

CfBT Education Services, Guyana

GUYANA EDUCATION ACCESS PROJECT (GEAP)

**Report on the Accreditation of Teacher
Education and Training**

October 1999

*Submitted to: Ministry of Education, Guyana
DFID Caribbean*

Prepared by: John Anderson

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

2. Context & Comment

3. Conclusion

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Annex B: Replication

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful for the help which I received at a time when the MoE staff were inundated with visitors. In particular I would like to thank the following members of the Ministry of Education staff: Mr. H. Ally (Permanent Secretary), Mr. E. Caesar (Chief Education Officer), Mrs. E. Hamilton (Chief Planning Officer), Mr. H. Patterson (Special Adviser to the Minister), Dr. C. Perry (Director of NCERD), Mrs. S. Balbahadur (Principal CPCE), Miss F. Dalgety (Director of GUIDE), and the Regional Education Development Officers for Regions 6 and 10.

From DFID my thanks to Mr. D. Bermingham for a number of very helpful discussions.

I would also like to acknowledge the help and hospitality given by members of the GEAP staff: Helen O'Reilly, David Pearson and the central office team; Ed Denham and the VSO team at Linden; Paul Worrall and the team at Corriverton.

The Directors of the CPCE outposts at Regions 6 and 10 also gave me time and help. With regard to schools, my gratitude goes to the headteachers and staff of Tagore Memorial Secondary School, Wismah Hill Primary School, Mackenzie Hill Primary School, and Christianburg Primary School.

My fellow consultant Mary Surridge and her team were very helpful in sharing information and exchanging views.

Finally, I am most grateful to my counterpart local consultant, Dr Alan Persico, for the vital part he played in explaining developments in Guyana and for finding the time to fit in with what was a demanding schedule of meetings.

Abbreviations

CfBT	CfBT Education Services
CPCE	Cyril Potter College of Education
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CXC	Caribbean Examinations Council
DFIDC	Department for International Development Caribbean
FOE	Faculty of Education
GBET	Guyana Basic Education Teacher Training Project
GUIDE	Guyana In-Service Distance Education Project
IDCE	Institute for Distance and Continuing Education
MoE	Ministry of Education
NCERD	National Centre for Educational Research and Development
ODL	Open/Distance Learning
SSRP	Secondary School Reform Project
UG	University of Guyana
UWI	University of the West Indies
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas

Executive Summary and Key Recommendations

- GEAP has two related dimensions:
 - developing activities in two contrasting ‘trial areas’ designed to increase access and improve the quality of secondary education;
 - informing MoE so that the experience and achievements gained can be utilised in wider policy development and planning.
 - In both of the above a key output is the improvement of teacher training. Four levels of teacher training are recognised in Guyana:
 - Qualification: this involves enabling teachers who do not have sufficient general education to enter teacher training to reach an accepted qualification level.
 - Certification: this involves undertaking a teacher-training course offered by CPCE or UG.
 - Post Certification Training and Professional Development: this involves providing courses for certificated teachers and is largely the province of the Faculty of Education, at UG.
 - Teacher support: this involves providing direct support to teachers as they carry out their teaching, for instance explaining curricular changes and developing good practice. This work is the responsibility of the National Centre for Educational Research and Development (NCERD).
- Accreditation is treated as part the certification role of the teacher training agencies and is not seen as a separate process. UG and CPCE do not accredit other institutions or courses.
- Teacher promotion and financial rewards are the responsibility of the Teaching Service Commission. The Commission rewards qualification and certification according to national agreements.

- These national processes / policies cannot be addressed by the activities of one project alone. However, there are a number of ways in which GEAP can make participating in training and development attractive to teachers. These approaches fit into the more flexible type of teacher preparation being promoted through the idea of a Council for Teacher Education and support the creation of a National Framework for Teacher Training, Education and Development as the basis for a better sequenced pattern of teacher qualifications and strengthened quality control. The GEAP activities are outlined below as key recommendations for supporting the improvement of teacher training and development:
 - Co-operative Developments with CPCE and/or UG: GEAP staff are already helping to teach on CPCE courses and where qualified could teach for UG. Inputs by GEAP staff to improve courses would be welcomed by both CPCE and UG.
 - VSOs contribute to materials development and make occasional inputs directly to students; it must be noted, however, that it is not feasible for VSOs to make regular inputs at UG in Georgetown. Where GEAP seeks to develop a specific course project staff could co-operate with CPCE and / or UG to gain recognition for the course as a college or university course. Both the Principal of CPCE and the Dean of the Faculty of Education, UG have made it clear that given joint goals and priorities, common standards and the necessary resources, they would welcome co-operation with GEAP staff to develop appropriate CPCE and UG courses.
- Developing externally validated courses
Should GEAP be unsuccessful in developing a course jointly with CPCE or UG an external validating body, for instance from UK or the region (eg. UWI), might be used. This would be subject to the agreement of the Examination Board Committee covering international qualifications, and care would be needed to draw up clear policy and guidelines.
- Securing exemption
Where GEAP training covers aspects of qualification or certification training that are part of CPCE or UG course requirements, exemption could be negotiated for the appropriate elements of the CPCE or UG courses.
- Profile development
Where formal recognition cannot be gained, training will have to be offered without accreditation, as is the case with all NCERD and SSRP training at present. However, it could be recorded as part of a GEAP teacher's development profile with certificates awarded.

