



International Education Centre

The College of St Mark & St John

Derriford Rd

Plymouth PL6 8BH

United Kingdom

tel +44 (0)1752 636821

fax +44 (0)1752 636802

e-mail: intec@marjon.ac.uk

GUYANA EDUCATION ACCESS PROJECT

Consultancy

15 June – 30 June 2001

REPORT

Steve Ansell
18th July 2001

CONTENTS

page

1.	Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	1
2.	Terms and Abbreviations	3
3.	Introduction	4
4.	Acknowledgements	4
5.	Terms of Reference	4
6.	Summary of Consultancy Activity	5
7.	Conclusions and Recommendations	7

1. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.1 Through review of key documents and meetings and consultation across a range of stakeholders, key TORs were met. It is regrettable that findings could not be presented to key Ministry personnel in a face-to-face session at the end of the consultancy as was originally intended.
- 1.2 There are already systems in place for SBTD though they are generally only notionally adhered to and have limited impact on development. (see 7.2)
- 1.3 Some present staff development is little more than transmission or dissemination of information. (see 7.2.1)
- 1.4 Attendance at staff development is patchy. (see 7.2.2)
- 1.5 Implementation procedures for staff development differ between Region 6 and Region 10. The system followed in region 6 in particular is not considered amongst staff or management as making much contribution to development. (see 7.2.3)
- 1.6 Where development issues are addressed, content and process is largely top-down determined and generally not viewed with enthusiasm by staff consulted. (see 7.2.4)
- 1.7 Most Head Teachers, Deputy Head Teachers and Heads of Department feel overburdened with duties and responsibilities; hence staff development comes low down the list of their priorities. (see 7.2.5)
- 1.8 Many Head Teachers, Deputy Head Teachers and Heads of Department feel unsure about how to manage SBTD and unaware of process options available to them. (see 7.2.6)
- 1.9 External INSET activity is largely perceived by the recipients as being poorly organised, not interestingly presented and often not of relevance. Its effectiveness in a cascade system is therefore of little value in teacher development. (see 7.3)
- 1.10 Senior staff and teachers, generally, feel that there is little understanding of SBTD in regional education offices, and that regional education officers are not particularly supportive of it, offering little in terms of support or feedback. This lack of understanding and support may have contributed to the disappointing representation of regional education office personnel in Region 6 at meetings called to assist me in the consultation process. (see 7.4)
- 1.11 Current provision of INSET and SBTD is in urgent need of regeneration and enhancement. (see 7.5)
- 1.12 There are, however, many opportunities to make such a regeneration effective in that SBTD complies with current MoE policy, could fit the present system, harmonises with CPCE's move towards a greater emphasis on school-based initial teacher training, has synergy with proposed development of SIP and has the capacity to turn TD into the responsibility of the whole staff rather than that of the currently overloaded senior management of each school. SBTD is also congruent with key issues addressed in the 5 year strategic plan for education with regard to decentralisation, the improvement of managerial capacity, increasing levels of participation, raising educational standards, and the provision of more and better support structures. (see 7.6)
- 1.13 It is therefore recommended that a cadre of trainers be developed through participation in a tailor-made trainer-training programme, the details of which are outlined in 7.7.1 – 7.7.9 of this report. (see 7.7)

- 1.14 It is also recommended that GEAP consider resourcing LRCs to enable them to play an active part in extension and replication of SBTD development and other INSET initiatives previously initiated through GEAP, and in future INSET initiatives generally. (see 7.8)
- 1.15 In order to make use of the limited windows of opportunity when modules could be run a decision on whether to proceed with this proposal would need to be made with some urgency, and by no later than August 31st, 2001. (see 7.9)

2. TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACEO (Sec)	- Assistant Chief Education Officer (Secondary)
AM	- Assistant Master/Mistress
C/BT	- Centre for British Teachers
CEO	- Chief Education Officer
CPCE	- Cyril Potter College of Education
DCEO	- Deputy Chief Education Officer
DEO	- District Education Officer
DFID	- Department for International Development
DHT	- Deputy Head Teacher
GBET	- Guyana Basic Education Training
GEAP	- Guyana Education Access Project
GTU	- Guyana Teachers Union
HOD	- Head of Department
HT	- Head Teacher
INSET	- Inservice Education of Teachers
INTEC	- International Education Centre at the College of St Mark and St John
IT	- Information Technology
LRC	- Learning Resource Centre
Marjon	- The College of St Mark and St John
MoE	- Ministry of Education
NCERD	- National Centre for Educational Resource Development
PS	- Permanent Secretary
RA	- Regional Adviser (GEAP)
REdO	- Regional Education Officer
RO	- Regional Office
SAM	- Senior Assistant Master/Mistress
SBTD	- School Based Teacher Development
SIP	- School Improvement Planning
SM	- Senior Master/Senior Mistress
TORs	- Terms of Reference
VSO	- Voluntary Service Overseas

3. INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 The International Education Centre of the College of St Mark and St John has been involved in educational development in some 45 countries over the last 10 years. In particular, the College has designed and delivered courses in teacher and trainer development and educational management in recent years in countries such as Mexico, Hungary, Namibia and Malaysia as well as running short courses and workshops in such countries as Brazil, Ecuador, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, India, Uganda, Zambia and many others. In addition, Marjon runs a one-year Master of Education programme in Trainer Development for initial and in-service teacher educators of all subjects.
- 3.2 The College has provided consultancy services to a number of DFID funded projects in the field of trainer development in recent years and has worked in partnership with CfBT on a number of projects in recent years in such countries as Vietnam, Namibia, Uganda, Bulgaria etc.
- 3.3 Our special ability to design and deliver relevant and appropriate courses in-country and our previous record of association with DFID and CfBT led to us being asked to engage in this consultancy, to explore the parameters within which a SBTD Trainer Training pilot course might be developed.

4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 4.1 My thanks to Steve Bradley GEAP PD for his assistance and support throughout this consultancy. In addition, my thanks to ROs Paul Worrall and Ed Denham and the VSO volunteers in Regions 6 and 10 for so freely giving of their time.
- 4.2 Sincere thanks to the many education professionals at national, regional and school level who gave freely of their time and responded to the many questions I put to them.
- 4.3 Finally, thanks to the GEAP project support office team for ensuring that all arrangements for this consultancy were so efficiently dealt with.

5. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Draft TORs were sent in late 2000, while revised specific objectives were made available on my arrival in Georgetown. They were as follows:

Section 1- Specific Objectives of the Consultancy

The consultant will:

- review key background documents, such as John Lowe's 'Report on the Development of an Appropriate Cadre of Secondary INSET Trainers'
- inform himself through meetings with appropriate senior MoE staff of likely strategic developments in terms of Teacher Development which will need to be taken into consideration in designing/ piloting a trainer training programme
- meet central and regional MoE staff/ committees to familiarise himself with current INSET practices and issues. It will be important within the framework of such meetings to note both *professional* and *administrative* points which might impact on the piloting of a Trainer Training programme (eg. *timing, release of teachers, location, the questions of accreditation, etc*)

- 4 -

- meet officials from key institutions/ projects (eg. CPCE, NCERD, GBET, SSRP) responsible for teacher development, in order (a) to assess other initiatives/ programmes; (b) to avoid duplication and (c) to seek possible synergies with whatever GEAP might propose
- visit GEAP schools (and others, if time permits), to assess the levels/ quality of teaching across different subjects and at different levels
- consult with the GEAP Teacher Trainers in Regions 6 & 10 to obtain a full picture of (a) what GEAP teacher training activity (1999-to-date) and (b) the key issues and constraints that might impact on a school-based development programme
- determine the broad parameters of a Trainer Training Programme, including issues in relation to the overall management of school-based CPD (eg needs analysis, setting targets, etc)
- produce an Aide Memoire to inform the way ahead on the development of a Trainer Training Programme.

Section 2 – Report

The consultant will:

- present initial findings to key MoE personnel at a session at the end of the consultancy
- produce a draft report within three weeks of the completion of the consultancy visit.

6. SUMMARY OF CONSULTANCY ACTIVITY

Fri 15 th June	18.30	Depart Plymouth airport to London Gatwick Overnight at Caprice Guest House
Sat 16 th June	11.30 15.15 18.40 20.00 21.00	Depart London Gatwick Arrive Barbados Depart Barbados Arrive Georgetown – met on arrival by C/fBT driver Arrive Cara Lodge
Sun 17 th June	09.15-12.30 13.30-14.45 14.45-16.00 20.00-21.30	Meetings with Steve Bradley (Project Director) Ed Denham (GEAP RA) and Leena Vadher (VSO) Meeting with Leena Vacher (VSO Teacher Trainer) Meeting with Ed Denham (GEAP RA Region 10) Meeting with Steve Bradley (Project Director)
Mon 18 th June	07.45 10.15-11.15 14.00-15.00 15.15-16.00	Pickup from Cara Lodge Meeting with DCEO Admin Mr Macadam, DCEO Development Ms Whyte-Nedd, ACEO Secondary Ms Chapman and others on the School Systems Management Committee Meeting with Mr Shears (GBET Project) Meeting with Mrs Balbahadur (Principal CPCE)
Tues 19 th June	08.30 9.00-10.00 10.00-10.30 11.00-11.30 11.30-12.15 pm	Picked up from Cara Lodge Meeting with Mr Caesar (CEO) Meeting with Mr Thomas (PP Officer) Meeting with Mr Patterson (Special Advisor) Meeting with Mr Ally (PS) Preparation for meetings in Region 6

