

**GUYANA EDUCATION ACCESS PROJECT
(GEAP)**

Ministry of Education/DFID

Submitted to:
The Ministry of Education, Guyana
and DFID

**GUYANA EDUCATION
ACCESS PROJECT:**

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR AN
APPROPRIATE CADRE OF
INSET SECONDARY TRAINERS**

Prepared by:

**John Lowe
January 2001**

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	2
Abbreviations	2
Executive Summary	3
The Report	
1. Introduction	5
2. INSET needs of the system	5
3. Current INSET provision	8
4. Current GEAP in-service activities	11
5. Options for teacher training cadres	13
<i>Mentor</i>	13
<i>Master Teacher</i>	14
<i>Advisory Teacher</i>	14
6. Forward activity plan	19
7. Recommendations	20
Appendices	22

Acknowledgements

Very many people contributed to ensuring my visit to Guyana was both well organised and enjoyable. I would like to offer special thanks to Stephen Bradley, Myrtle Yansen and Diana Swan in the Georgetown GEAP office, and to Ed Denham and Paul Worrall who looked after me in Regions 10 and 6 respectively.

The timing of my visit was not ideal, coinciding as it did with the beginning of a new school year. This meant that I was asking to see many very busy people at a time when they were busiest of all. I am very grateful to all those who so willingly gave up their time to talk to me. A full list of those who did so appears in Appendix 2.

Abbreviations

AT	Advisory Teacher
CPCE	Cyril Potter College of Education
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CXC	Caribbean Examinations Council
DFID	Department for International Development
GBET	Guyana Basic Education Training
GSS	General Secondary School
HoD	Head of Department
IDCE	Institute for Distance and Continuing Education
INSET	In-service Education and Training
LRC	Learning Resource Centre
MoE	Ministry of Education
NCERD	National Centre for Educational Resource Development

Executive Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

- Current in-service provision in Guyana lacks coherence in its function and co-ordination between the various agencies involved. This has repercussions for the effectiveness and very purpose of GEAP interventions.
- A large part of what is currently referred to as in-service teacher education in the country is in fact part-time delivery of pre-service education in an attempt to reduce the high percentage of untrained and unqualified teachers in the system. While this must be seen as the outstanding training priority of the education system, current strategies to deal with it do not appear to be working. More flexible approaches are needed that make use of a greater range of training options. These may include allowing accreditation for training delivered by agencies other than CPCE or even more radical alternatives such as the franchising out of CPCE activities.
- Quality of training must be maintained, however, and to this end efficient Quality Assurance mechanisms must be put in place. It is likely that for the foreseeable future, CPCE and the University of Guyana would be the Quality Assurance agents.
- The effectiveness of current initial teaching training courses currently provided by both of these institutions, both part-time and full-time, should be subjected to a thorough evaluation and subsequent review as soon as possible.
- There are serious deficiencies in subject knowledge, as well as teaching methodology, amongst many teachers, not just the unqualified and untrained. Opportunities for the upgrading of subject content knowledge should not necessarily be tied to teaching methodology courses. The greater use of distance education for subject knowledge upgrading should be explored.
- The notion of continuing professional development (CPD) should guide in-service provision as part of an overall strategy to improve systemic quality. This would provide a framework for professional development for all teachers at all stages of their career.
- The focus for CPD should be the whole school and not the individual teacher. CPD should become school-managed and school-based as much as is feasible. Regional support systems based on a cadre of Advisory Teachers and better resourced Learning Resource Centres should be developed.
- Teachers require motivation to remain in teaching and engage in CPD. In addition to improvement of conditions of service for all teachers, an extended career structure that recognises high quality teaching performance and commitment to the profession should be established. The grade of Master Teacher, with a salary structure comparable with that of a deputy head or head teacher, should be established for those who demonstrate exceptional teaching capability.

- A framework for continuous support of teachers exists in the current mentoring and appraisal systems but these need to be developed much further and taken more seriously. Heads of departments and other senior teachers need training as mentors, and a recognition of the demands of this role should be built into their terms of service. In return, their responsibilities must be formalised and spelt out clearly.
- GEAP interventions must support the development of whole-school capacity for sustainable quality improvement. The focus should be on the school and subject departments rather than individual teachers.
- Greater co-ordination and coherence amongst GEAP trainers – while avoiding an insistence on mindless uniformity – would enhance the project’s impact.
- A new focus will involve some redirection of attention to working with and through the more senior teachers rather than (or in addition to) working directly with the weakest, inexperienced and unqualified teachers. The current teacher training role would be better recast as one of ‘training the trainers’.
- Greater co-ordination between GEAP and other systemic agencies and developments must be sought. This requires action at both regional and central levels.
- As part of a (suggested) move to greater flexibility in the provision of training and the recognition for accreditation of courses other than those delivered by CPCE, GEAP should engage with CPCE at central and regional levels in an attempt to have its in-service courses recognised as contributing to teacher accreditation.
- The original premise that Primary Tops teachers will be upgraded and accepted as secondary teachers seems to be in doubt. This must be clarified before work with these teachers continues.
- A useful initial step contributing to school-based CPD capacity is for GEAP trainers to promote the development of mentoring practices within the schools. This would involve mentoring training and help with the establishment of mentoring and appraisal systems.
- Subsequent training activities should aim at developing a body of Advisory Teachers to take on CPD roles within their own schools and within each region as a whole. School-based in-service work by GEAP will then be planned and delivered in collaboration with these teachers.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The full terms of reference for this consultancy are reproduced in Appendix 1. The aims of the consultancy may be broadly summarised, however, under the following three headings:
- to evaluate the current in-service training activities being carried out under GEAP in the two regions in which it is operating, Region 6 and Region 10;
 - to suggest how these in-service activities might be developed within GEAP;
 - to evaluate the broader provision of in-service support to teachers in Guyana beyond that provided within GEAP, and make suggestions for its development, particularly in relation to a possible future national replication of GEAP.
- 1.2 Information to meet these aims was gathered through interviews with key personnel and some documentary analysis. A complete list of those individuals consulted is attached as Appendix 2, but they fall broadly into the following groups:
- central Ministry of Education officials;
 - heads of the key teacher training and accreditation institutions;
 - GEAP/DFID personnel in Georgetown;
 - GEAP personnel in the regions;
 - various other providers of in-service training;
 - regional education officials;
 - teachers and principals of schools receiving GEAP interventions.
- 1.3 It was not possible to meet all relevant personnel but it was felt that, in general, an adequate picture of in-service provision, its context and its constraints was obtained. Overall, discussions were held with more than sixty people, either individually or in small groups.
- 1.4 Although the prime focus of this report is the GEAP activities, these must be placed in a broader context. For this reason, the next two sections (Sections 2 and 3) provide a review of current needs and in-service provision, to help contextualise the summary of GEAP in-service activities in Section 4. Sections 5 and 6 explore strategies through which GEAP's contribution to longer-term teacher development and strengthening of the system's capacity can be developed. These are followed by a series of recommendations in Section 7.

