

TOWARDS UNIVERSAL SECONDARY EDUCATION

**A CONSULTANCY REPORT BY THE
GUYANA EDUCATION ACCESS PROJECT**

**“AN AUDIT OF PROGRESS TO DATE & DESIGN
OF AN IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY”**

Michael Latham

December 2002

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

ALP	Alternative Learning Pathway
BCCP	Basic Competence Certificate Programme
CHS	Community High School
CPCE	Cyril Potter College of Education
CSEC	Common Secondary Examination Certificate
EDP	Education Development Plan
ESP	Education Strategy Plan
GEAP	Guyana Education Access Project
GOG	Government of Guyana
GSS	Government Secondary School
MoE	Ministry of Education
NTFE	National Third Form Examination
P/T	Primary Tops
REDOs	Regional Education Officers
SBA	School Based Assessment
SETT	Secondary Education Task Team
SIMs	School Information Management Systems
SIPs	School Improvement Plans
SSRP	Secondary School Reform Project
SSEE	Secondary School Entrance Examination
UoG	University of Guyana
USE	Universal Secondary Education

Contents

Contents	3
List of Boxes	3
List of Tables	3
List of Annexes	3
Executive Summary	4
I. Introduction	5
II. Framework for Audit of the USE Process	7
- The Policy Levers	7
- The Local Challenges	15
III. Towards an Implementation Strategy	18
- The Process of Reform	19
- The Key Intervention Points	20
- Conclusion	23
IV. Conclusions	25
V. Recommendations	28
List of Boxes	
Box 1: Options following Form 4	10
Box 2: Policy on the Quality of Teachers in Secondary Schools	10
Box 3: Characteristics of USE	20
List of Tables	
Table 1: Key Intervention Point 1 – Administrative Development	21
Table 2: Key Intervention Point 2 – Teacher Training	22
Table 3: Key Intervention Point 1 – Motivation and Commitment	23
Table 4: Dilemmas and Constraints against Implementation	24
Table 5: The Process towards the USE Action Plan	27
List of Annexes	
Annex 1: Priorities for Resolution under the USE Action Plan	30
Annex 2: A Preliminary List of Achievements to date	33
Annex 3: Indicative List of Activities to be completed by September 2003	35

Executive Summary

The Government of Guyana (GOG) recognises the urgent need to revitalise the quality of educational services through a combination of improved resource utilisation, strengthened management and organisational systems, selective rationalisation of operations and the provision of additional well-targeted resources. Universal Secondary Education (USE) is a high-profile objective for the Ministry of Education (MoE) within its recently completed Education Strategy Plan (ESP) for the period 2003 – 2007.

Specific USE-related objectives within the ESP include:

- the conversion of non-Government Secondary Schools into GSSs;
- the gradual amalgamation of Primary TOPs as a preliminary step towards conversion of these into Secondary Schools;
- a partial abandonment of Secondary School Entrance Examination's (SSEE) current role as the key allocation mechanism for placing Primary leavers into Secondary Schools in favour of a catchment related structure;
- further curriculum reform, including the implementation of a more vocational / technical programme for Secondary students as an alternative learning pathway.

This report is the first part of a proposed ongoing process to support the development of a full USE implementation strategy.

Chapters II and III present a comprehensive framework which will permit a review of progress to date towards USE and upon which the development of the implementation strategy can be based, beginning with the production of a fully costed USE Action Plan by September 2003.

Chapter IV provides a brief assessment of progress to date while Chapter V offers some specific recommendations for ensuring that certain key activities are underway by particular dates.

Annex I specifies priorities that need to be resolved; Annex 2 provides a list of achievements to date and Annex 3 provides a list of activities that need to be completed by September 2003.

The consultant reviewed progress to date towards USE, meeting key officials from the MoE in order to carry out the audit. Meetings were held: at the central Ministry with the Permanent Secretary, the Chief Education Officer, the Chief Planning Officer and Deputy Chief Education Officer, Development; at the regional level with the Regional Education Officer for Region 3 and the Regional Secondary officers for Regions 3 and Georgetown; and, in addition, visits were made to three secondary schools. Discussions were also held with staff involved in the Secondary School Reform Project and the Guyana Education Access Project.

The consultancy sought to investigate the properties of large-scale reform envisaged under USE and to identify the conditions under which USE reform will succeed. Crucial questions to address include:

- How can a centrally created government initiative best motivate educators to change their practices in line with the reform initiatives?
- What inputs and opportunities must be provided in order for these educators in the field to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills?
- What mechanisms are in place which will allow modification to the elements of USE as a response to information about progress and challenges?
- What contexts or conditions must be built to sustain the motivation and capacity for change?

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 *Background*

1.1.1 Universal Secondary Education (USE) Strategy is a comprehensive government reform effort aimed at improving educational quality and enhancing student performance. It supports change through planned improvement in the educational system aimed at teaching practice, learning resources, structure and organisation. A key tenet of USE is the replacement by 2005 of the current three tiered education system with Government Secondary Schools (GSS), Community High Schools (CHS) and ‘all age’ Primary schools, or Primary Tops (P/T) into a single GSS system.¹

1.1.2 The objective of USE is to provide equality and access to a high quality five-year secondary education for all primary school leavers. A pre-requisite for attaining this objective is to be clear as to what the terms equality, access and quality mean. This will impact on what is attainable, by when, across the following four interrelated components:

- *Improvement in the quality of education* - curriculum development; teaching and learning strategies; supporting resources; professional development; testing, assessment & evaluation;
- *Equity* – deshifting; rehabilitation and upgrading of school infrastructure by building new & refurbishing old secondary schools to a minimum level of quality;
- *Institutional strengthening* – education management and improved internal operational efficiencies; and
- *Studies and measures* for improved sector performance necessary for building a platform for ongoing development and improvement within the system.

1.1.3 The proposal mandated under the Ministry of Education’s Strategic Plan 2003-2007 is to accomplish USE in Guyana by 2005, but in essence the educational change process has already begun on a number of fronts: 21 Community High Schools have been designated as Government Secondary Schools (GSS), 12 pilot schools under the World Bank funded Secondary School Reform Programme (SSRP) operate as new Government Secondary Schools and the DfID funded Guyana Education Access Project (GEAP) has been exploring a number of different options for improving secondary education in the two pilot areas of Regions 6 and 10.

1.1.4 This report draws on that ongoing practical experience and on an understanding gained from the literature and first hand discussions with Guyanese educators at the central and school levels, in order to:

- (i) develop an indicative framework for reviewing the content and structure of the overall initiative to date;

¹ Annually 16,000 pupils write the Secondary Schools Entrance Examination (SSEE) but only 60 percent are placed into General Secondary Schools and Community High Schools. The remaining 40% are placed in the secondary departments of the Primary schools. (Data extracted from page 1 of the “Towards Universal Secondary Education” Policy Paper. 2002.)

- (ii) identify those programme design and implementation strategy characteristics that are associated with implementation success;
- (iii) assist in the process of USE implementation through providing recommendations that support a phased approach to the development of a USE Action Plan by mid-2003.

1.2 Overview

1.2.1 The following Chapter provides an indicative framework for reviewing the Universal Secondary Education process. The aim of the framework is to enable a two-stage audit of progress toward design and implementation of USE: Stage 1 looks at progress at the national level and considers the policy levers that are creating the conditions for implementation within which this change in the secondary sub sector will occur; Stage 2 looks briefly at the main challenges that need to be addressed for implementing a radical reform such as USE.

1.2.2 Chapter III describes the analytical procedures and methods needed for the development of an implementation strategy. So often the approach to large-scale reform emphasises programme adoption rather than implementation, curriculum change rather than institutional strengthening and dissemination rather than application. This Chapter highlights the complexity and length of the educational change process and places a particular focus on the specific intervention points that will be critical for success.

1.2.3 Chapters IV and V then provide conclusions and recommendations. Chapter IV focuses on a brief assessment of USE to date and an outline for a possible phased approach to the production of a USE Action Plan by June 2003, while Chapter V offers a number of specific actions needed to get the approach under way.

1.2.4 Overarching the two frameworks - one to enable the audit and the other to examine the barriers ahead in the implementation phase - is the premise that to be successful in a reform of the magnitude envisaged under USE, centralised actions need to build and sustain a comprehensive infrastructure. This infrastructure, in turn, needs to support change in the classroom and school practice, by motivating educators, building their capacity to implement the reforms and fostering the development of school cultures that will sustain improved practices. These frameworks provide a guide for data collection, support thinking about how the USE Strategy has been conceived as policy levers and enable forward planning as to how the changes desired under USE can best be delivered and sustained by those in the field.