- As part of the co-operative process it will be important to review needs in schools and prioritise accordingly to ensure that basic needs are met and to ensure that limited resources are used as effectively as possible. Providing co-operation is emphasised and expected outcomes are matched to project capacity, GEAP offers considerable potential in supporting the improvement of teacher training and development in Guyana.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The purpose of the Guyana Access Project (GEAP) is to support the Ministry of Education, Guyana (MoE) in its mission to improve access to, and improve the quality of, secondary education. The Master Plan for GEAP sets out seven expected outputs. The need to improve teacher performance, and therefore teacher training and development bears on most of these, and is thus a vital element within the GEAP operational programme

1.2 It is important to note that while the first six outcomes focus on the activities to be developed in the ‘pilot areas,’ output 7 focuses on ‘replication’. Thus, the focus moves from the local to the national level, and highlights the need to be aware of the interaction between these two levels.

1.3 This sets the scene for the consultancy with regard to the accreditation of teacher education and training. The use of the word ‘replication’ and the implications involved raise issues which lie outside the terms of reference of the consultancy, but they do shape the context in which GEAP, and therefore the teacher training aspect of its work, has to develop. (Annexe 1 refers to the issue of replication).

1.4 In practice GEAP has two related dimensions

- developing activities in two contrasting trial areas in consultation with local communities, regional offices and MoE, designed to increase access and improve the quality of secondary education;
- on the basis of experience and achievements, to inform MoE so that the benefits can be evaluated and where appropriate utilised in wider policy development, design and planning.

2 CONTEXT AND COMMENT

2.1 The Accreditation of Teacher Training, Education and Development in Guyana: Current Status

Currently MoE Guyana recognises four levels of activity:

- Qualification:
This involves enabling those teachers who do not have sufficient general education to enter teacher training to reach an accepted qualification level:
 - ❑ University of Guyana (UG) offers a BA or BSc. which demands 5 CXC (Grade 3 or above) including Mathematics and English,
 - ❑ Cyril Potter College of Education (CPCE) offers a certificate which demands 4 CXC (Grade 3 or above) including English, or an appropriate equivalent, for instance achieving a GUIDE certificate (N.B. the GUIDE programme was designed to meet this need, but is now being run down and will end next year)
- Certification:
This involves undertaking a teacher-training course.
 - ❑ UG offers Bachelors degrees, BA/BSc and a part time in-service training course (attendance on Saturdays) over 2 years leading to a diploma.
 - ❑ CPCE offers a 3 year course for secondary teachers and a 2 year course for primary teachers on a full time, pre-service basis. CPCE also offers a 5 year course through part time study at local/regional centres for teachers who achieve entry qualifications.
- Post Certification Training and Professional Development:
This involves providing courses for certificate teachers and is largely the province of the Faculty of Education, (FOE) at UG. The courses offered fall into two categories:
 - ❑ the upgrading of CPCE certificates to University certificates and degrees.
This involves certificate trained teachers taking a 5 year course, (1 year usually remitted), 2 years leading to a University certificate and a further 2 years leading to a BEd. degree.
 - ❑ Professional development courses including specialist certificates and Masters degrees.
- Teacher support:
This involves providing direct support to teachers as they carry out their teaching, for instance explaining curricular changes and developing good practice. This work is the responsibility of the National Centre for Educational Research and Development(NCERD)

2.2 Accreditation is incorporated into the certification role of UG and CPCE. They certificate teachers when making awards and by so doing accredit them as professionally trained. Accreditation is thus treated as part the certification role of the teacher training agencies and is not seen as a separate process. UG and CPCE do not accredit other institutions or courses. However, they can allow exemptions for parts of the certificate courses which they offer.

2.3 Qualification, Certification, Promotion and Financial Rewards

In effect teachers operate at three levels of qualification /certification:

<u>Qualification</u>	<u>Certification</u>
(i) Graduate level	Trained with Dip Ed Untrained
(ii) CXC qualified level	Trained with a certificate (with options to upgrade) Untrained
(iii) Unqualified	

Teacher promotion and financial rewards are the responsibility of the Teacher Service Commission. The Commission recognises the levels of qualification and certification noted above and rewards them according to national agreements so that teachers gaining certification or upgrading their certification are awarded increments. Promotion however turns on the availability of promotion posts in schools. Each school has a recognised establishment and when posts become available these are advertised and teachers apply. Candidates are selected according to the following criteria: length of service, references, experience and qualifications. The Teaching Service Commission recognises a highly complex range of categories of teacher posts in schools. This has been highlighted in the baseline survey.