2. INSET needs of the system

- 2.1 The education system is currently very heavily dependent on the services of untrained and unqualified teachers. A priority need, therefore, is the upgrading of these teachers. Ideally, neither of these categories of teachers should be working in schools, and certainly not in the current proportions. This situation arises because of the continued high rate of loss of trained teachers from the system and from the country. This is a crucial issue for the medium- and long-term development of education in Guyana and will be returned to later.

- 2.2 'Unqualified' refers to those teachers who do not have necessary examination passes at CXC to be accepted for teacher training through CPCE or the University.
- 2.3 'Untrained' refers to those teachers who do not have a recognised teacher training qualification.
- 2.4 This distinction emphasises that there is a need for both subject knowledge and pedagogical skill development amongst these teachers. It was frequently pointed out to me that even those teachers who have CXC passes at the level required for admission to teacher training generally do not have adequate subject knowledge to teach with confidence up to CXC level. Apart from the commonly recognised understanding that it is important to have knowledge of a subject at a level beyond that at which one is teaching, there are two reasons why these teachers have a subject knowledge problem. The first is that the level of passes required at CXC for acceptance into teacher training is actually quite modest. Secondly, it appears that their knowledge tends to be rather shallow and rote-learned, rather than reflecting the deeper understanding of a subject that is necessary for effective teaching. A vicious circle is operating in the education system here with low quality teaching producing low quality students who go on to become inadequate teachers themselves.
- 2.5 Amongst trained teachers in the system there is also a need for continuing professional development (CPD). Initial training can only ever be an introduction to the demands of teaching and to ways of meeting them. Teachers need in-service support to develop their knowledge and skills, building on and informing their practice. There is also a need for continuous updating of both subject knowledge and pedagogical skill as these two fields themselves develop. Finally there is a need to ensure that teachers are adequately prepared to handle changes in the curriculum as these are introduced.
- 2.6 Newly employed or newly trained teachers are particularly in need of close and frequent support. This is recognised during the two-year 'probationary' period that all newly trained teachers must go through. Supervision of this period is the responsibility of the schools themselves, generally through heads of subject departments. Although it was clear that some schools and some heads are meeting this responsibility, several pointed out that heads of departments commonly do not have the time, experience or training to carry out effectively this 'mentoring' role towards new teachers.
- 2.7 The preparation of heads of departments (and senior masters/mistresses) is another area where dissatisfaction with current in-service training provision was expressed. Although newly appointed heads of departments do attend a short training workshop this was felt to be insufficient and was often poorly timed, occurring some time after the individual had already taken up the post. The inadequacy of the current training is exacerbated by the common need to promote relatively inexperienced teachers, due to the high rate of attrition of trained and experienced teachers from the system. Training for such posts would be more effective if it were to a large part seen as a preparation that precedes appointment rather than following it. Indeed, it can be argued that the continuing professional development that all teachers should receive would go a long way towards preparing them for these posts of greater responsibility.

- 2.8 There is a particular development need emerging for all, namely Information Technology skills.
- 2.9 The development needs of school managers and administrators must not be overlooked. Good management is an important tool for the raising of school effectiveness.
- 2.10 In relation to the central GEAP aim of providing access to common secondary schooling for all, two staff development needs can be identified.
- 2.11 The first is that this proposed expansion of access to secondary schools will lead to a greater range of ability in the secondary school student body than that which currently exists as a result of post-primary selection. This in turn will demand a greater range of teaching approaches and skills than at present. This will be true whether schools opt for mixed-ability classes or for streaming by ability, although the former approach will pose particular challenges. It seems certain that in-service support for dealing with this wider ability range will be a requirement of almost all teachers, experienced and inexperienced alike.
- 2.12 The second staff development implication of secondary school access expansion concerns teachers of the current Primary Tops students. It remains unclear whether these teachers are to be drafted into the expanded secondary school sector or not. The current GEAP approach is largely predicated on the assumption that they will. Certainly, if the removal of Primary Tops classes from the primary sector leaves surplus teaching capacity there, it would be sensible to make use of these experienced teachers – suitably upgraded - in the expanded secondary sector, rather than recruiting yet more unqualified and untrained teachers. If this is the case, then clearly there is a need for an intensive in-service upgrading programme for these teachers. Though, in common with other teachers, their needs will include both subject knowledge and pedagogical upgrading, it is likely that the former will be particularly significant.
- 2.13 If current Primary Tops teachers are to be taken into the secondary sector there are issues concerning recognition of their status as secondary teachers. These include whether they will be required to complete the full pre-service secondary teacher training course or whether alternative in-service provision will be recognised both in relation to pre-training subject qualification levels and for certification of pedagogical skill.
- 2.14 If there is a commitment to providing full secondary access for all, but Primary Tops teachers will not be used in this expanded programme, then the particular training needs outlined above no longer apply, except in the very short-term until the transition is complete. A decision on this issue is therefore essential for the planning of in-service provision.