II A FRAMEWORK FOR AUDIT OF THE USE PROCESS

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The proposed Audit Framework highlights different aspects of large-scale reform efforts that appear to make a difference in altering school and classroom practice, both at the level of central policy levers and at the level of local challenges for implementation in school and regional authorities. Eight policy levers and three main local challenges are briefly introduced, followed by an initial assessment of USE progress so far, and finally an outline of priorities for immediate further action.

2.1.2 The eight *Policy Levers* are:

- Vision and goals for the reform and for the education of the pupils
- Standards for judging performance of pupils and others within the education system
- Curriculum frameworks and other instructional resources to assist in meeting the standards
- Focus on teaching and learning, including teacher learning and education management
- Coherent, integrated policies that are aligned in support of the initiative
- Planning, management and accountability
- Sufficient funding and
- Workable governance structures.

2.1.3 The three *Local Challenges* are:

- *Motivation* : the willingness to put effort into implementing the strategy for USE
- *Capacity* : the skills and understandings that individuals bring to their work with USE
- *Situation* : the extent to which a school's organisational context will enable appropriate changes in practice.

2.2 The Policy Levers

2.2.1 Policy Lever 1 "Vision and Goals"

The 4 core themes below are highlighted in the literature and in discussions with senior officials:

Core Themes • Urgency about the need for reform; • Realisation that the status quo is not working; • Appreciation that education is an integral part of the solution; • Concern about equity.

For example, the Strategic Plan (2003-2017) outlines particular policies that stress these themes:

- a) Placement of students – *by 2005 the Government will provide access to at least five years of secondary schooling for all primary school leavers.* (Page 13). At present schooling is compulsory to age 14.5 and all students should complete primary plus at least two years of secondary school.

- b) Removing inequalities – *Government remains committed to removing or significantly reducing remaining inequalities of educational and financial provision.* (Page 14). Inequalities that are presently exacerbated by the system that funnels those who do not enter GSS into the Primary Tops (P/Ts) or into the Community High School (CHS) and their more vocationally oriented curricula.

A Mission Statement for USE is given in the Secondary Education Policy Paper “Towards Universal Secondary Education” (page 1):

Entitlement, quality, achievement and accountability represent the Ministry of Education’s commitment to providing as an entitlement, a high quality secondary education for all primary school leavers, with the expectation of success that reflects the ability, aptitude and interests of the individual leavers.

But this change to a unitary secondary education system requires clearly defined long-term goals, within which medium- & short-term benchmarks need to be expressed in greater detail. For example, the Strategic Plan says that it will implement the proposed changes in a phased manner, starting with the Community High Schools and then moving to amalgamate Primary TOPs to form new secondary institutions. Hence the priorities under this first Policy Lever are:

- 1. To develop the plan with clear targets to meet agreed minimum criteria of equality, quality and access by the year 2005²***
- 2. To present the USE Action Plan publicly to all stakeholders, ie. teachers, administrators, beneficiaries (students) and clients (parents)***
- 3. To agree completion dates for Regional USE Plans which link to and synergise with the National USE Plan?***

2.2.2 Policy Lever 2 “Standards for Judging Performance”

Standards are elusive concepts that can result in an over-focus on attaining test results rather than improving actual learning. The GOG/MOE has addressed this issue through the proposed development of a range of instruments that will report on learners’ progress:

- school-based assessments administered during each school term;
- regional examinations including School Based Assessment (SBA) for Forms 1 and 2 administered during the last term of the school year;
- National Third Form Examinations including the SBA at the end of Form 3;
- school-based assessments administered during Forms 4 and 5 to determine the level of the individual student’s entry to the Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (CSEC) and
- the proposed Basic Competency Certificate Programme (BCCP) in Form 4.

² It is also understood that by June 2003 the USE Action Plan will also have to enumerate the number of secondary students that shall still be unable to enter a GSS that meets the agreed criteria by September 2005 and specify what is being done on their behalf.

In comparison with now, under USE schools will have more and higher-quality data available about what standards of quality represent in practice, thus facilitating key decisions, eg. which stream or learning pathway to place students in as they move from Form 3 to Form 4. Teachers and parents will also need to believe that reforms and new standards will contribute to the desired improvement in examination results. The following questions are critical to this Policy Lever:

1. *When will the proposed new National Accreditation Board be able to validate the new BCCP curriculum and any associated examinations upon completion of Form 4?*
2. *The BCCP should be relevant to all stakeholders and have currency within Guyana, CARICOM and hopefully the international education system. What time allocation is considered adequate for ensuring that BCCP fulfils its promise as a true alternative qualification and not a stop gap exercise in expediency?*
3. *When will it be possible to publish annual & meaningful targets for students taking the NTFE, CSEC, BCCP examination and/or any other national assessment instruments?*

2.2.3 Policy Lever 3 “Curriculum Frameworks”

The provision of the new Foundation curriculum for Forms 1-3, the new Alternative Learning Pathway for Form 4 and the pedagogical resources for teachers to support both new curricula will be vital components of the USE strategy from the outset. The activity has begun, most particularly with SSRP’s production of the new Form 1-3 Foundation Curriculum, but the activity cannot stop there. Through 2003, 2004 and beyond, programmes and modules will be required to support identified priorities or to provide additional support in dealing with particular groups of pupils (such as those with special educational needs).

The timeline for developing the curriculum and the modules is extremely tight, especially given the mandate to introduce the ALP by the start of September 2003. The priorities for this Curriculum policy lever are:

1. *When will a catalogue of teaching, learning & support materials be developed and issued in order to assist schools to access the resources they need?*
2. *Has sufficient provision been made for the design of materials to support particular pupils?*
3. *How does the decision to have only a one year ALP programme in Form 4 followed by the three options outlined in Box 1 marry with the mandate for all secondary age students to have a five year secondary education?*

Box 1: Options following Form 4 for students on the BCCP Programme

BCCP student graduates and continues in the secondary system → CXC year 1 or 2 in Mathematics / English / Industrial Technology / Home Economics / Visual Arts / Social Studies / Integrated Science or any available subject for which they show aptitude. Year of entry dependent on attainment grade at the end of BCCP.
BCCP student graduates and exits Secondary System end of Form 4 to → Technical Institute or equivalent Craft level course, apprenticeship training and/or employment
CSEC student continues in the secondary system → Continues into year 2 dependent on year 1 attainment.

2.2.4 Policy Lever 4

“Focus on Teaching and Learning”

Box 2: Policy on the Quality of Teachers in Secondary Schools

The Ministry of Education is committed to ensuring that:

- By 2006, the teaching staff of every secondary schools will have a minimum of 50% secondary trained teachers;
- By 2010 there will be a 50% increase over the 2002 number of trained teachers in secondary schools;
- A trained teacher-student ration of 1:40 is maintained in all secondary schools.

Source: Secondary Education Policy Paper “Towards Universal Secondary Education” (Page 8)

USE Strategy must always focus in on classroom teaching - through the curriculum, materials, training and support for teachers. Research has consistently shown that changes in learning come from changes in teaching. *A good curriculum with a bad teacher will produce a poor student, whereas a bad curriculum with a good teacher is more likely to produce a successful student.*

The USE process has started in the pilot initiatives described in Chapter 1. Have the USE-oriented training and materials in these pilots become more differentiated to match the increased diversity of the USE student population? These pilots have in fact already illustrated the inevitable tension embedded in the USE Strategy, *a tension between seeing unitary secondary education as an entitlement for all children and acknowledging the varied learning needs of different groups of children.* Indeed USE has been developed upon the assumption that all secondary age children should participate in the Foundation three year programme while acknowledging that some children will require differentiated support and assigned learning tasks.

In respect to the interventions regarding differentiation of teaching and the development of intervention programmes, the critical questions are:

- 1. Can the Action Plan develop a matrix of activities in 3-year cycles, with concomitant costs, required to achieve the targets set out in Box 2?**
- 2. Can the extensive programmes of training and support that are proposed be extended to allow for diverse teaching situations, eg. students with special needs or students whose progress may be slower than their peers?**

Strengthening teacher learning has to be a key goal for USE, with a major proportion of the overall funding being allocated to training and support. Professional development sessions are going to be required, delivered by trainers who are knowledgeable about the new curricula, and have a particular understanding of the issues of literacy and numeracy and opportunities for sharing good practice and solving implementation problems. In addition to providing more training for those already in the profession, the USE Strategy will need to strengthen links with institutions that train new teachers.