2.4 Training Needs in the ‘Trial Areas’

2.4.1 In the initial phase of the project a determined effort has been made in both ‘trial areas’ to ascertain the training needs of the teachers and to consider the best way of meeting these needs. This has proved to be a highly complex task compounded by the very wide range of training needs of teachers in the schools. A brief survey made by the consultant during his visit highlights these differences:

- At one end of the spectrum is Mackenzie High School. This is a well established secondary school with a well recognised reputation, taking pupils from the higher range end of the secondary entrance examination scores. It has a Sixth Form and over 50% of the teachers are graduates. The headteacher has

made it clear that in her view the school does not need any training under GEAP.

- At the other end of the spectrum is Crabwood Creek Primary School which has a Primary Top with one class of 47 pupils covering the first three forms of secondary school. There are 23 pupils at Form 1 level, 17 at Form 2 level, and 7 at Form 3 level. There is no teacher for the class, but some teachers in the Primary School give occasional lessons and set work.
- At the centre of the spectrum is Tagore Memorial School which is making real efforts in very cramped conditions. The Principal and several teachers asked for as much training as possible in all fields and in all subjects but emphasised that the top priority should be given to remedial teaching, particularly reading.

2.4.2 The more deeply one looks the more complex the situation becomes. In the three primary top schools which the consultant visited in Linden there was a total of 59 teachers:

- 1 was an untrained graduate
- 32 were certificated teachers
- 12 were qualified but not certificated
- 15 were unqualified.

One of the trained teachers was taking an upgrading course to B.Ed at UG, five of the trained teachers were attending NCERD Workshops in various subjects, nine of the qualified teachers were taking the CPCE part time certificate course at the regional centre circa forty miles away, and two of the unqualified teachers were following the GUIDE programme.

2.4.3 It was also significant that the database the consultant had been given, which was only three months old, had to be adapted in each school. Several teachers had already left, changed roles within the school, or changed their training plans. When asked to identify the most pressing needs for training, Principals and teachers in all the schools visited emphasised repeatedly that they were teaching pupils who, in most cases, had relatively low scores in the selection examination. Moreover, several made it clear that these groups of students had come from primary schools with very poor basic skills, and pointed in particular to the need to develop and improve reading skills. This view was confirmed in discussions with members of staff of CPCE and UG and by the VSOs involved in surveying school needs.

2.5 The Development of National Training Provision

GEAP is being implemented at a time of rejuvenation in education in Guyana, particularly in teacher qualification and training.

2.5.1 Qualification

The GUIDE distance learning programme is now coming to a close. It has provided valuable experience in the use of open/distance learning and has helped to reduce the numbers of teachers who are unqualified for certificate training. There is a general feeling that the qualification element of teacher preparation is becoming less significant and as the numbers of secondary school students rise there will be a supply of qualified candidates to meet demand, at least as far as the coastal and easily accessible regions are concerned. However, the position in the more remote mountainous and riverine areas still needs attention. The Guyana Basic Education for Teachers Programme (GBET) supported by CIDA and based at CPCE, is preparing an ODL based programme for schools in these areas as a first phase of its outputs.

2.5.2 Certification

CPCE is poised for considerable change. An evaluation of the education programmes has recently been made, chaired by Dr. Una Paul, which recommends the strengthening of the management and the course studies at the College. Following this, a revision of the curriculum is currently being undertaken by Dr. Zelline Jennings. The Principal, Mrs. S. Balhabadour, is very conscious of the need to strengthen teacher education; to make it sufficiently flexible to meet the very varied conditions in Guyana; and to make it more school based, with greater attention being paid to teacher competence. She made it clear that she would wish to have close co-operation with GEAP and welcomes GEAP support, particularly at the two CPCE centres in Region 10 and in Region 6. She pointed out the need to create a new framework of teacher education and referred to the proposal for the Council of Teacher Education. UG is also reviewing its certification training, through the Dip Ed. for graduates.

2.5.3 Post Certificate Training

UG is actively reconsidering teacher education at this level and is looking towards a comprehensive programme of continuing professional development. In the words of Dr. Alan Persico, the Dean of the Faculty, there is a need for *“a unified and flexible teacher education curriculum which allows for varying entry and exit points. At the lowest level it could include short courses offered, for example, by NCERD, GTU, CLC, SSRP and GEAP, and at the highest levels it could include courses offered by local or overseas university level institutions,. However, it will be important that detailed information be provided for such courses, so as to enable the FOE to determine where they fit into the formal existing programmes, or where they may be accommodated as equivalents for existing courses, or parts of courses.”*

This helps to set the scene for the likely future development of teacher training and development in Guyana.