3. Current INSET provision

- 3.1 In-service provision for teachers in Guyana comes from a range of sources and for a variety of ends. While it is probably not fair to describe this provision as ad hoc, it is certainly neither co-ordinated nor coherent.
- 3.2 To benefit the system as a whole, it is the raising of teachers' effectiveness that is the important goal of all teacher training, both in-service and pre-service. For the individual teacher, however, the main concern may be the upgrading of his or her formally recognised status, since this status determines salary. These two foci – effectiveness and certification status – are not necessarily the same. Improvements in teacher effectiveness as a result of training are commonly assumed but we should demand that they be empirically demonstrated. Indeed, one can go further and state that training interventions must be evaluated not just in terms of their effectiveness but in terms of their efficiency – their effectiveness per unit input of various resources.
- 3.3 The heads of both of the main teacher training institutions (CPCE and the University of Guyana Faculty of Education) expressed a desire to see an evaluation of their training provision. Neither felt they had the necessary resources – material and human - to carry this out. One approach to this problem that was discussed was the establishment of links with an overseas university to support an evaluation and subsequent course development. This would need specific funding but would have several spin-off advantages such as promoting research and course development capacity within the University of Guyana Faculty of Education, perhaps usefully including the gaining of doctoral degrees, currently only held by two members of the faculty staff. (The consultant's 'home' University of Bath was naturally the focus of discussions about this collaboration.)
- 3.4 Opportunities for serving, untrained teachers to obtain trained teacher status through part-time attendance at regional CPCE centres is commonly described as INSET. It is more accurately described, however, as part-time provision of the pre-service training course. The key point about in-service provision is that it recognises the experience of the participants and relates closely and explicitly to their on-going everyday practice in schools. This does not seem to be the case with the part-time courses run by CPCE regional centres. They are 'in-service' only in the minimal sense that the participants happen to be serving teachers, but they appear largely to comprise the pre-service course. Nonetheless, in view of its central role in developing teacher competence, this part-time training will be considered as a form of INSET in this report.
- 3.5 Current pre-service routes to qualified, trained teacher status seem rather long, although probably not more so than in many other countries when analysed closely. The part-time (so-called in-service) route does seem particularly demanding for teachers, however, who must simultaneously hold down a full-time teaching post. In Region 6, for example, trainees are expected to attend four hours of classes five afternoons a week after a full morning's teaching, for a total of three years. Travel to and from the regional CPCE centre commonly increases the time demand to six hours a day. In Region 10 the pattern is five hours of training four days per week.

- 3.6 A common defence of the need for such long training courses is that the target subject knowledge of new trainees is poor. The poor subject knowledge of new trainees means that the training institutions must devote a considerable amount of the course time to developing subject knowledge, not just pedagogical skills. Viewed in this light, the long full-time pre-service courses are perhaps not so unduly long.
- 3.7 In terms of the part-time training, however, one can question whether the development of subject knowledge is necessarily, or even best achieved through the regional CPCE centres. Separating this subject development from pedagogical upgrading would allow much more flexible approaches that could reduce the intensive, concentrated demand on part-time trainees. Currently, for example, untrained teachers must have a minimum of two years' teaching experience before being accepted for part-time training. These two years would provide an ideal opportunity for subject knowledge upgrading. Indeed, such learning could add enormously to the untrained, poorly qualified teacher's effectiveness. It would also offer the opportunity for those teachers who have not achieved the minimum grades at CXC for acceptance for training to remedy this. This subject knowledge development could be achieved through a variety of means that might include distance modes and after-school courses that do not necessarily have to be tied to CPCE centres. If these interventions are to be recognised for eventual acceptance on to CPCE courses, they must meet CPCE approval. This raises issues of accreditation of INSET.
- 3.8 Currently, CPCE and the University of Guyana Faculty of Education have sole responsibility for accreditation of teachers. Currently, also, these institutions are only accrediting courses that they deliver themselves, either at their central institutions or through regional centres. The heads of both institutions expressed a willingness to recognise courses delivered by other bodies as contributing to the attainment of qualified teacher status, but there appear to be no examples of this happening and no formal process by which this recognition can be sought or granted.
- 3.9 A comparison of the annual rate of accreditation of teachers through full-time initial training schemes or part-time upgrading courses with the rates of teacher attrition and the numbers of untrained teachers in the system clearly reveals that current systems of provision are totally inadequate. Alternative approaches to upgrading, using alternative agencies and sources of training skills, must be sought.
- 3.10 While there is clearly a need to maintain quality in the process leading to qualified teacher status, there is no reason why this quality assurance responsibility and training delivery should both be in the sole hands of the same institution. Indeed, there is a strong argument, based on objectivity, that the quality assurance function should be separated from that of training delivery. This would lead, in Guyana's case, to the creation of a new body to oversee the quality of teacher training. While strong arguments could be mounted for this, the current shortage of suitable personnel to fill existing educational posts in the country suggests its recommendation would be premature; as one senior education officer commented when interviewed, 'It is easier to create posts than to fill them'.

- 3.11 A more pressing concern at present is to make better use of existing personnel and resources. This can be achieved by adopting more flexible approaches to the delivery of training for accreditation and the recognition for accreditation of in-service training delivered by bodies other than CPCE and the University. The latter institutions would, however, retain exclusive control of quality assurance.
- 3.12 There are two aspects to this development of greater flexibility in delivery. One is that currently recognised training courses can be delivered by agencies other than CPCE. This would essentially mean that CPCE-produced syllabuses (and possibly even some course materials) would be made available to other bodies. This process would be particularly aided by modularisation of existing courses. The second aspect is that courses developed by other bodies would be submitted to CPCE, in its capacity as quality control agent, for approval for accreditation.
- 3.13 'Other bodies' for this delivery of training already exist within the system; others may be encouraged to form once opportunities exist. Educational development projects such as SSRP and GEAP are delivering INSET that may be creditable. NCERD similarly is delivering in-service courses that could be recognised.
- 3.14 In principle at least, NCERD has a regional infrastructure in the form of the Learning Resource Centres that could be invaluable for supporting their own contributions and those of other groups. In one of the regions visited as part of this consultancy, however, there seems to be some confusion over both the role(s) of the LRC and who was responsible for it: NCERD or the Regional Education Office. This confusion effectively marginalises a potentially valuable resource. These centres are also under-resourced in terms of materials and personnel and are thus unable to fulfil their potential. As suggested above, provision of personnel may be problematic given the general national shortage but the provision of moderate facilities and materials in the centres would encourage the more efficient use of existing human resources. Groups of more experienced and qualified teachers, together with other regionally based education personnel, could be encouraged to use these facilities to provide in-service work for their colleagues. For this they would of course be paid, as they currently are when they teach at CPCE regional centres.
- 3.15 School effectiveness and improvement research findings from elsewhere suggest that the most effective approach to in-service development, in terms of its impact on the quality of schools and the system as a whole rather than individual teachers, is that which is school-focused and school-based. That is, teacher development is integrated within a broader school development plan and is provided through a combination of in-school and external human and material resources. Such an approach has been found to promote an 'improvement culture' within the school, able to support self-sustaining development of educational quality. As a minimum, school-based in-service development requires the following: a cadre of teachers within the school who (with external support) can organise and supervise teacher development activities and are motivated to do so; an allocation of time for such activities, with an obligation that teachers attend; some material resources, and an effective school development plan into which these activities fit. Given the human and material constraints facing schools in Guyana, a modification (or supplementation) of this approach, based on school clusters, may be more realistic for the immediate future. The issue of developing school-based teacher development capacity is revisited in Section 5 of this report.