For in-service and pre-service training needs, the critical questions are:

1. ***When can a firm commitment be given as to the sourcing of the financial and human resources needed to support Continuous Professional Development (CPD) at the central, regional or (ideally) school level?***³
2. ***What analysis is being carried out to map out the specific needs of the teachers in the schools that are changing their status? For example, has there been any study carried out yet that is specifically aimed at gathering data on the hurdles that have been faced by teachers in the initial cohort of 21 CHS schools?***
3. ***Is the USE training that is being given for Headteachers and teachers in the 21 CHS being prepared in such a manner that it can be reproduced and amended for use during the incremental Primary TOPs amalgamation process?***
4. ***Are programmes being developed at CPCE & UG to ensure that newly qualified teachers enter secondary schools equipped to teach a different curricula and a different clientele?***
5. ***Is it possible to revisit the option whereby Primary certified teachers train to be qualified secondary teachers without going through the full Secondary training programme?***

2.2.5 Policy Lever 5 “Coherent Integrated Policies”

Consistency, coherence and integration with other agencies and policies are difficult to achieve. This difficulty is evidenced in the following quote from the Strategic Plan:

There is still some dissonance between the MoE and agencies such as the Minister of Finance and the Public Service Ministry, which have overarching national responsibilities. This can sometimes lead to problems, for example, less efficient allocation of funds, bottlenecks in the ward of contracts, and delays in filling important positions within the MoE.” (Page 9)

Efforts at integration must be part of the USE Strategy from the outset, aiming at a high degree of alignment across different MOE departments and between different Ministries. From the perspective of central government, USE is part of a larger plan for systemic reform of the education system. USE is seen as a powerful tool for ‘levelling up’ and for improving the quality of teaching and learning. Different groups, however, will view USE through personal and local lenses, seeing what it means for them and their school. Teachers, for example, will need to be convinced that this unification is more than merely ‘one more edict’ from central office.

A further key issue for USE that affects MoE and other Ministries (eg. Finance) is the need to provide more subject specialist teachers capable of teaching to the level of CSEC. GoG must review its recruitment policy for secondary school trainees and set targets for recruitment, in each of the specialist areas, at the five CPCE In-Service Centres.⁴ This inter-ministerial review will need to make recommendations on how the throughput of secondary trained teachers can be increased based on a baseline of a specific percentage of trained teachers by subject per secondary school.

³ In 2002, on account of a shortfall in funding, the secondary department had to drastically downsize the delivery of the planned in-service training for teachers in the 21 CHS that had become GSS. Further, much of this training was unfortunately being delivered some months after the change of status.

⁴ SSRP data shows that in 2001 only 69 secondary teacher trainees enrolled for training in the 5 CPC In-Service Centres in September while only 71 persons enrolled at the CPCE pre-service centre for training as secondary teachers. A total of 140 qualified teachers will thus be available to the secondary school system.

The key questions for this Policy Level to address are thus:

- 1. What percentage of trained specialist teachers by subject should be allocated to each secondary school over the respective 3-year project cycles?**
- 2. Given the difficulty staff at the Regional offices and schools may have in divorcing their own personal feelings about USE from their professional roles under pressures from the parents or teachers, who has the responsibility for ensuring that the message is clear and unilateral and that non-compliance is not an option?**
- 3. Who is in charge of the planning and dissemination of national awareness campaigns?**

2.2.6 Policy Lever 6 “Accountability and Incentives”

The focus on school improvement will require the development of many procedures and mechanisms to monitor the work of schools. Indeed, monitoring of progress that leads to adjustments in pressure and support are a vital component of the USE drive. There are possible unintended effects, however, by relying on only a few indicators (such as the CSEC or BCCP) since these measures cannot fully capture all the important dimensions of USE. One immediately significant dimension, for example, is the psychological effect on students who have now got an opportunity for a five-year secondary education. An equally significant psychological dimension that requires monitoring is whether the Alternative Pathway is seen by students and parents as a valid entry into the world of work (whether public or private sector).

Much depends on the nature of the tests - a test that requires pupils to produce complete pieces of writing is less problematic than a multiple choice standardised test focussing on the recall of facts. For USE, the increased emphasis on curricular targets and identifying the next appropriate learning for specific groups of children will help to broaden the focus. The key is to gain evidence that children of all levels have improved, i.e. the percentage of pupils getting the lowest scores has declined while the percentage reaching Form 5 has increased.

Priority questions to address under this Policy Lever include:

- 1. What procedures are in place to monitor performance on the different groups of pupils as part of the USE Strategy?**
- 2. School Information Management systems (SIMs) have been initiated under SSRP, but there has been no (or only partial) crossover into schools outside the project. Should there be a mandate to all Regional Education Departments that all school collect data according to the SIMs framework by 2005?**
- 3. Should there be a specific Information Secretariat established for USE?**
- 4. Which department has the responsibility for setting the curricular targets for the different groups at the five different Form levels?**
- 5. Improvement on the retention rate is one measure of performance for USE, but what other measures can be deployed that measure characteristics such as student ‘enjoyment’ of learning or teacher ‘satisfaction’ in the profession?**
- 6. Should there be a mandate that all secondary schools submit their School Improvement Plans to the Regional Education Offices by 2005?**

- 7. Should there be a mandate that all Regional Education Offices submit their Education Development Plans (EDP) to the central ministry; and further, that the Offices should be held accountable through the respective Regional Education Sub Committees for attaining designated performance indicators that have been agreed to under these EDPs?**
- 8. What system has been designed to ensure that assistance and support are directed at schools that are not meeting the targets?**

2.2.7 Policy Lever 7 “Funding”

Any undertaking the size of USE requires a major allocation of resources and attention to the kind of infrastructure that will be required not only to establish the reforms but also to sustain them over time⁵. Striking the appropriate balance between the existing structures and creating new ones is difficult. Ultimately, decisions need to be made on a new or modified process for longer-term efficiency and sustainability. In addition, over the long term funding will probably need to feature new procedures although it is not yet clear what such arrangements might be⁶.

Even with substantial amounts of money devoted to efforts to enable universal secondary education, these amounts will appear ‘thin’ when policies are expected to produce significant changes in national teaching and learning practice over all Guyana’s secondary schools.

Funding policies need to be consistent with the reform efforts, hence within this policy level the following are critical questions:

- 1. With the proposed national School Mapping Exercise set for early 2003, will it be possible to have a secondary education budget ready for submission to the Ministry of Finance that specifically addresses the four interrelated components (improving quality –equity – institutional strengthening - measures for sector improvement) by August 2003?**
- 2. Given the introduction of BCCP in September 2003, can specific funds be vired within the current annual budget to support the delivery of the new ALP in the selected pilot schools?**
- 3. A major aim of the SSRP Education Finance and Budget Reform Report was to establish funding procedures which are more equitable, contribute to school performance and are based on functions to be carried out by local authorities and schools. The initiative is presently being trialled in six schools. Should a significant goal of USE be to implement a per capita formula funding system managed by School Boards in all secondary schools by a specified date?**
- 4. Given the per capita funding system, could there be a pilot study that trialled school-based training, delivered by MoE accredited private education suppliers paid for out of the individual school’s budget?**

⁵ A number of finance studies have been conducted, such as: ‘The Secondary Education Finance Study’ (GEAP- 2001), ‘Fiscal Implications of the Proposed Universal Secondary in Guyana - A Note’ (WB - 2001) and ‘Education Finance and Budget Reform’ (SSRP - 2001/2002).

⁶ The SSRP Finance Study proposes financial reforms that restructure the financing of education through the establishment of School Boards and funding based on a per capita funding. The GEAP Study assessed the per capita student cost in secondary schools in Regions 6 and 10 and proposed the breakdown of annual expenditure for an 800 persons model school. The WB Note posited three scenarios for reaching USE by manipulating different variables such as student pupil ratios and staggering the absorption of CHEs and P/Ts into Government Secondary Schools on different time schedules.