2.5.4 Teacher Support

NCERD is also reviewing its work and is very conscious of the need for expansion and development. Dr Clarence Perry, the present Director, who has considerable professional experience overseas, and Miss Florine Dalgetty, the former Director, who set up the GUIDE programme and now, in retirement, is acting as Director in its final phase, both emphasised the need to develop a much stronger, more accessible programme of professional development and support, with a particular emphasis on making provision for teachers in their own schools or at centres that can be easily reached. NCERD now has extended premises which provide for the development of Open /Distance Learning and the production of television broadcasts and videos.

Some very specific teacher support is provided by the World Bank funded Secondary School Reform Project (SSRP). This involves workshops focusing on the key subject curriculum guides which the project has introduced to the project schools.

2.6 Specific Objectives Identified in the Terms of Reference for the present consultancy

2.6.1 To ensure that GEAP teacher training programmes for untrained teachers are designed to strengthen the existing in-service programmes provided by CPCE and the GUIDE unit of NCERD

- The key to meeting this objective is to ensure close co-operation and, as far as possible, joint planning with CPCE and its outposts serving Regions 6 and 10. Both the Principal of CPCE and the senior tutors responsible for the outposts, Mr. Martin Porter (Region 10) and Mr. Mangal (Region 6), are keen to co-operate with the GEAP team on a more formal basis. Good foundations are already being laid on a practical basis in both regions.
- VSOs are helping with teaching courses at the Linden outpost in Region 10 which is based in one of the GEAP schools, Mackenzie Hill Primary. The outpost is dependent on part time teaching from local teachers with sufficient qualifications; it is difficult to recruit teachers in all subjects, and after a day's teaching both trainees and part time tutors are tired. The injection of help from GEAP through the VSOs has been very timely and has brought considerable benefits. Mr Porter expressed the hope that this help could be further developed.

- In Region 6 the outpost is based in a school some forty miles from the project area. GEAP now provides transport for the teachers which has proved popular and has helped to ensure teachers participate in training. Mr Mangal is very keen to extend co-operation and also wishes to work closely with GEAP in the work it is undertaking in schools.
- GEAP is clearly having a valuable practical impact in helping with the current certification training programme as well as addressing the issue of more direct help to teachers in GEAP schools. VSOs are currently surveying training needs and are developing training strategies. However, this type of assistance falls more properly under the remit of NCERD rather than CPCE. NCERD tends to base its work on national workshops rather than on the school-based support approach made possible by the GEAP focus on two clusters of schools. This is an approach which NCERD would like to consider once resources become available, if possible supporting it with the Open/ Distance Learning provision which it is now developing. Further discussions would therefore be very timely with NCERD in particular to see how far co-operative experimentation could be developed in the GEAP 'trial areas'.
- As this work develops it is also important for GEAP to work closely with REOs who have responsibility for the quality of education in their regions. The GEAP team leaders in each area have made special efforts to develop working relationships with their respective REOs but there will need to be closer co-ordination, especially where training involves time release for teachers.
- In order to achieve maximum effectiveness the development of in-service training of teachers must start from an understanding of need and current provision, and must operate on a co-operative basis with those responsible for such provision. Initial moves mentioned above have laid the foundations for this development, but as surveys of need lead to plans for action these will have to be formulated as proposals to be discussed beyond the immediate school cluster at the following levels:
 - i) REOs and relevant regional staff
 - ii) CPCE outposts
 - iii) CPCE and UG
 - iv) NCERD.

This will take time and energy but in the initial stages of a programme designed to develop methods of training which, where successful could be used nationally, it is essential to ensure wide understanding and co-operation. Moreover, the experience and knowledge of colleagues in the national organisations could be very helpful both in shaping proposals and in identifying forms of co-operation.

- It would be useful for GEAP to assist the GUIDE programme and to this end contacts have been made; however, only a few teachers are now following the GUIDE programme which is currently running down.

2.6.2 To identify the forms of accreditation which teachers would value and would increase their motivation for training

- Teachers would like to receive financial rewards for successful training. However, as discussed above, accreditation is part of the certification process with the Teaching Service Commission being responsible for financial rewards. This does not allow for changes in financial arrangements to be made easily. It would be very divisive were teachers treated as a special case in the two small selected areas where GEAP is active, and thus any plans for financial incentives need to be developed nationally in line with public expenditure policy.
- The best approach to this issue therefore would seem to be to develop with each teacher a *professional development profile*, outlining experience, qualifications and interests, which would be designed to include each training programme, each piece of experimental work and a note of improvements in teaching performance. This would help teachers to build confidence in their own abilities and develop an understanding of career development. The profiles could be used when applying to the Teaching Service Commission or in applying for the next level of certification/training.