- 3.16 A more radical approach to increasing the provision of accreditable professional development courses is to encourage the formation of private educational training enterprises to which, for example, CPCE could franchise part of its training delivery function. This commercialisation of training could both encourage the mobilisation of human resources within the country and attract resources from outside. As stressed above, CPCE would maintain quality control functions in this process, through a variety of mechanisms such as the setting of examinations and observation of teaching.

4. Current GEAP in-service activities

- 4.1 There are two main target groups for GEAP INSET: teachers in primary schools teaching Primary Tops classes, and teachers in General Secondary Schools, notably but not exclusively the untrained teachers (UTs).
- 4.2 Inputs aim to provide both subject content and teaching methodology upgrading. The former is seen to be particularly necessary for teachers taking Primary Tops classes since: (a) they commonly have weaker academic backgrounds than teachers in secondary schools, and (b) the broad, cross-curricular initial training of primary teachers does not necessarily prepare well for the subject specialised approach of secondary level teaching. The project trainers pointed out, however, that weak subject knowledge is a GSS problem too, a view shared by CPCE trainers.
- 4.3 Some project trainers felt it is not helpful to distinguish content and methodology training needs, preferring to structure activities to develop the two areas simultaneously.
- 4.4 Two forms of in-service intervention are in use: in-class observation and support with individual teachers, and out-of-class training sessions with groups of teachers, usually in the afternoons after normal classes. Some individuals, both trainers and teachers, also mentioned individual out-of-class support such as help with lesson preparation.
- 4.5 The mix and balance of training activities varies. Some trainers prefer to work with individual teachers in-class, by observing, commenting, suggesting and teaching example classes themselves; others prefer to provide group-based out-of class sessions, and some offer a mix of these approaches.
- 4.6 Individual, in-class observation and support was defended as being most effective and relevant to the individual's needs. It was also claimed that the trainer's credibility with teachers is enhanced if they are seen teaching.
- 4.7 Group-based, out-of-school activities were defended on grounds of being a more efficient use of personnel and of being an important pre-requisite for classroom-based work. Some interviewed teachers also felt that pre-class support from such sessions allowed them to prepare better and gave them greater confidence.
- 4.8 The GEAP trainers are also involved in support materials preparation. I was particularly impressed by a booklet for science teachers collaboratively designed and produced by trainers in both regions to support science practical work in schools.

- 4.9 Teachers, head teachers and heads of departments in schools generally commented very positively on the impact of the various interventions. They felt they have provided new content and methodology knowledge and increased the confidence of teachers. There was a feeling that both forms of intervention are valuable and necessary, but for all teachers, not just UTs. The senior managers in one GSS expressed reservations about in-class interventions, suggesting that they can be disruptive if too frequent and not geared sensitively to the school teaching timetable. Another GSS Head commented that, whether in-class or out-of-class, she preferred school-based INSET work, so that she was more aware of what was happening.
- 4.10 An opinion expressed by some of the GEAP trainers was that their interventions are 'sticking plaster' work – treatment to deal with a current crisis but small scale in relation to actual problems and lacking longer-term impact. There was some resonance with this view amongst head teachers and heads of departments, who wanted to see a more coherent continuing professional development programme that targeted all teachers on a whole-school and/or whole-region basis.
- 4.11 As evidence of the positive impact of GEAP interventions on Primary Tops teachers, one primary school headmaster noted that attendance by Primary Tops pupils was significantly higher than it had been in previous years. This was seen as a response to the extra attention and better quality of teaching that they were receiving.
- 4.12 A particular problem in relation to the upgrading of Primary Tops teachers is that these teachers do not necessarily remain teaching these senior classes from one year to the next. Other classes within the school get priority in teacher allocation and Primary Tops classes are commonly taught by whoever happens to be available, possibly not even receiving full time teaching.
- 4.13 This clearly has serious implications for Primary Tops pupils and also for the GEAP intention of upgrading selected primary teachers to teach at secondary level. This latter intention is very problematic because of regulations concerning the recognition and registration of secondary level teachers. Currently, these regulations offer only one route for primary to secondary upgrading, which is by taking the full CPCE secondary teacher training course. Even this option may not be possible if candidates for upgrading do not have the higher level of CXC performance that is demanded of prospective secondary teachers.
- 4.14 This in turn is related to the more general issue of the lack of official recognition (in the form of accreditation) given to in-service course attendance. CPCE is the only institution accrediting in-service teacher training and currently, only its own courses, delivered in its own centres, are recognised for this purpose. While it appears that, in principle, there may be willingness on the part of CPCE to accredit other in-service work, there does not appear to be any mechanism in place for doing this.

5. Options for teacher training cadres

- 5.1 The consultancy terms of reference ask specifically for the evaluation of three alternative cadres of trainers which might play a role in in-service professional development of teachers: Mentors, Master Teachers and Advisory Teachers. As a first step the meaning of these terms will be clarified and some possible roles outlined.

5.2 *Mentor*

- 5.2.1 Mentoring refers to a one-to-one professional relationship in which the mentor, through a combination of coaching, counselling and assessment, seeks to enhance the professional practice of a mentee. The mentee is commonly a novice teacher in the first two years or so of his or her professional life. There is no reason, however, why the mentoring relationship should be restricted in this way and it may be useful for all teachers to be able to turn to a mentor for support and advice. In the Guyanese context it would be important to establish mentoring relationships to support untrained and inexperienced teachers. The mentor will almost inevitably be a teacher with greater experience than the mentee, but it should be noted that experience alone is not enough to ensure a teacher is a good mentor or that the mentoring relationship will be effective. A mentor requires training in this role, a commitment to the mentee(s), and time allocated to meet this commitment.
- 5.2.2 The demands of the mentoring relationship means that the mentor will almost certainly be a teacher within the same school as the mentee. Although much of the mentoring will take place relatively informally and on an ad hoc basis to cope with demands as they arise, it will also benefit from clear expectations on both sides and from some formalisation such as regular appraisals and reports. Mentor posts will exist in every school, with the individuals for whom they are responsible clearly identified. The position of mentor may or may not accompany another position such as head of department or deputy head, but it must be recognised as a role which demands extra time and responsibility from the appointee(s) who can legitimately expect increased financial reward or a reduction in teaching load.
- 5.2.3 The successful use of mentors to support professional development is dependent on their being adequate numbers of teachers in each school with suitable levels of experience and expertise. As indicated earlier, the reality in Guyana is that many schools simply cannot meet this condition. The role of mentor is already an expectation of heads of departments in relation to novice teachers. Some heads of departments indicated to me, however, that they felt inadequately prepared to take on this role and found difficulty in giving it the time it demanded. The lack of formal mentor training is just one aspect of the inadequate preparation; the relative lack of experience of some departmental heads, appointed as a consequence of rapid teacher turnover, is another. In one case, the head of department herself was only three years out of training college and admitted that she did not feel comfortable with the mentoring role.