The four priorities itemised above relate to funding at the central level, the three priorities below refer to funding at the other two tiers – the regional and school levels:

5. *What provision has been made for the Regional Education bodies to retain an amount of funding for targeted support of USE according to agreed criteria?*
6. *Under USE, will there be greater flexibility for Regional Education departments to utilise their funds across different line items, such as from capital works to training?*
7. *The GEAP and SSRP Finance Studies both mentioned the difficulty of accessing financial data on income and expenditure in a uniform manner at regional & school levels. When will funding procedures at the regional and individual school levels be accessible in a uniform and transparent manner?*

2.2.8 Policy Lever 8 “Workable Governance Structures”

Governance structures are required that integrate pressure and support, provide coherence and balance central and local capacity building and innovation. It is important at this delicate stage of USE implementation that the government is not seen as dominating a relationship characterised as ‘top-down’, ie. ‘you will do what we say’. In practice, management of USE across the country will be led by the Regional Education Officers (REdOs). They will be the focus of support and pressure, particularly in relation to schools requiring the most assistance. They must be required to produce Education Development Plans and must be held accountable for their work in delivering USE.

Key, immediate questions to address under this Policy Lever are:

1. *When will the USE Strategy have its own workable structure in which there is a particular Task Group with the specific mandate to lead in the planning and ongoing implementation of USE?*
2. *Is the Secondary Education Task Team (SETT) an existing Task Group that could take on this mandate?*
3. *Would SETT have the role & mandate to co-ordinate Working Groups in areas of importance, eg. finance, buildings, teacher supply, training, public awareness, administration and personnel?*
4. *Should a fulltime USE Coordinator be appointed to assist SETT in its mandate?*
5. *There is a lack of capacity, and perhaps even capability in some instances, for the difficult task of developing and delivering the USE Vision within the Regional Education Departments. How therefore can USE Regional Task Forces be convened such that they share ownership of the overall Strategy and address the specific dynamics of their own Region at the same time?*
6. *Should there be USE packs developed by the MoE for Regions and schools that can assist them with the process of gazetting of new secondary schools?*

2.3 The Local Challenges

The three local challenges (motivation, capacity and situation) are not so much priorities to be addressed as constraints to be considered. They are important challenges in which the political mandate from the top must be matched with educational reality at the chalk face. The Framework holds that teacher motivation, capacity and the contexts or situation in which they work have a direct effect on school and classroom practices. These practices in turn impact upon what the pupils learn. Leadership or management practices of key officials such as the REO, District Education Officer Secondary, School Headteacher, etc., have both a direct and indirect impact upon classroom practices. What these officials do and how they do it impacts on teachers' and students' motivation, capacity and work environment.

This Chapter concludes with a brief description of each of the challenges and suggestions as to how the respective challenges can be overcome.

2.3.1 Local Challenge 1 “Motivation”

“In large scale reform, particularly in the early stages, governments need to “think big, start big.” They can push accountability, provide incentives (pressure and support), and foster capacity building. If they only do the first two, they can get results that are real but not particularly deep or lasting. To have a good chance of going the distance, they need to do all three.”⁷

School administrators' and teachers' motivation is a function of their goals, their beliefs about their own capacities, and about how supportive the context is in which they work. If teachers feel pressured to adopt USE out of compliance rather than conviction about the possible value that the new curricula bring, the value of USE will be diminished. Teachers and Headteachers in the schools need incentives in order for them to become engaged in the reform. Consideration, for instance, could be given to the provision of incentives for trained secondary teachers who choose to teach in new GSSs, especially newly converted Primary TOPs. Finally, from the perspective of the senior education leaders, it is important to achieve and display early successes as well as to maintain continuity and stability during the inevitable times of turbulence.

2.3.2 Local Challenge 2 “Capacity and Manageability”

There are two key manageability issues – national management structures and school workload or overload issues. The current management structures are constrained by the lack of officers in certain posts and the substantial number of officers in acting rather than substantive positions. Manageability in the sense of overload is presently a serious issue at senior staff levels in Central MoE and in the Regional Education Departments. The burden for these personnel will undoubtedly increase further if USE is to entail more than merely changing the acronym of the CHS and P/T to that of GSS.

⁷ Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change*, 3rd edition. New York: Teachers College Press.

A key goal of USE is to enhance the capacity of teachers to teach the four core CSEC subjects so that all secondary school students acquire the fundamental building blocks for further education, training or the workplace. It has become clear in several of the pilot USE projects that many teachers are themselves not sufficiently knowledgeable about the subjects they teach. As a result, continuing professional development inputs often focus on remedial teaching of content rather than on introducing alternative methodologies such as interactive teaching and the use of continuous assessment. *Thus substantial and ongoing investments in capacity development are going to be essential.* In addition, it will be necessary to make extensive use of assessment data to track the progress of individual children in order to obtain a measure of ‘value added’ by the school and to inform both the teachers’ planning and their own ongoing development.

2.3.3 Local Challenge 3 “Situation”

The situation (or workplace) interacts with motivation and capacity to influence the extent to which the reform efforts will actually be implemented in the schools. Interesting lessons were learnt in this regard from the GEAP work on amalgamation in Regions 10, eg:

- *A major area that Linden failed to anticipate fully was the change in dynamics as a result of bringing students and teachers together from a range of Primary Tops institutions. This resulted in serious problems for the administrative staff at school and regional level as conflicts arose among teachers and these conflicts were transmitted to students.*
- *A key consideration that was not fully appreciated was the extent to which demand and enthusiasm would result in requests from Form 4 and 5 students to remain in the system and complete CSEC.*⁸

Two final comments in relation to the challenge of situation or organisational capacity: firstly, there will be a continual need for training because of the high staff turnover in many schools; secondly, there will be considerable variability among schools in the extent to which they are able to fully engage parents in the learning of their children. School Improvement Plans and the process that they entail provide an important opportunity to meet these two constraints. SIPs will broaden the base of leadership within a school. Management teams will need to work on organisational and planning issues as well as setting core principles and aims for the schools. Teachers in turn must take on roles for their respective departments, observe classroom teaching and make suggestions for improvement and use assessment data for planning purposes.

2.3.4 Conclusion

Chapter II has introduced the eight policy levers and three main local challenges which together provide a framework for (a) evaluating progress towards USE (b) developing specifications that need to be incorporated within the USE Action Plan.

⁸ Extracted from an as yet unpublished GEAP Theme Paper on Primary Top Amalgamation and Secondary Expansion.

The Table in ***Annex One*** provides a summary of the eight policy levers and the forty-one priorities that were identified for resolution in the development of the Action Plan.

The Table in ***Annex Two*** provides a summary of some of the activities that have already been conducted in support of USE. It is important to stress however that neither Table is intended to provide an exhaustive list of either priorities or activities to date. Further work is required in order to refine the list of priorities and to determine a broader audit of the achievements to date.

III. TOWARDS AN IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Introduction

3.1 Policies and practices for the design and implementation of education reform projects are generally based on a model that is appropriate for infrastructure. This model emphasis details identification and costing of project inputs and the careful planning for their timely delivery over a specified timeframe. This model is based on three assumptions:

- it considers the technology of the innovation – the selection of programme objectives and inputs to be the dominant variable affecting outcomes;
- organisations are seen as rational and goal-oriented institutions that are pursuing policies that aim at maximising economic returns; and
- it is assumed that programme design can be standardised and transferred across large numbers of beneficiaries while producing essentially the same outcomes.

3.1.1 Educational change is a complex process that does not fit comfortably into such a prescriptive model. Rather the technology of the USE programme is tentative and the some of the outcomes cannot be known with any degree of certainty. The reactions of teachers and students for instance in the three different types of schools will differ and be difficult to predict while what works in Region 4 may well not work in Region 6. Thus the distinction between the USE policy levers that are necessary during the planning process and the actual implementation practices that are used in the schools will become blurred.

3.1.2 In order to meet with this disconnect between the traditional approach to project design and implementation, this Chapter has taken into account four key considerations for the development of an implementation strategy for USE; these considerations include:

- a) Implementation, the most critical phase that has the most impact on success or failure, should be given top priority;
- b) Effective administrative infrastructures are a precondition for the implementation of the USE programme;
- c) Project designs must be flexible and have provisions within them for incremental change; and
- d) Attention needs to be paid at the outset to the eventual institutionalisation of the changes envisaged under USE.

3.1.3 The implementation strategy therefore will need to emphasise curriculum development and dissemination but it will place an equal emphasis upon the administrative and school environment (the three local challenges introduced in Chapter 1). Further the strategy will aim at comprehensive change but it will adopt a phased implementation strategy that allows for experimentation and testing in the early phases. The substantial curriculum and teacher training interventions will obviously be included but they will be combined with support for administrative and management training and the provision of educational materials and

appropriate facilities. The end result is a multi-faceted design composed of several objectives that are in turn supported by a mix of interventions.