2.6.3 To identify where training provided by GEAP can be validated under existing teacher training accreditation schemes in Guyana

The term ‘validation’ is not used formally in Guyana and, as explained above, accreditation is built into the certification functions of CPCE and the UG. GEAP will therefore need to structure its training programme to relate to the current approach and could operate at the following levels:

- *Developments with CPCE and/or UG*
GEAP seeks to develop a specific course for which it seeks recognition; this will involve negotiating and co-operating with CPCE and/or UG, depending on the level and purpose of the course. The aim would be to develop a course formally so that CPCE and/or UG would recognise it as a college or university course and it would thus meet the requirements for recognition. Both the Principal of CPCE and the Dean of FOE, UG made it clear that providing GEAP had goals which meshed with their institutions’ priorities, met their standards and could provide the necessary resources, they would welcome the idea of joint co-operation to develop appropriate CPCE and UG courses

- *Developing externally validated courses*
Where GEAP sought to establish a course which could not be developed jointly with CPCE or UG, it might be possible to use an external validating body, for instance from UK or the region. Some consideration is being given to an RSA course in the practical use of IT. However external validation should only be considered after negotiations with CPCE or UG, and ideally with their support. Moreover, to be effective, agreement about the recognition of such an award should be obtained from the Examination Board Committee which covers international qualifications.
- *Securing exemption*
Where GEAP training covers aspects of qualification or certification training that are part of CPCE or UG course requirements exemption could be negotiated for the appropriate elements of the CPCE or UG courses.
- *Profile development*
Where formal recognition cannot be achieved, the training would have to be offered without accreditation, as is all NCERD and SSRP training at present, but it could be recorded as part of a teacher's development profile, as previously discussed in 2.6.2.

2.6.4 To explore additional forms of accreditation which could be set up for trained teachers through the University of Guyana or the Institute of Distance and Continuing Education (IDCE)

As argued above, structured co-operative links need to be established with FOE and CPCE. Trained teachers already have the opportunity to take post initial training qualifications at the FOE in a number of fields, including Master degrees, which cover a range of options. Where GEAP felt that it could make additions to such courses, or develop further courses, these could be negotiated with FOE and the courses developed and offered as UG courses on a joint basis.

FOE would be interested to receive and discuss such proposals and to join in experimenting with the school-based approach work which is being adopted in the GEAP trial areas. However, there would be critical questions about the qualifications and certification levels of teachers meeting university requirements in order to enter such courses. It might therefore be sensible to consider two levels of courses, and to negotiate on an experimental basis with CPCE in order to offer a lower level certificate or element of certification.

An example makes this clear. At secondary level there is a current need for courses for teachers in remedial work, particularly reading. CPCE is interested in developing this, as is FOE which already offers a certificate in reading and a BEd course. However, unfortunately only a few teachers have the time to

take courses which are based at UG. GEAP, CPCE and UG could work collaboratively to establish a structured sequence of a remedial reading course which fitted into CPCE and UG frameworks, and which, with GEAP co-operation, could be offered at centres in the two ‘pilot areas.’ This would initially serve the GEAP schools but would also provide an experimental prototype which might lead to the wider use of school clusters as bases for professional development. This is already of strong interest to both CPCE and UG (note the words of the Dean of Education quoted above in 2.5.3).

It is worth noting that although IDCE is the university agency focussing on the developments in ODL it has only two or three courses concentrating on literacy and basic adult education and has no bearing on teacher training and development.

2.6.5 To provide further information to feed into the Ministry of Education’s discussions on the proposal to institute a Council for Teacher Education in Guyana

The proposal to institute a Council for Teacher Education in Guyana is at a fairly early stage of consideration. In discussions held during the consultancy it was apparent that the intention is to widen and strengthen stakeholder participation in informing national policy and practice. The extent to which the Council would have any formal position in establishing policy and practice has not yet, it appears, been clarified. There is, however, a growing recognition that the present arrangements for the control of teacher training and development need to be reviewed as part of the preparation to achieve the MoE mission of providing ‘quality education’ appropriate to the needs of all children in Guyana.

The certification of teachers, although nominally the responsibility of MoE, is in practice delegated to the key training agencies: CPCE and UG. MoE has strong representation on the Governing Councils of both institutions but does not intervene in this process. However, MoE has recently instituted discussions to consider the formation of a national council and joined the CARICOM initiative to achieve a common acceptance of accreditation for qualifications across the Caribbean states, including teacher education and development.