5.3 *Master Teacher*

- 5.3.1 The term ‘Master Teacher’ is taken here to refer to a promoted post that recognises exceptional capability and performance. It is a promotion based on demonstrated (and formally assessed) performance and not merely on long-service. It is not a position for which an individual can be trained, although training may have contributed to an individual’s competence over time. The title of Master Teacher applies to an individual rather than being part of the establishment of any school. As such there could be schools without any Master Teachers and other schools with several. Indeed, in principle, all teachers in a given school could be Master Teachers, although this would represent an uneven distribution of valuable human resources.
- 5.3.2 In many education systems the creation of a category of Master Teacher, or its equivalent, is seen as a way of encouraging good teachers to remain in the classroom rather than turning to administrative positions as the only means of gaining promotion and increased financial reward. The post must, therefore, offer incentives to teachers commensurate with those available in administrative positions such as deputy principal or principal. Encouraging a long-term commitment to teaching demands the establishment of a long-term career structure, essentially parallel to an administrative career structure and equally as well rewarded.
- 5.3.3 It is important that the exceptional capability of a Master Teacher be used to enhance the capacity of the system. The position should, therefore, carry with it certain expectations and responsibilities. Two models of teaching commitment for a Master Teacher can be envisaged: one in which all teaching is done in the ‘home’ school, and another in which the Master Teacher teaches in more than one school in a local school cluster – as a sort of peripatetic exemplar of good practice. The former is the simpler and probably the more efficient option. Whatever the teaching expectations, however, the position of Master Teacher should include a responsibility to lead in-service professional development activities for colleagues. These may be directed solely at the Master Teacher’s ‘home’ school or at a wider cluster of schools, depending on what decisions have been made about the structuring of in-service provision. A Master Teacher would also be expected to act as a mentor to colleagues in the ‘home’ school. These various responsibilities of a Master Teacher would require specific training. At this point of the discussion, the professional grade of Master Teacher begins to overlap with the post of Advisory Teacher, which will be considered next.

5.4 *Advisory Teacher*

- 5.4.1 The term Advisory Teacher refers to a specific role in relation to other teachers that goes beyond the mentoring relationship. An active and proactive involvement in professional development provision for colleagues will be the central aspect of the AT’s role. As with the Master Teacher position, an Advisory Teacher will have demonstrated exceptional capability as a teacher. Indeed, Master Teacher status may be a prerequisite for appointment to an Advisory teacher post, although the appointment of Advisory Teachers is not dependent on their being a Master Teacher grade. Proven teaching ability must also be accompanied by specific training for an Advisory Teacher role, however.

- 5.4.2 Two Advisory Teacher models can be envisaged. One has the AT based in a single school and professional development responsibilities are largely or solely to the teachers, departments and curriculum in that school. The second model has the AT taking on regional or district responsibility for professional development in a cluster of schools. In this second model there may be some part-time teaching attachment to an individual school. This is less common but can provide the opportunity for the AT to keep in contact with classroom experience and to enhance credibility with other teachers. His/ her primary roles are to support school-based professional development activities and to organise other INSET provision for individual schools on request, or for school clusters.
- 5.4.3 The second model, of a school-cluster based AT has several advantages, particularly in a situation where there is a shortage of experienced and skilled teachers. It encourages a more efficient use of such scarce human resources and has equity arguments on its side too: schools lacking experienced teaching staff will have access to the AT's experience. In a cluster-based AT model there is likely to be a need to maintain a sensitive balance between proactive and reactive interventions. If the aim is to develop schools' capacities to plan and manage their own in-service provision, the AT's role may be largely that of a resource person, giving advice, contributing to INSET activities on request, assisting with resources, etc. If, however, schools are not meeting expectations of teacher support and development, perhaps because they simply do not have suitable personnel of their own to take a lead, the AT may be expected to take a more proactive, interventionist role. In general the AT will work through school hierarchies, notably the principal and departmental heads, rather than with individual teachers, except by request from the school. This approach would support the growth of good school management practices and the taking of responsibility for teacher professional development.
- 5.4.4 The post would carry other responsibilities too, such as curriculum development work or an involvement with assessment. There are likely to be further roles involving co-ordination with other in-service and pre-service providers and with the inspectorate, although it is important that the latter does not compromise perceptions of the AT as an adviser. The Advisory Teacher will be an important link through which central initiatives and innovations in pedagogy and curriculum are introduced into schools.
- 5.4.5 There is considerable scope for a useful role supporting the part-time, 'in-service' delivery of pre-service training currently undertaken at regional CPCE centres. The details of this would need working out but it would offer considerable efficiency savings.
- 5.4.6 The current regional subject panels offer a possible basis for the establishment of a cadre of Advisory Teachers, although the existing system would have to be formalised and developed much further.

5.5 A summary of cadre characteristics

5.5.1 The following table attempts to summarise some of the key characteristics of the three cadres outlined above. It must be pointed out that there is inevitably some overlap since they represent three quite different entities: Mentor is associated with a relationship and responsibility; Master Teacher is a grade of professional expertise; Advisory Teacher is a specific post.

<i>Cadre</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Professional development role</i>	<i>Skills/ experience/ training</i>
Mentor	School	Continuous support and advice on a one-to-one basis. Probationary teacher supervision	Some minimum level of experience to be specified. Inter-personal skills. Specific mentor training.
Master Teacher	School	Exemplar teaching. A lead role in planning and running school-based INSET might be expected.	Demonstrated high level of teaching performance. Willingness and ability to work with colleagues. Some training for INSET if this is demanded.
Advisory Teacher	School and/or school cluster/ region. Possibly attached to a Resource Centre.	Organisation of 'home' school-based INSET. Support for school-organised INSET in other schools. Cluster-based INSET provision. Advice to HODs (and possibly to individual teachers). Link role between central bodies, TT institutions, other INSET providers and schools.	Demonstrated teaching capacity plus involvement with professional development and curriculum activities. Training as a trainer required.