The Process of Reform under USE

3.2 There are two particular areas of significance to consider under the *process of reform* as

- (i) the phase of the change and
- (ii) the factors surrounding the educational change

impact upon the design and strategy for implementation.

Phases of Change

3.3 There are perhaps three specific phases of implementation:

Initiation

3.3.1 This is the mobilisation phase that consists of the events leading up to and including the decision to adopt a reform. This Phase is nearing completion although the Framework for the audit has clearly indicated that there were still crucial gaps in this phase that need filling.

3.3.2 This phase included the planning process in which programme objectives were selected, priorities were assigned and strategies for implementation were determined. This phase also included the translation of these broad programme objectives into specific policy actions and investments that allow the achievement of the strategic USE objectives.

3.3.3 For the most part this Phase has followed the infrastructure model in that it has emphasised a detailed preparation of specifications for inputs, costs and implementation schedule. The outcome of this Phase is contained within the secondary sector component of the MoE Strategic Plan (2003-2007).

Implementation

3.4 This is the phase in which the process of putting the reform into practice in the classroom. USE is at the early stages of this phase with the experiments in the SSRP and GEAP pilots and the change in status in September 2003 of the 21 Community High Schools. The second stage of this phase will commence in September 2003 with the introduction of more schools as designated GSSs and the start of the trial of the new Alternative Pathways curriculum in Form 4.

3.4.1 The process of implementation is technically and socially complex. It is technical complex because of the idiosyncratic nature of teaching and the limited knowledge of effective ways to enhance student achievement. It is socially complex because of the large numbers of people involved in the education system. Financial constraints and the politically turbulent environment then further exacerbate dealing effectively with this technical and social uncertainty.

Institutionalisation

3.5 This is the third phase in which the programme is now applied routinely and sustained within the normal administrative and classroom practice. USE shall have reached from Phase two into this third phase when all schools have met the full secondary school criteria that support equity, access and quality. Thus merely having all students engaged in the five-year programme would not be deemed sufficient.

3.5.1 Attention to this third phase of institutionalisation will be important throughout the reform process of implementing USE. In fact, in many instances, an institutionalisation strategy that focuses on the development of educational and budgetary regulations during the implementation phase will need to be part of both the project design and the implementation strategy.

Factors impacting upon change

3.6 The ‘external environmental’ in which USE is implemented impacts upon implementation. In other words, the stability and complexity of the political and economic conditions will affect the project. Besides the security situation, economic performance and the resulting constraints on the government budget will be obstacles that may force cutbacks in either the scale or the size of the USE programme.

3.6.1 The factors related to the ‘degree of innovation’ – a function of the size and the scale of the various programmes – are the other critical set of constraints on USE. The characteristics of USE are summarised in Box 3.

Box 3: Characteristics of USE

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ambitious long term objectives• National application• High standard of educational goals• Coverage in all types of secondary school• Difficult implementation requirements• Short time frame between planning and implementation• Top-down management model• Strong political pressure |
|---|

3.6.2 There are different ways to implement programmes aiming at educational change. The external - political and economic – environment factors and the extent of the degree of innovation will determine to a large extent the feasibility of implementation. In the case of USE, the aim for high outcomes must be married with a situation in which the external factors have a high degree of uncertainty and the degree of desired innovation is also high.

Three Key Intervention Points

3.7 The analysis so far has focused upon the timing, the different phases of the education change process and the external factors that impact upon any model for change. More is needed however for establishing the implementation framework. To become operational and affect secondary school and classroom teaching and learning processes, the implementation strategy will need to focus on three specific intervention points:

- Administrative development

- In-service teacher training
- Building and maintaining commitment

3.7.1 These three intervention points will hold the key to bringing about and sustaining the change to a unitary secondary education system. This report now reviews these three intervention points in greater detail as integral factors in the USE Strategy and whether USE shall attain high or low outcomes.

Administrative Development

3.8 Administrative development is the process of directed change of the main features of the administrative system. Change and innovation can only occur when the elements of the organisation delivering educational services are in place and functioning effectively.

3.8.1 Four types of institution can be distinguished:

- the planning and policy institutions,
- the support agencies,
- the line agencies and
- the operating units.

3.8.2 Administrative development within these four types of institution can be done largely through five different instruments of change:

- (i) the structure of the organisation;
- (ii) the information, communication and evaluation systems;
- (iii) the institutions;
- (iv) staff competence; and
- (v) the resources available for administrative tasks.

3.8.3 Table 1 considers these five instruments of change and poses questions in order to assess how USE Strategy is preparing to address this first key intervention point of administrative development.

Table 1: Key Intervention Point - Administrative Development

<i>Instruments</i>	<i>Key Success Factors</i>	<i>Questions</i>
1. Structural change:	• Strengthening the organisation at the school and regional levels	• What degree of delegating tasks (especially supervision and support) has been initiated? • Has there been a grouping of schools into clusters to improve pedagogical support? • Has new organisational units been formed at the top to lead on the USE Strategy?
2. Communication systems	• Regularly collecting of implementation data • Teachers regarded as a prime source of data	• Has or will an official evaluation unit been established to collect and disseminate the flow of information? • Is there a communication system that can provide a base for disseminating information about USE progress to interested parties?

		Will it be possible to collect data on student flows and internal efficiency (drop out and repetition rates)
3. Institutional strengthening	Considerable attention paid to the strengthening of particular institutions that have responsibility for carrying out the reform	Is there a specific institution or unit within the MOE that has overall responsibility and a strong mandate for overseeing the planning and implementation of USE?
4. Staff	- Training for key administrative and professional staff - Limited use of expatriate experts	- Are there national training courses planned for key staff involved in USE? - Is this training paying heed to all levels of staff within the system?
5. Resources	Adequate and consistent resource provision, both human and financial	Has a specific funding allocation been itemised and calculated to support additional administration needs under USE?

Teacher training

3.9 Successful education reform under USE will be built on effective teacher training. *Educational change depends on what teachers do and think –it's as straightforward as that.* A well-designed and effectively implemented in-service teacher-training programme will be the key element in the successful implementation and institutionalisation of unitary secondary education. Allocation of sufficient funding for the purpose of in-service teacher training is absolutely vital. Research has shown that four elements stand out as important features of successful teacher training components in education reform initiatives. These features are highlighted in Table 2, and their critical variables are described.

Table 2: Key Intervention Point - Teacher Training

<i>Feature of success</i>	<i>Critical variables</i>
1. Permanent and locally available	- Mechanism to provide teachers with ongoing in-service training at a convenient location - Strengthening the administrative presence at the local level aids this process - Training using a cascade approach with initial training of a small core of personnel
2. Establish effective systems for supervision and support	- Strengthening the administrative presence at the local level aids this process - Establishing a cluster of schools - Establishing a programme of regular provision of pedagogical and supervisory rather than merely administrative support
3. Make the training appropriate for the teachers who receive it	- Trainers should visit the classrooms in order to observe performance - Initial testing of teachers' areas of strength and weakness
4. Encourage motivation and commitment	- Allow teachers to become active participants rather than merely recipients - Provision of pedagogical support, training and instructional materials are critical for sustaining morale and commitment.

Building and maintaining commitment

3.10 Commitment from the Government is the third critical condition for the successful implementation of USE. But this concept of commitment is mercurial for a number of reasons. The government's commitment will fluctuate, often being very strong at the outset and then tailing off. The relationship between this commitment and the outcomes is difficult to gauge since there is no direct correlation. The commitment among the different government stakeholders may vary. To understand this commitment in the implementation of USE, it is useful to look at it from the perspective of the three main groups that are involved in the implementation of the unitary system, namely:

- (i) the local implementers, such as the teachers and the regional administrators;
- (ii) the external agencies, in this instance, primarily the Inter American Development Bank and World Bank for the multilateral agencies and the Canadian International Development Agency and Department for International Development for the bilateral agencies; and
- (iii) the central and regional government officials.

3.10.1 Table 3 itemises these three groups and then poses questions with regard to their commitment toward USE.

Table 3: Key Intervention Point - Commitment and the Stakeholder Groups

Group	Key Questions
1. Local implementers	• To what degree has this group been involved in the design of the programme? • What efforts are being made to develop the commitment of this group during the implementation phase? • What base of support is being built among the parents and communities?
2. External agencies	• External support has been provided through SSRP and GEAP in piloting during the initiation stage and early implementation phases - but to what degree is there support during the main stage of implementation?
3. Government officials	• Is there a clear central policy directive that states that non-participation is not acceptable? • Is this policy directive matched with an equally clear offer of assistance and support to teachers to actually apply the programme?

