	58
Migrated											
Georgetown	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	4
Overseas	0	0	2	6	3	0	0	0	5	6	11
other/unknown where	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Deceased	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Unknown	18	33	11	11	2	28	1	1	31	71	102
Totals	58	89	59	66	26	46	19	40	161	241	402