5.6 Conclusions

5.6.1 The three 'training cadres' outline above should not be seen as alternative approaches to the development of a system of in-service professional development and support but, rather, as different components within such a system:

- The role of Mentor provides continuous, day-to-day support and developmental help.
- The creation of a Master Teacher position will encourage high quality teachers to remain in teaching, to the benefit of their pupils and other teachers in the system with whom they can share their skills and experience.
- The Advisory Teacher plays a key role in providing and supporting in-service professional development at school and/or school cluster level.

- 5.6.2 Research and experience from elsewhere points to the value of adopting school-focused approaches to in-service professional development, rather than the targetting of individual teachers. A school focused and school-based INSET approach supports the development of schools as 'learning organisations' capable of self-sustaining improvement.
- 5.6.3 Within the Guyanese context there may be serious limitations on the initial capacity of schools to adopt such self-developmental roles. This suggests a need for a regional or school cluster approach as a first step for many – but not necessarily all - schools. It is important, however, that this be envisaged as support for the longer-term goal of school-based development, rather than as a substitute that will lead to dependency rather than independence.
- 5.6.4 Within the context of GEAP (and as a possible model for later system-wide action) it is recommended that training activities become whole-school focussed rather than aimed at individual teachers. The aim would be to promote each school's capacity to support the professional development of its teachers. This would involve some shift in training focus to the stronger rather than the weaker teachers, to the heads of departments and more experienced teachers, to develop their capacity as in-service 'trainers' and supporters of professional development. The weaker, untrained, inexperienced teachers would remain targets for support and intervention but this would be achieved in collaboration with and through the school's more experienced staff. It is hoped that this would also have the effect of making the schools feel more 'included', through a sense of partnership, rather than being 'objects' of the project. GEAP would, therefore, largely adopt a role of 'training the trainers'.
- 5.6.5 There is a need to develop the teaching skills of many of even the more experienced teachers in the schools if they are to have the knowledge and the confidence to take on a training role. There may be a need to develop their subject knowledge in some cases. This would have to be handled sensitively by the GEAP trainers if these teachers are to become partners in and ultimately take responsibility for the in-school development activities. Existing skills and experience within the pool of teachers should be identified and exploited while moving them forward to a greater repertoire of skills than appears to be in common use at present.
- 5.6.6 The development of school-based INSET capacity needs considerable infrastructural and managerial support, especially in the early stages. It cannot be separated from broader issues of whole-school management to produce the sort of milieu in which INSET can be effective and self-sustaining. Some staff development activities must therefore be focussed on school management issues and skills for heads, deputies and departmental heads.
- 5.6.7 Creating additional expectations and responsibilities for teachers who are to be in-service trainers increases demands on their time, which may conflict with existing teaching obligations. Teachers facing increasing demands on their time, and new demands from unfamiliar roles, can legitimately demand increased rewards. In the long term it is hoped that a restructuring of the teaching career structure would accommodate these new demands, but for the present, supplementary payments above normal salaries could legitimately be expected from the project.

- 5.6.8 A useful immediate target for GEAP intervention would be training for the mentoring role of heads of departments. The value of starting here is that mentoring is already an expectation of heads of departments and a 'system' already exists, albeit not always taken very seriously.
- 5.6.9 The further development of an in-service training capacity amongst these same heads of department (and other senior teachers) would almost certainly demand out-of-school activities based on school clusters. For several obvious reasons it would be sensible to try to establish collaborative links with individuals and institutions currently involved in training, notably CPCE regional centres. The use of existing infrastructures and facilities is both more efficient and likely to make integration of activities into the wider system easier. The under-utilised, under-resourced and (apparently) incoherently conceived Learning Resource Centres would appear to be ripe for development as centres for school cluster activities.
- 5.6.10 A school-cluster approach has different implications for the two GEAP regions. Within Region 10, there would probably be few problems. The linear nature of Region 6, however, presents distinct logistical complications. Transport costs and time could very high for some schools and individuals, reducing incentives and efficiency. Careful consideration would have to be given to the siting of activities and resources, perhaps using smaller school clusters than those in Region 10.
- 5.6.11 The longer-term vision for in-service support suggested by the role of Advisory Teachers could be approached either by establishing regional Advisory teacher posts and then using these to develop in-school capacity, or by strengthening schools' own training capacity and then using this to develop a regional structure. I suggest that the former approach carries the danger of perpetuating external dependency rather than a self-sustaining development capacity in the schools. The GEAP trainers and administration already constitutes a regional structure but of a temporary nature that is less likely to lead to longer-term dependency. Attempts to include other regional support structures, such as the subject panels and LRCs should be made as long as these are aware that the longer-term aim is the development of in-school capacity rather than the strengthening of external structures.
- 5.6.12 A strategy for achieving a new approach to GEAP intervention is the subject of the next section, presented in the form of a 'modified logframe'. This should be considered in conjunction with the recommendations in Section 7, of which it addresses only those relating to school-based INSET development.

6. Forward Activity Plan

<i>Target</i>	<i>Activities to reach target</i>	<i>Sources of costs</i>	<i>Other resources</i>	<i>Commitments by MoE</i>
6.1 Development of effective mentoring skills in Heads of Departments	Mentoring training workshops for HoDs	Time and travel costs for participants in workshops	Venue for workshops. Materials (see Appendix 3 for suggested mentoring resource book).	Recognition of time demands for mentoring in HoD job descriptions. Support for teacher appraisal schemes drawing on mentoring.
6.2 Development of pedagogical skills and new teaching approaches amongst HoDs and senior teachers	Workshops for HoDs. In-school support and exemplar teaching.	<i>Short-term:</i> usual workshop costs. <i>Long-term:</i> costs of new teaching grades recognising exceptional competence (Master Teacher)	Venue for workshops. In-school resources to support alternative teaching approaches. Long-term: learning resource centre materials	The development of incentives such as an enhanced career structure, for teachers to engage in professional development and remain in teaching.
6.3 Development of a cadre of in-service 'trainers' within each school.	Training workshops. Planning of school-based INSET activities. Joint INSET activities in schools.	<i>Short-term:</i> workshop costs. Possible supplementation of salary costs for trainers and participants. <i>Long-term:</i> salary costs for Advisory Teacher posts.	Venue for workshops. Materials for workshops.	Commitment to school-based professional development. Allocation to schools and staff of time and resources to support this.
6.4 Ongoing support for school-based in-service activities	Establishment of regional or school cluster support base and personnel.	Salary costs for support team. LRC materials and facilities.	LRC (or equivalent) development.	Creation of Advisory Teacher (or equivalent) posts at school/ regional level. Recognition of alternative routes to teacher qualification and accreditation.