Conclusion

3.11 This Chapter commenced by discussing two significant areas that impact upon the process of change – which phase within the reform process and the factors, including the external environment and the degree of innovation that are involved within the education change. Three intervention points were then introduced that were considered to play a critical role in determining the level of success of the reform – administrative development, teacher training and the building of commitment among the different stakeholders. This Chapter now concludes by firstly outlining the challenges presented by large-scale change stemming from the conflicting

demands of central level priorities and local priorities; and, secondly, by considering the implications for the development of the USE Implementation strategy.

The Challenges of USE

3.12 USE has a number of programmes with broadly defined objectives linked with national social and economic development. It is complex in that it comprises a package of innovations that are to be implemented almost at the same time on a national scale. Planners and policy makers at the central level have attempted to detail these objectives and elements of the programmes with a view that teachers implement them and they become adopted with immediate effect within the classroom. But, as illustrated in Table 4, there are four dilemmas involved in the implementation of USE.

Table 4: Dilemmas and Constraints against Implementation

<i>Features of USE</i>	<i>Constraints against USE Implementation</i>
<u>Complexity</u> USE comprises a package of innovations with a multiplicity of objectives	Limited capacity to absorb change at the school level
<u>Commitment</u> The priorities are being generated from the central policymakers and planners	Issues at the school level are perceived differently
<u>Conformity</u> USE is proposing a national rollout across very different locales	Specific conditions at the local level will limit applicability
<u>Lack of Resources</u> There are limited resources to support adoption at the school level	Definite need for costly ongoing school level support and local training

3.12.1 What is the most effective approach for managing the large scale changes envisaged under USE given these four dilemmas at the local level? The management approach required will need to have a firm commitment to the vision and goals for reform combined with acceptance of substantial diversity at the regional and school levels, married with an insistence on school accountability while still allowing for a mix of dissemination strategies. The implications of this management approach on project design and development of the implementation strategy are now outlined.

Implications for Design and Implementation

3.13 No matter how well the innovations of USE have fared in the pilot projects, it is only when the unitary system is applied in all the government secondary schools, both new and old – that its outcomes can be determined and the different programmes under the USE Strategy evaluated. The uncertainty caused by the difficulty in predicting the outcomes and in assessing the effectiveness of implementation strategies requires considerable flexibility in the implementation strategy. A well-designed and carefully prepared plan for implementation is important but it should be acknowledged from the outset that the plan is unlikely to be implemented as planned! The implementation plans must include mechanisms therefore that allow for adjustments to be made during implementation. These mechanisms include:

- Provision for the monitoring of project implementation – planners will particularly require reliable information about the efficiency of input delivery, the degree of application of the programmes and early outcomes from the programmes.
- Project design supports an incremental expansion of the programmes – there should be a realisation that there are limitations as to what can be achieved and under what time frame.
- Acceptance of the need to support USE over a long period of time through a series of different programmes;
- Provision for implementation audits performed by independent experts who would assess the degree of implementation achievement, and advise on ways to address problems.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Universal Secondary Education can bring considerable benefits to Guyana, including higher quality education, cost savings and increased management capability within the education sector. The Ministry of Education's Strategic Plan (2003-2007) has set itself a target of increasing the share of CHS and P/Ts operating as Government Secondary Schools. The determination of the exact number of government secondary schools to percentage of secondary education enrolments by 2005 is not yet known. Whatever the eventual target, this is an ambitious goal given the current logistical and financial constraints to the establishment of a unitary secondary education system.

4.2 This report has highlighted a number of policy issues that must be faced in support of the USE reform and identified a number of priorities that must be agreed in order to enable the attainment of a unitary secondary education sub sector. Chapters IV and V provide a summary of recommendations and possible directions for reform designed to promote the development of a USE Action Plan and implementation strategy. The proposals in these last two Chapters provide a foundation for a necessary dialogue between the government departments and the Education ministry at the regional and central levels and the schools themselves. This Chapter commences with five brief conclusions and then Chapter V offers some specific recommendations under the four headings of:

- Improving the framework for USE
- Improving the provision of information
- Improving the funding of schools; and
- Enhancing the capability and capacity of the sector.

Conclusions

Conclusion 1 “Considerable Lessons Learned”

4.3 A number of donor funded initiatives over the past five years have either trialled USE or contributed significant inputs into the preparation for USE, similarly there are recent ‘home grown’ examples with the USE amalgamation of the 21 CHS in September 2002 and important inputs from the central Secondary Education Task Team and different regional Task Forces in preparing for USE. SSRP and GEAP have been high profile pilot projects that have supported the MOE in preparing for USE. Unfortunately funding for these pilots ceases by the end of 2003 when the MOE is perhaps embarking upon the most critical two years of implementation for USE.

4.4 These projects have provided valuable lessons both with regards to USE and the role of pilot programmes. The pilots highlighted the fact that the external environment within which USE is operating is uncertain and that USE entails a high degree of innovation – the combination of these factor results in a range of problems. In some cases, the recurrent cost requirements of the programmes were considerable and, given scarce resources, this will mean experimenting in the

future with lower-cost solutions⁹. Finally, and most critically perhaps, for a variety of reasons neither programme was really able to build up the national administrative and policy institutions that will be needed to command the commitment and support that will be required for the incremental expansion of USE.

Conclusion 2: “A Hiatus of Late?”

4.5 The Secondary Education Task Team (SETT) contributed a considerable amount of effort into enabling the integration of the CHS into GSS. But the Task Team has not convened since May 2002 and the energy it provided toward the USE process has been in abeyance. On a practical front and in line with the three key intervention points identified in the previous chapter, the secondary education sector has also been hampered by financial constraints from delivering the full extent of its training programmes for administrators and teachers.

4.5 During this consultancy visit, two of the 21 Community High Schools were visited, one in Georgetown and one in Region 3, and a number of lessons learnt; the lessons included:

- There is great variation among the different schools involved. One of the CHS had 702 students and 23 teachers (STR 30:1) and the other had 437 students and 19 teachers (STR 23:1); but
- There was considerable similarity in that neither school had received any textbooks for Forms 3 and 4; and
- Both Headteachers expressed concern with regard to the need for: (i) more physical space to handle the increase in student numbers; (ii) more support for the teachers in delivering the new curricula; and (iii) additional materials to support teaching to the students with remedial needs.

Conclusion 3: “A Daunting Task Ahead”

4.6 The external environment factors, in combination with the considerable degree of innovation that is expected, have ensured that implementation of USE is a daunting task. The next key implementation component of USE is perhaps the introduction of the Alternative Learning Pathways programme (the BCCP) in selected schools in September 2003. Introduction of BCCP is in a sense a smaller version of the introduction of USE in that it includes a new curriculum, new materials and equipment, refurbishment or building of premises, new examinations, in- and pre-service training and additional funding. Similarly BCCP requires a judicious mix of political will with educational reality and a marketing campaign that shares with the stakeholders the aims and challenges ahead.

Conclusion 4: “The Time Perspective”

4.7 One of the most frustrating features of educational change is that it takes time and programmes such as USE in which there are changes in educational objectives, organisational structure and professional roles of teachers and administrators typically take longer than

⁹ SSRP, for example, has involved the delivery of a number of inputs: considerable in-service training, on-the-job subject training, the provision of resources such as textbooks and computers; improvement of facilities and the development of SIPs. The 21 CHS that enrolled in the new curriculum in September 2002 have not had the benefit of such extensive, albeit critical, inputs.

programmes that have more limited objectives. In comparison with other international examples, introduction of certain facets of USE – such as the Alternative Pathways curriculum and its proposed use of competency based assessment instruments – appear to be delivered in a very short timeframe. If the BCCP programme is to go from pilot in 2003/2004 to full rollout in 2005/2006, then there must be considerable support given to its design, implementation and evaluation over the ensuing two year period.

Conclusion 5: “A Critical Time Now”

4.8 There is also a critical time period stretching from the present until August 2003. It is proposed that there be three phases each of three month’s duration into which a specific range of activities need to be fitted. Table 5 summarises these three phases and the activities.