In a paper ‘Moving Towards an Improved Teacher Training Programme’ presented at the MoE retreat held in 1999, Mrs Balhabadaur, Principal of CPCE, argues that ‘the main functions’ of the proposed council should be:

- a) “ *to examine the input, the throughput and the output of all teacher education institutions. This should ensure the smooth flow of curriculum content from one institution to the other;*
- b) *to address quality control through accreditation procedures;*
- c) *to promote distance education in all aspects of teacher education”*

These objectives mesh closely with Dr Persico’s argument quoted above in section 2.5.3 for developing a national framework for teacher training and development.

Such a framework will need to provide for:

- i) *Qualification and training for unqualified teachers (foundation programme)*
This may be only an interim measure but will be needed until sufficient qualified candidates can be recruited for teaching. The school based training/support aspect needs to be given careful attention if the quality of teaching is to be raised whilst such untrained teachers are serving in schools
- ii) *Training for qualified trainees and qualified but untrained teachers*
This is currently provided through a pre-service college based approach, or an in-service school based approach. The Executive Summary of the recent review of CPCE recommends a total review of the curriculum, much more practical experience for teachers and better links with schools. It would make good sense to look closely at the moves to establish school based training and explore ways of building training partnerships with schools. One possibility would be to move towards merging the college based pre-service and the school based in-service approach so that *all recruits are recognised as trainee teachers* and spend a substantial part of their course as teachers in schools, under the supervision of *senior teachers trained as mentors* by CPCE. Ideally, trainee teachers should be given time release to attend group discussions and for study. Regional programmes could be developed and supported through the current outposts and where these are not accessible school training clusters could be formed.

High quality open/distance learning support would be particularly important to maintain the academic and theoretical aspects of the course. Valuable experience has been gained through GUIDE and CPCE, with the support of GBET, is already beginning to prepare for such developments.

Any such moves will depend heavily on the recruitment of teachers and the costs involved, and would need to be explored carefully with appropriate consultation. Several schemes are being developed along these lines in a number of countries and information about them could be obtained from agencies such as the Commonwealth of Learning, the International Extension College and the Information Technology Team at the World Bank

iii) *Continuous Professional Development (CPD)*

The need to establish stronger CPD is well recognised in Guyana. There are moves to shift the emphasis from upgrading certification to the development of a wider range of courses following a professional development sequence to support effective classroom teaching and develop specialist skills particularly in administration. This is being initiated through FOE's specialist certificate and Masters' courses and could be taken much further if UG could develop, or co-jointly develop, good quality ODL provision and could support school based study.

(iv) *Support in good practice for all teachers in post*

As NCERD develops its teacher support programme it would be helpful to identify the various levels at which support is given and to build appropriate links at the higher levels, for instance in the development of classroom based research, with the expanding pattern of FOE courses.

As the concept of a national framework and the use of ODL develops it might be helpful to consider establishing a network of regional centres, possibly based on the present CPCE outposts and linked to school clusters. These would enable CPCE, FOE and NCERD to work together to provide a comprehensive service to teachers in or near to their schools.

Besides facilitating discussions about closer co-ordination and establishing a national framework, it is envisaged that the new Council might have an accrediting function. In this case it will be important to consider the distinction now being drawn in other countries between validation (normally seen as a university /college responsibility to maintain the academic integrity and overall quality of its qualifications) and accreditation/certification, which focuses on ensuring the professional competence of teachers. Although, this latter responsibility usually lies with the government it is often delegated to an appropriate agency in which the government has confidence. There is an awareness in Guyana of the changing nature of academic and professional accreditation and that changes are being made in other Caribbean countries. Dr London, who has great experience in the field of accreditation and is chairing the CARICOM Commission into developing common accreditation standards, was in Guyana and was very helpful in explaining the developing pattern.

A short study tour including a visit to other CARICOM members and the UK might provide the opportunity for key advisers such as Dr Persico and Mrs Bahalbadaur to examine the question of teacher accreditation in greater detail. This would help greatly in furthering MoE's intentions in this vitally important area of quality control.

2.6.6 Outline and cost alternative routes to Accreditation which would be open to staff receiving training through the Project

Below is an initial identification of areas of cost. Many of these relate to management and staff time, and thus involve opportunity costs which are difficult to quantify at this stage. The costs of transport/accommodation, materials and incidentals will be real costs, to be found from the budget. At this stage it is not possible to assess how such costs might be met, but they are not likely to be of an order that will cause problems with the present budget scheme for the GEAP project.

The approach to accreditation discussed above relates to current procedures in Guyana. Four approaches were suggested:

i) The first relates to *the use of VSO time* in supporting the current training programmes at the regional outposts. Costs include: a small amount of project management time, VSO time, transport (mainly in Corriverton), and supplementary teaching materials.