7. Recommendations

7.1 These will be given under two headings, those that are specific to GEAP and those that are related to INSET provision more generally. It should be recognised, however, that successful implementation of many of the former, especially in the longer-term, will be dependent on wider systemic changes.

7.2 Recommendations pertaining to GEAP

7.2.1 GEAP interventions should aim at developing systemic and in-school continuing professional development (CPD) capacity rather than focussing on individual teachers. A 'training the trainers' role and a whole school CPD strategy should be adopted, rather than one of training the individuals in need.

7.2.2 The development of greater mentoring capacity in the schools is recommended as a useful initial contribution to this overall aim. The focus would be mentor training and the establishment of mentoring and appraisal systems.

7.2.3 Greater co-ordination of activities and approaches amongst GEAP trainers should be sought, particularly in relation to the successful achievement of regional and school-based CPD capacity building.

7.2.4 Means should be sought to establish greater co-ordination and co-operation with other national and regional providers of INSET, and to use existing infrastructure such as LRCs.

7.2.5 In particular, GEAP should engage with CPCE with the aim of obtaining recognition of INSET provision for formal teacher accreditation.

7.2.6 The future of current Primary Tops teachers in an expanded secondary sector must be established. If they are to have no future role in secondary teaching then the current intervention to develop their knowledge and skills in that direction should be halted and efforts directed elsewhere.

7.2.7 If, on the other hand, Primary Tops teachers are to have a teaching role in the secondary schools, GEAP should establish what will be needed for these teachers to obtain secondary teacher status recognition and direct at least some of their activities towards achieving that. This should be done in collaboration with other agencies, notably CPCE.

7.2.8 Attention should be focussed on developing skills for the teaching of a greater range of student ability than is currently the norm in secondary schools and of dealing with mixed ability classes.

7.2.9 Thought should be given to the opportunities which new IT facilities offer for CPD as these facilities are increasingly provided. Many of these opportunities may lie outside the country and be accessed through the internet. A search for such opportunities, and the compilation of a data-base, should be carried out.

7.2.10 Greater integration of GEAP into both national and regional educational development strategies is essential. To achieve this, closer involvement with GEAP of the appropriate education officers at both levels should be facilitated.

7.3 Broader systemic recommendations

- 7.3.1 A clear policy on professional development (CPD) of staff at all levels of the system should be established, together with a clear structure of responsibility for the implementation of this policy and the monitoring of its effectiveness. The policy must clarify the functions of CPD and the responsibilities for delivery and co-ordination.
- 7.3.2 In-service staff development activities should become school-focussed and integrated into a whole-school improvement approach. The medium- to longer-term aim should be for school managed in-service professional development, suitably funded and supported at central and regional level.
- 7.3.3 CPCE and the University of Guyana should retain responsibility for accreditation of trained teacher status but there should be greater flexibility in the provision of the appropriate training, making use of a range of providers and means of delivery. The aim must be to make greater use of existing individual and institutional capacity within the system and to promote the expansion of that capacity.
- 7.3.4 Evaluations of the effectiveness and efficiency of current pre-service and in-service teacher training provisions should be carried out as soon as possible. It is suggested that this be done by CPCE and the University of Guyana in collaboration with an overseas university. All future in-service and pre-service professional development provision must have in-built quality assurance and evaluation mechanisms.
- 7.3.5 Better articulation between the centre and the regions over CPD policy interpretation and implementation must be achieved. A clear demarcation of responsibilities and roles is needed. This must allow flexibility to meet local demands and conditions at regional level while not frustrating the achievement of common national goals and agendas.
- 7.3.6 A new, extended career structure for teachers, that recognises the central importance of good classroom teaching, must be established if the current exodus of qualified talent is to be halted and good teachers are to be encouraged to stay in teaching.
- 7.3.7 To this end a new grade of Master Teacher should be created, with its own salary scale matching that of the Senior Master/ Deputy/ Head Teacher promotion route. Appointment and promotion will be on the basis of performance, not experience or qualification. Clear performance criteria and a means of evaluating them must be established. Engagement with CPD activities may be part of these criteria. The post will carry extra responsibilities, particularly with respect to the provision of CPD within the school and mentoring of inexperienced teachers. Master Teachers will remain in their schools and not become peripatetic advisory teachers for a group of schools.
- 7.3.8 Greater use must be made of regional Learning Resource Centres for CPD activities. This demands better human and material resourcing of these centres but also requires a clarification of their role and of responsibilities for their use and administration.
- 7.3.9 Advisory Teachers, with a role of providing and supporting CPD at regional level, both in-school and in the form of out-of-school workshops, should be attached to Learning Resource Centres. This post of Advisory Teacher would in future form part of the envisaged new career structure for teachers, drawing on those promoted to Master Teacher status and being professionally equivalent to a training college lecturer.

APPENDIX 1: Terms of Reference for the consultancy

GUYANA EDUCATION ACCESS PROJECT

Terms of Reference for a consultancy on:

**DESIGNING A DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR AN APPROPRIATE CADRE OF
IN-SERVICE SECONDARY TRAINERS (MASTER /
MENTOR / ADVISORY TEACHER) FOR THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION**

Monday September 11th to Friday September 22nd 2000

Section 1 – Title of consultancy

Designing a development plan for an appropriate cadre of In-service secondary Trainers (at Master / Mentor / and/or Advisory Teacher level) for the Ministry of Education, with a focus on both administrative / financial and professional aspects

Section 2 - Background

2.1 The Guyana Education Access Project aims to pilot full access to secondary education in its two target zones within Regions 6 and 10. Inputs are focused on:

- Provision of new / refurbished schools
- Increasing access and participation
- Improving teaching & learning
- Improving educational management
- Procurement of support resources (computers, books and teaching/science materials)

2.2 The project has been working with the Ministry to improve the teaching and learning process in targeted schools within Regions 6 & 10, with In-service teacher training provided by a cadre of VSO Teacher Trainers and local trainers (eg. in the area of IT) contracted to GEAP. In both regions, the focus has been on Maths, English, Science and Remedial Education, with (more recently) inputs to IT.

2.3 The GEAP cadre of VSOs is of course a relatively short-term input. A key GEAP objective is the strengthening of in-country expertise in the provision of In-service teacher development and support. This is vital to the *long-term* maintenance of any improvements initiated within the life of the project.