Table 5: The Process toward the USE Action Plan

<i>Phase</i>	<i>Overall Aim</i>	<i>Main Activities</i>
December 02 – February 03	Gathering the information in partnership	• SETT is reconvened • Central Task Groups report to SETT • Regional USE Task Forces are convened • Format for gathering data is agreed and shared
March 03 – May 03	Assessing what is attainable centrally and on a regional basis	• Training at regional levels to support gathering of the requisite data • National workshop is convened • Development of the draft USE Action Plan • Development of USE Packs for dissemination to different stakeholders
June 03-August 03	Going public to all the stakeholders	• USE Action Plan is approved and published • USE Packs are approved and disseminated • USE National Awareness Campaign is officially launched

4.9 It is proposed that GEAP could provide support into the USE process in Phases 2 and 3 above in the following manner:

- In Phase 2: USE consultancy support in March 2003 for the National USE workshop and inputs where deemed appropriate that support the work of the USE Regional Taskforces; and
- In Phase 3: USE consultancy support in June 2003 for the development of the USE Action Plan and the USE Packs.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 We recommend that the Ministry of Education:

Improving the framework for USE

- a) **develop** by June 2003 a USE Action Plan that can support a USE Vision and targeted goals for a unitary secondary education system stating what is attainable, when it shall be attained and in what regional location;
- b) **ensure** that the Action Plan comprises four strong interrelated components, namely: improvement in the quality of education, equity, institutional strengthening and studies and measures for further improved sector performance;'
- c) **include** within the Action Plan the following six objectives: curriculum development, teaching and learning strategies, professional development, assessment and evaluation, construction and rehabilitation of new secondary schools, and institutional strengthening;

Improving the provision of information

- a **introduce** a number of changes aimed at improving information available to USE planners and the general public, including:
 - i requiring all secondary schools by September 2004 to adopt the SSRP Budget data sheet;
 - ii requiring all secondary schools by September 2004 to have prepared and delivered a School Improvement Plan;
 - iii publishing by June 2003 information on the proposed Basic Competency Certificate Programme;
 - iv developing by September 2003 and maintaining a directory of secondary schools containing information required for tracking performance across a range of indicators;
 - v requiring by September 2003 that all Regional Education Offices submit an Education Development Plan that has specific details tracking progress on USE;
- b **establish** an ongoing independent USE review process with responsibility for assessing readiness for USE;
 - i requiring in March 2003 under Phase 2 a GEAP-supported USE national workshop;
 - ii involving in June 2003 under Phase 3 a GEAP-supported consultancy to assist in the development of the USE Action Plan;

Improving the funding of schools

- c **introduce** by September 2003 on a broad pilot basis in different regional locations, a formula-driven, student-based funding system with funding targeted on factors such as grade level, location and socio-economic status;
- d **consider**, initially for trial on a pilot basis, programmes under which the delivery of certain services may be provided under contract to MOE-certified private education providers (for example, the provision of teacher and education management training and/or the distribution of secondary school textbooks); and undertake feasibility studies;

Enhancing the capability and capacity of the secondary education sector

- e **introduce** a number of measures to enhance the capacity of the MoE at the central and regional levels, through:
 - i developing by September 2003 a resource and training program outlining good practice in education management and use of innovative educational management models;
 - ii continuing to provide training and mentoring in good regulatory practice for the regional education officials and new and existing GSS Headteachers;
 - iii preparing by September 2003 a USE Pack that can be distributed to different stakeholders (the administrators, teachers, parents and students);
- f **designate** one department with responsibility for collating information on the secondary school sector and release an annual report on progress toward USE in Guyana;
- g **re-establish** by January 2003 the Secondary Education Task Team with a mandate to prepare an innovative USE Action plan and policy investment framework as a part of the MOE Strategic Plan;
- h **support** the establishment of Working Groups that report to SETT on the four components and the six objectives;
- i **establish** by January 2003 USE Task Forces in all the regions that can represent the respective regions;

Financing educational opportunities

- j **prepare** a costed Action Plan with achievable priorities, defined timeframe and designated responsibilities for the implementation of USE;

Annex One

Priorities for Resolution under USE Action Plan

Policy Levers	Priorities for Resolution under USE Action Plan
Policy Lever 1 <i>Vision and goals for reform to USE</i>	1. What is the agreed process for developing the targeted plan for phasing in the CHS and then P/Ts with a view that a specified percentage of all students eligible for secondary school are actually in secondary schools that attain to agreed minimum criteria of equality, quality and access by the year 2005? 2. When will it be possible for a USE Action Plan to be presented publicly to the stakeholders, be they the teachers and administrators or the beneficiaries (students) and clients (parents)? 3. The Strategic Plan mandates that the Regional USE Plans shall be completed in 2003, but when should these Plans be completed in order that they can feed into the USE Action Plan?
Policy Lever 2 <i>Standards to judge performance</i>	4. At what time shall the proposed new National Accreditation Board be able to validate the new BCCP curriculum and its examinations upon completion of Form 4? 5. It is fundamental that the BCCP should strive to be relevant to all stakeholders and should have currency within Guyana and within both CARICOM states and the international education system. What time allocation is considered adequate for ensuring that BCCP fulfils its promise as a true alternative qualification and not a stop gap exercise in expediency? 6. At what time can targets be publicised annually that are framed in the percentage of children reaching a certain target on the NTFE, CSEC, the BCCP examination and/or the annual national standard assessment instruments?
Policy Lever 3 <i>Curriculum framework to assist in meeting standards</i>	7. When will a catalogue of teaching and learning resources as well as support materials be developed and issued in order to assist schools to source the resources that they need? 8. Is there an assessment as to whether there has been sufficient provision for designing modules that support particular pupils? 9. How does the decision to have only a one year ALP programme in Form 4 followed by the three options outlined in Box below marry with the mandate for all secondary age students to have a five year secondary education?
Policy Lever 4 <i>Focus on Teaching and Learning (including Teacher Learning and Education Management)</i>	10. Can the Action Plan develop a matrix of activities, time frame in 3 year cycles and concomitant costs that shall be required to attain the laudable targets set out in Box 2? 11. Can the extensive programmes of training and support that are proposed be extended to include not only practices for use in most classrooms and under typical conditions, but can it also adapt for specific situations or particular groups of students? 12. Has the USE Strategy developed a sufficient variety of special interventions aimed at children whose progress is slower than their peers and who shall need more intensive support if they are to reach the expected levels of performance? 13. When can a firm commitment be given as to the sourcing of the financial and human resources that shall be needed to support the continuous professional development (CPD) at the central, regional or ideally directly at the school level? What analysis is

	being carried out to map out the specific needs of the teachers in the schools that are changing their status? For example, has there been any study carried out yet that is specifically aimed at gathering data on the hurdles that have been faced by teachers in the initial cohort of 21 CHS schools? 14. Is the USE training that is being given for Headteachers and teachers in the 21 CHS being prepared in such a manner that it can be reproduced and amended for use during the incremental Primary Tops amalgamation process? 15. Are programmes being developed within Cyril Potter and UOG that ensure the newly qualified teachers enter secondary schools equipped to teach a different curricula and a different clientele than that for which the new teachers had previously been trained? 16. Is there a possibility to revisit the option whereby Primary certified teachers can become qualified secondary teachers without embarking on the full Secondary teacher training programme?
Policy Lever 5 Integrated policies across departments	17. What percentage of trained specialist teachers by subject should be allocated into each secondary school over the respective 3-year project cycles? 18. Who has the responsibility for ensuring that the message is clear and unilateral that compliance to USE is mandatory? 19. Who is in charge of the planning and dissemination of the national awareness campaigns that can address the respective concerns of the different stakeholders?
Policy Lever 6 Planning, management and accountability	20. What procedures are in place to monitor performance on the different groups of pupils under the USE Strategy? 21. School Information Management systems (SIMs) have been initiated under SSRP, but there has been no crossover into schools outside the project. Should there be a mandate to all Regional Education Departments that all schools shall collect data according to the SIMs framework by 2005? 22. Should there be a specific Information Secretariat established for USE? 23. Which department has the responsibility for setting the curricular targets for the different groups at the five different Form levels? 24. Improvement on the retention rate is one measure of performance for USE, but what other measures can be deployed that measure such characteristics as student 'enjoyment' of learning or teacher 'satisfaction' in the profession? 25. Should there be a mandate that all secondary schools shall submit their School Improvement Plans to the Regional Education Offices by 2005? 26. Should there be a mandate that all Regional Education Offices should submit their Education Development Plans (EDP) to the central ministry; and further, that the Offices should be held accountable through the respective Regional Education Sub Committees for attaining designated performance indicators that have been agreed to under these EDPs? 27. What system has been designed that ensures that assistance and support are directed at schools that are not meeting the targets?