It is difficult to prepare an exact costing for this as much of it is the opportunity cost of time involved, which is significant. The costs of transport and supplementary materials are unlikely to have a significant impact on the 'trial area' budget. A course will typically involve two hours classroom contact plus time for individual students which would total some four hours a week. Transport costs could be covered by adding a small allowance to the trial area budgets as necessary.

ii) *Co-operation with CPCE and/or UG* in developing joint courses which could be offered within the 'pilot areas'. These will need to be selected carefully, prioritised accordingly and related carefully to capacity. This was discussed during the consultancy and focused on:

- remedial teaching, with reading and mathematics as key issues;
- special needs: CPCE would welcome co-operation in this field;
- school organisation and administration: this is an area which the REdO (Region 6) raised. He explained that he and his staff would be pleased to help in offering such a course;
- information technology: this is a need which will grow in importance throughout the project and needs to be discussed fully with CPCE, FOE at the university and NCERD

Developing these and further courses for consideration should result from discussions held at a local level.

These courses will place significant demands on project management time, VSO time, transport and accommodation at UG and CPCE, materials, and incidentals (telephone, photocopying, etc.) The time factor is largely that of opportunity cost but could be significant (see below).

If consultancies become necessary there would be budgetary implications.

To cover the transport and accommodation costs of working at CPCE and UG, which could possibly be negotiated with co-operating agencies, an allowance would need to be made for at least two weeks course development time per course.

The cost of materials will vary per course. Information technology will almost certainly require quite considerable expense, and this is already being taken into consideration.

iii) *Externally Validated Courses.* These would involve many of the costs noted above with less funding for co-operative development, although this should be encouraged where possible. Registration/validation fees of the Examining Body used will be a further cost.

iv) *Non Accredited Courses.* Although these would not involve accreditation, they would incur staff time and material costs. If the Teacher Profile approach is developed costs will be involved in designing and printing profile proforma and certificates.

There is however one aspect to the costing relating to management time which should be considered very carefully in relation to teacher training and development, and perhaps the project as a whole. GEAP is a very complex and demanding project. It seeks to set up experimentation on a substantial scale and relate the experience and results of this to national policy and planning at a time when other initiatives in teacher training and development are also being considered. This means that the project management has to cover trial areas whilst other changes are having an increasing impact. There is a similar but much more demanding situation at the national level where changes are being planned or developed which impinge on a wide range of institutions and agencies, all of whom must be informed and consulted. As this report has emphasised, careful consultation and co-operation are essential to achieving intended GEAP outcomes with regard to teacher training. This will require time, energy and patience, and places great demands on a small management team however committed and hard working.

The issue of cost is clearly the key to the scope of what can be attempted. Additions to the teacher training budget will be required for extra equipment consumables and external consultants, but the main pressure is what can be achieved given the present range of human resources. This turns on the opportunity costs of time and effort of a team of : one national manager, two 'trial area' managers and at present nine VSOs. Further recruitment of VSOs is

intended and care must be taken to match expected outputs to numbers, experience and particularly to the time that can be realistically be made available for teacher education and the essential ground work of research, consultation, co-operation, trialing and testing.

Conclusion

The teacher training and development aspect of GEAP is vital to the project and its outcomes. The context in which GEAP has to develop this aspect of its work is complex because in this field Guyana is now at a critical point of change and expansion.

At the time of the SSRP inception it was felt that it would have been difficult to make appropriate changes in teacher training and teacher training was therefore not included. However, SSRP does now include a training component, delivered in blocks during the holidays. Also, Guyana has moved forward rapidly with organisational developments at CPCE and UG, bringing new awareness and capacity to teacher training and development. GEAP therefore now faces a situation whereby, whilst it must have clear objectives as a project, it must also relate these objectives to what is developing in Guyana particularly with regard to CPCE, FOE and NCERD and the activities of other aid agencies, in particular GBET and SSRP.

It is also important to note the impact of a growing range of new initiatives, currently co-operation with other CARICOM members over quality control and the Organisational Capacity Assessment being carried out through Partnership in Primary Education. All this puts continuing pressure on MoE and other educational institutions at a time when there is an increasing turnover in staff. It was only as a result of the patience and helpfulness of all concerned that the consultant was able to meet so many key people at a time of intense pressure and continual meetings.

GEAP is very timely in attempting not only to develop its own activities but, at the same time, locate these in a range of moves to improve secondary education in Guyana with sensitive and attentive support, on an experimental basis in two carefully chosen 'trial areas'. But it goes beyond the project mode using experience gained and initial results in informing both MoE and DFID of the possibilities for wider, more national, thinking and planning. This is a very demanding agenda, covering more than normal project management, that places great demands on what at present is a relatively small team with a wide range of responsibilities.

Nevertheless, time has been found and efforts made to lay good foundations for consultation and co-operation in the important area of teacher training. It is now important to develop the opportunities this has created.