2.4 A consultant is sought who will work with Ministry personnel at both central and regional levels to draw up a range of scenarios for the development of a cadre of trainers, taking into account all relevant factors, both administrative/financial and professional and bearing in mind the in-service work done to-date. The resulting report will present the MoE with *options* which will inform decisions (a) by MoE as to the most appropriate way forward; and (b) by MoE/DFID/GEAP as to the best way GEAP can support the process of developing In-set provision.

Section 3 – **Specific objectives of the consultancy**

The consultant will:

- assess the current MoE provision of In-service support to secondary teachers. This assessment must cover national and regional provision, with particular focus (at the Regional level) on Regions 6 & 10.
- assess the GEAP provision of In-service support to date, along with an overview of what other donor-funded projects have been and/or are providing
(*as much as possible of the above assessments, with relevant information & documentation, will be made available to the consultant before or on his/her arrival to economise on time*)
- assess wider human resource capacity-building & development initiatives under discussion within MoE to ensure that there is synergy with the ideas & recommendations which derive from this consultancy
- meet relevant MoE officials (eg. at NCERD) involved in the delivery / administration of In-service activity in order to understand the realities and constraints of In-set provision within Guyana and to judge MoE views on the most appropriate forms of building a higher quality long-term Inset capacity.
- draw up a range of scenarios for In-set provision, highlighting the advantages / disadvantages of cadre(s) such as (but not limited to) *Mentors, Master Teachers* and/or *Advisory Teachers* along with patterns of delivery (eg. distance, face-to-face, regional vs. school-based, etc.)
- meet the appropriate finance, planning and Teacher Service personnel in order to assess how the 3 cadres mentioned would function within MoE structures, paying particular attention to issues such as recurrent costs (financial and/or in kind), post allocations, accreditation, etc. which the development of a given cadre might involve
- meet CPC / NCERD officials in order to assess how Pre-service & In-service provisions correspond and how to guarantee synergies
- produce a report (*see below*), the key purpose of which is to set out clearly the different options, with indicative costs, for the MoE to use as a decision-making instrument

Section 4 - **Report & recommendations**

The consultant will produce a draft report within three weeks of the completion of the consultancy visit. The report must:

- illustrate the *professional* advantages & disadvantages of the three different trainer cadres within the Guyana context
- present indicative *costs* of each of these options, with emphasis on the long-term implications for the Ministry in terms of sustaining any cadre which is put in place during the life-time of GEAP
- develop a *framework* for a programme which might be trialled in the GEAP target areas within Regions 6 & 10, to start as early as possible in 2001.

--*-----*-----*-----*-----*--

APPENDIX 2: List of people interviewed/ consulted during the consultancy***Georgetown:***

Mr Stephen Bradley, GEAP Project Director
Ms Zohora Singh, Project Director Counterpart
Dr Clarence Perry, Director of NCERD
Mr T Thomas, Principal Personnel Officer (Policy), MoE
Ms Evelyn Hamilton, Chief Planning Officer, MoE
Mr Desmond Bermingham, Education Field Manager, DFID
Mr Romeo McAdam, DCEO (Administration), MoE
Dr Alan Persico, Dean of Faculty of Education, University of Guyana
Ms Genevieve Whyte-Nedd, DCEO (Development), MoE
Ms Donna Chapman, ACEO (Secondary), MoE
Ms Savitri Balbahadur, Principal, Cyril Potter College of Education
Ms Jan Draper, Director, Guyana Basic Education Training (GBET)
Mr Samuel Small, Director, IDCE

Linden Region 10:

Mr Ed Denham, GEAP Regional Adviser
Ms Gwen George-Albert, Head Teacher, Christianburg Multilateral Secondary School
Ms Miriam Gillis, Head Teacher, New Silvercity Secondary School
Heads of Departments, New Silvercity Secondary School
Mr Martin Porter, Head of Centre, CPCE Linden
Mr Bertram Hamilton, Co-ordinator Allied Arts, Linden, President GTU
Ms Lola Daniels, Admin. Assistant to REdO
Ms Evelyn David, Amalgamation Officer, Regional Ed. Office
Ms Joy Walton, Amalgamation Officer, Regional Ed. Office
Ms Ruth Mentore, Amalgamation Officer, Regional Ed. Office
Ms Yvette Layne, DEO, Regional Ed. Office
Ms Verlyn Pitt, Linden Foundation Secondary School
Ms Grace Lewis-Antoine, New Silvercity Secondary School
Ms Jacqueline Osborne, Mackenzie High School
Mr Richard Osborne, Mackenzie High School
Ms Andrea Levine, Linden Foundation Secondary School
Ms Jennifer Bourne, Christianburg W Secondary School
Ms D Porter, Christianburg W Secondary School
Ms Gloria Britton, Counterpart to GEAP Regional Adviser
VSO Teacher Trainers in Linden Region 10

Corriverton Region 6:

Mr Paul Worrall, GEAP Regional Adviser, Project Area Region 6

Region 6 GEAP Centre personnel:

Mr Bashir Khan, Counterpart to Regional Adviser

Ms Kim Spencer

Ms Norma Mackenzie

Ms Naomi Wallace

Ms Bernadette Higgins

Ms Sarah Wood

Ms Sue Miller

Mr Richard Ramnarine

Ms Savitri Ramdas

Mr Faroukh Kudrath

Ms Amelia Newland, Tagore Memorial Secondary School

Ms Guytril Panchu, Teacher, Tagore MSS

Ms Kamaldai Heralall Autar, Teacher, Tagore MSS

Mr Dhanoshwar Bhola, Teacher, Tagore MSS

Mr Kamil Khan, Teacher, Tagore MSS

Ms Darveena Prananand, Maths HoD, Tagore MSS

Ms Akshai Devi Rattan, English HoD, Tagore MSS

Mr Mahadeo, Head Teacher, Skeldon Line Path Secondary School

Mr R Sookram, Deputy Head Teacher, Skeldon Line Path SS

Mr Johnson, Head Teacher, No. 48 Primary School

Mrs Claudette Pestano, Co-ordinator, Corriverton Learning Resource Centre

APPENDIX 3: Recommended material

The following is suggested as a source book for the development of mentoring practices, as recommended in this report.

Fletcher, Sarah (2000) *Mentoring in Schools: A handbook of good practice*. Londo, Kogan Page. (ISBN 0 7494 3183 0)