Policy Lever 7 <i>Sufficient funding and resource provision to enable reform</i>	28. Will it be possible to have a secondary budget ready for submission to the Ministry of Finance that specifically addresses the four interrelated components (improving quality –equity – institutional strengthening - measures for sector improvement) by August 2003? 29. Given the introduction of BCCP in September 2003, can specific funds be vired within the current annual budget to support the delivery of the new ALP in the selected pilot schools? 30. Should a significant goal of the USE Action Vision be to go forward with the vision of a per capita formula funding system and the utilisation of governance through School Boards in all secondary schools by a specified date? 31. Given the per capita funding system, could there be a pilot study that trialled school-based training that was delivered by MoE accredited private education suppliers paid for out of the individual school's budget? 32. What provision has been made for the Regional Education bodies to retain an amount of funding for targeted support of USE according to agreed criteria? 33. Under USE, will there be greater flexibility for Regional Education departments to utilise their funds across different line items, such as from capital works to training? 34. When will funding procedures at the regional and individual school levels be accessible in a uniform and transparent manner?
Policy Lever 8 <i>Workable governance structures</i>	35. When will the USE Strategy have its own workable structure in which there is a particular Task Group with the specific mandate to lead in the planning and ongoing implementation of USE? 36. Is the Secondary Education Task Team (SETT) an existing Task Group that could take on this mandate? 37. Would SETT then have the role and support to lead in the coordination of Working Groups in selected areas of importance, such as: finance, buildings, teacher supply, training, public awareness, administration and personnel? 38. Should a fulltime USE Coordinator be appointed to assist SETT in its mandate? 39. There is a lack of capacity, and perhaps even capability in some instances, for the difficult task of developing and delivering the USE Vision within the Regional Education Departments. How therefore can USE Regional Task Forces be convened in order that they can have their own ownership of the Strategy as well as address the specific dynamics of their own Region? 40. Should there be USE packs developed by the MoE for Regions and schools that can assist them with the process of gazetting of new secondary schools?

Annex Two

A Preliminary List of Achievements to date toward USE

<i>Levers and Challenges</i>	<i>National Initiatives</i>	<i>GEAP Initiatives</i>
Policy Lever 1 <i>Vision and goals for reform to USE</i>	➤ SWOT session involving the Strategic Planning Committee and REDOs + extensive consultation meetings with the communities ➤ Development of the Guyana Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper ➤ Questionnaire to determine readiness for USE ➤ Development of the USE Policy Paper	➤ GEAP Theme Papers on Strategy and Policy
Policy Lever 2 <i>Standards to judge performance</i>	➤ Development of new National Form 3 Examinations ➤ Development of annual Form 1 and 2 examinations ➤ Development of a reporting structure on results on these examinations.	➤ Consultancy to look at issues of amalgamation and consolidation of schools in Regions 6 and 10 based on academic performance ➤ Development of a Form I nationally used Literacy test
Policy Lever 3 <i>Curriculum Framework to assist in meeting standards</i>	➤ Establishing the Task Group to develop the Alternative Learning Pathway; ➤ Development of the Form 4 Basic Competency Certificate Programme	➤ Provision of a TVET Adviser to support the TVET Task Group ➤ 4 Consultancies to look into School to Work issues

Policy Lever 4 Focus on Teaching and Learning (including Teacher Learning and Education Management)	➤ Teachers in secondary schools (GSS, CHS and P/Ts) are given special training in the new curriculum ➤ USE and GEAP training workshop for H/Ts and teachers from the 21 CHS	➤ Training programs for CHS/PTs in pedagogy and subject content ➤ GEAP Theme Papers on Teaching and Learning ➤ Trialling of holiday Outreach programmes ➤ Development of an Continuous Professional Development (CPD) Pilot ➤ 4 consultancies on Teacher training in-service
Policy Lever 5 Integrated policies across departments	➤ Development of central and regional USE Plans ➤ Work completed under the Secondary Education Task Team in support of USE for the 21 CHS	➤ School Mapping Exercises in Regions 6,10 and 4 ➤
Policy Lever 6 Planning, management and accountability	➤ Development of SIPs under SSRP ➤ Development of the Education Strategic Plan (2003-2007) ➤ Development of the School Information Management system and its deployment in SSRP pilot schools	➤ Establishment of SIPs in secondary schools in Regions 6 and 10 ➤ GEAP Theme Papers on Whole School Improvement
Policy Lever 7 Sufficient funding and resource provision to enable reform	➤ 4 SSRP Education Finance and Budget Reform consultancies ➤ Approximately \$29 million to support the provision of capital works and other resources.	➤ Consultancy to investigate funding in Regions 6 and 10 ➤ Allocation of a Fund to support SIPs ➤ Approximately \$12 million toward the provision of capital works and other resources ➤ Establishment of the Education Access Fund
Policy Lever 8 Workable governance structures	➤ Establishment of the Secondary Education Task Team ➤ Establishment of the USE Task Groups	➤ Support toward Regional USE initiatives in Regions 6 and 10

Annex Three

Indicative List of Activities to be completed by September 2003

Lever	Activities
Policy Lever 1 <i>Vision and Goals for reform to USE</i>	➤ Vision and goals for USE Reform Framework specified for each of the eight Policy Levers ➤ National Awareness Campaign is developed and launched
Policy Lever 2 <i>Standards to judge performance</i>	➤ National standards for Secondary School Years 1-3 finalised and published ➤ Assessment of the National Third Form Examination is made since its inception in SSRP schools ➤ School Based Assessment instruments are in place for ongoing trial and analysis of examinations in Forms 1 and 2 ➤ National standards for 1 year Basic Competence Certificate Programme are finalised and published ➤ Performance norms for Forms 1-5 are established for all secondary schools ➤ Selected students in CHS and Primary Tops Form 5s are selected and entered to sit CSEC
Policy Lever 3 <i>Curriculum framework to assist in meeting standards</i>	➤ The compulsory core foundation curriculum for Forms 1-3 is keyed to intended outcomes ➤ Curriculum for Alternative Elective Pathways 1 and 2 are finalised and published ➤ The Basic Competence Certificate Programme is ready to be launched for trial within selected schools in September 2003
Policy Lever 4 <i>Focus on Teaching and Learning</i>	➤ By end of August 2003 30 percent of all teachers in CHS and Primary Tops schools have received in-service training ➤ By end of August 2003 20 percent of teachers in existing GSS have received training ➤ All secondary schools have one textbook per student at each year level in the core subject areas ➤ By end of August 2003 there is a programme planned for the development of remedial materials for students in Forms 1 through 3
Policy Lever 5 <i>Integrated policies across departments</i>	➤ By April 2003 the findings from School Mapping Exercise (SME) are being analysed in order to determine physical and human resources required to support Regional USE ➤ National study on mainstreaming establishes data on those with special education needs.

Policy Lever 6 <i>Accountability incentives linked to performance and to</i>	➤ Regional USE Plans for elimination of CHS and P/Ts are developed ➤ A programme to support training for all Secondary Headmasters in USE by September 2004 is prepared ➤ A mandate for the development of SIPs in all schools by 2004 is prepared ➤ A mandate for the development of Regional Secondary Education Development Plans by 2004 is prepared
Policy Lever 7 <i>Sufficient funding to enable reform</i>	➤ By June 2003, assessments are made of what is attainable for the years 2003-2007 with regard to: human resources; physical resources; teaching and learning resources; and per student funding allocation by region ➤ Findings, based on the SME and the assessments of what is deemed ideal and attainable, are costed for 2003/2004 ➤ The budgetary implications of this assessment is agreed with MOF by January 2004 ➤ School refurbishment and extension programme is prepared to enable 10% increase in capacity by 2004 ➤ A costed plan is prepared for the delivery of in and pre-service training that can ensure that there will be a minimum of 50 percent secondary trained teachers in all secondary schools
Policy Lever 8 <i>Workable structures for governance</i>	➤ SETT is reconvened as the central group driving the USE Policy mandates ➤ SETT is leading central and regional USE Task Forces in defined areas of work under specific Terms of Reference (i.e. teacher supply – school infrastructure – curricular targets – Form 4 programme – finance – teaching and learning resources)