ANNEX A

Guyana Education Access Project (GEAP)

Consultancy to be carried out by John Anderson
25 September – 9 October, 1999

Terms of Reference

1 Title: Consultancy on Accreditation of In-service Education and Training (INSET)

2 Background

- The primary purpose of the Guyana Education Access Project is to increase access to secondary education in two regions, Linden and Corriverton, as pilot schemes which should inform replication at a national level.
- It is also recognised that there is a need to raise pupil performance by improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools as well as planning and management by teams of well trained staff at Regional and school levels. In-service training will therefore be arranged for staff using a range of strategies including school based training, inter-school workshops and regional workshops. This training will be provided for both trained and untrained teachers.
- A study is required to explore the feasibility of accrediting the training provided through the project, in order to motivate teachers to access the training available and to ensure synergy with other teacher training initiatives.

3 Overall objectives

The overall objectives are to:

- identify the forms of accreditation which teachers would value and which would increase their motivation for training
- identify where training provided by GEAP can be validated under existing teacher training accreditation schemes in Guyana
- explore additional forms of accreditation which could be set up for trained teachers through the University of Guyana or the Institute of Distance and Continuing Education (IDCE)

- provide further information to feed in to the Ministry of Education's discussions on the proposal to institute a Council for Teacher Education in Guyana
- outline costed alternative routes to accreditation which would be open to staff receiving training through the project.

4 Scope of work

- One consultant will be required with experience of accreditation of INSET within the Caribbean. S/he will work closely with the GEAP Project Manager and Regional Advisers and a nominated officer from the MoE to achieve the objectives. The consultant will be expected to meet with senior staff within the MoE (including the Deputy Chief Education Officer - Development), the directors of NCERD and GUIDE, the Dean of the Faculty of Education, University of Guyana, the Director of IDCE, Regional Education officials, Headteachers and teachers and VSO Teacher Trainers.
- Account should be taken of the INSET undertaken by other projects and every effort be made to ensure complementarily with:

IADB PEIP:	Primary Education Improvement Project
WB SSRP:	Secondary School Reform Project
CIDA GBET:	Guyana Basic Education Training project
DFID GUIDE:	Guyana In-service Distance Education programme.

A presentation will be made to MoE senior staff towards the end of the second week in country.

5 Expected outcomes

A report which sets out costed and realistic alternatives for accreditation of GEAP In-service activities with recommendations for the MoE and GEAP Project team to consider.

- Conduct of work/level of chargeable input
Timing: September 1999
- Twelve days in country to undertake field work.
- Three days preparation and report writing.

6 Expertise and Experience Requirements

- Detailed working knowledge of teacher in-service accreditation systems in the Caribbean Region
- Detailed working knowledge of HE systems and requirements to accredit teacher education programmes for pre-service and in-service training
- Reporting and presentation skills.

7 Reporting requirements

- A draft report describing the alternatives available with recommendations for further action, as unbound printed copy and a diskette in Word 7.0. to be submitted to CfBT Head office two weeks after completing field work.
- A final report with a diskette to be submitted to CfBT Head Office one week after receiving comments on the first draft.

Replication

The seventh output of GEAP is Replication.

Key Objective: 'The MoE strategy for replication is informed by GEAP'.

The term 'replication' is currently used in education development projects in a number of countries to express the intention of transferring successes achieved in one area to others. This is a key feature of most projects, but it is raising important questions about the purpose and nature of projects in several countries, particularly about how replication is to be interpreted:

- is it to be strictly interpreted so that achievements are to be transferred?
- is it to be loosely interpreted so that the lessons learned in one area are to 'inform' development in other areas, taking into account differing circumstances?
- does it suggest that there is an optimum position to be found through careful and close scrutiny, through discussion and co-operation, by the parties involved?

GEAP has considerable potential benefits for Guyana and the early advantages can already be seen in Linden and Corriverton, for instance the help already being given to the CPCE teacher training outposts and the VSO surveys of need being undertaken in the schools. However, although Linden and Corriverton can be contrasted, they do not cover the wide range of variation with which MoE has to contend. This therefore raises the issues indicated above with regard to the interpretation of 'key objective.'

Is it a premise of GEAP that MoE is already committed to a 'strategy of replication'? Or is it intended that GEAP will aim to develop improvements within negotiated parameters for the trial areas, co-operating where appropriate with local agencies and other projects, in order to 'inform' MoE as it develops a national strategy for secondary education?

In my own discussions about the future of teacher education I sensed an element of uncertainty which seems to be constraining relations between the key participants. The first six outputs seem to be recognised clearly, but the aims of replication are of a very different order and the way they are interpreted carries with it, possibly unforeseen but, critical implications.

If it is possible, it would help the development of GEAP for the outcome of 'replication' and its 'key objective' to be reconsidered and restated, on the basis of a clear and common understanding.

This annexe draws on recent experience in other countries as well as Guyana and is presented briefly simply to raise the issue. If it were felt to be helpful, the consultant would be happy to respond to questions.