- 5 -

Wed 20 th June	08.00-12.00 12.00-15.30	Picked up from hotel. Transport to Reg. 6 GEAP Office Briefing meetings with Region 6 VSOs and RA
Thurs 21 June	09.00-11.45 14.00-15.45 19.00	Meeting with GEAP Team & selected HODs and c' parts Meeting with Secondary Head Teachers/ DHTs, selected Primary Head Teachers, GTU Representative Dinner with the Region 6 GEAP team
Fri 22 nd June	8.30-14.30	Visits to one Secondary and one Primary school Visit to LRC and discussions with staff
Sat 23 rd June	08.00-12.00 14.00-17.30	Picked up from Riverton Suites. Transport to Cara Lodge Georgetown Compiling notes from Region 6 trip
Sun 24 th June	09.00-12.00 12.00-13.00 15.00-16.30 16.30-19.30	Compiling notes from Region 6 trip Meeting with Steve Bradley Transport to Region 10 Meeting with Ed Denham, Region 10 RA and VSO teacher trainers, S Wilkinson (IT), Siva (Maths) and Leena Vadher
Mon 25 th June	08.30-9.30 13.00-14.30 14.30-15.30 15.30-16.00 16.30-17.30	Meeting with Mr J Gilgeous (REdO), Gloria Britton (DEOsec) and Primary DEO (former Acting RedO) Meeting with Mr M Porter (Head of Centre CPCE) and Eric Baird (LLRC Co-ordinator) Meeting with HODs Wisburg SS Meeting with Rawle Craig (GEAP Community Team Member) Review meeting with L Vadher and Ed Denham
Tues 26 th June	8.30-9.30 9.30-10.30 10.30-11.30 14.00-15.30 15.45-17.15	Meeting with Ms Y Phillips (Head Teacher, Lindnen Foundation Sec School Meeting with Ms M Gillis (Head Teacher New Silver City Sec School) Meeting with Ms M Spee (VSO Literacy Trainer) Meeting with HODs, New Silver City SS Travel to Georgetown
Wed 27 th June	am and pm 18.00-19.30	Compiling notes for feedback to committee on 28 th June Briefing meeting with S Bradley and E Denham
Thurs 28 th June	13.00 15.00-16.00	Expected meeting with Ms D Chapman cancelled Meeting with Mr D Bermingham (DFID Field Officer)
Fri 29 th June	9.00 14.30 17.30	Departed Cara Lodge Departed Guyana Departed Barbados
Sat 30 th June	6.30 10.00 11.15	Arrived London Gatwick Departed London Gatwick Arrived Plymouth

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 A number of relevant documents (eg 'Report on the Development of an Appropriate Cadre of INSET Trainers', Lowe, J 2001, 'Regional Education Development Planning and School Improvement Planning in Regions 6 and 10', Hilsum, J 2000, Quarterly reports etc) were reviewed and central and regional MoE staff and professionals from key institutions were consulted in order to determine broad parameters of a trainer training programme.

It is regrettable that my initial findings were not presented to key MoE personnel at the end of the consultancy in a face-to-face session. This was due to a late change to MoE staff availability.

- 7.2 Through consultation with various stakeholders (see Section 6), it is clear that there are already in place several systems for SBTD. However, although there is variance in quality of the delivery and effectiveness of present SBTD, overall responses suggested that it is largely only notionally adhered to and is seen as being of only limited developmental value.

7.2.1 Specifically, many staff development sessions (at either whole-staff or departmental level) or used in part or wholly for the dissemination of information (often in the form of passing down instructions or requirements from regional or central policy makers). An example is the recent introduction of new child record cards – some HTs use allotted staff development time to instruct teaching staff on how these cards are to be completed and used.

7.2.2 Similarly, and again there is variance amongst HT, HOD and teacher responses, attendance at staff development sessions can be regarded as at best, patchy. Less experienced staff often cannot attend due to CPCE in-service commitments, whilst in some cases more experienced senior staff did not regard their attendance as being useful in their development and therefore in some cases absented themselves and in others attended reluctantly. As one HT put it 'You can make them attend, but you can't make them pay attention'.

7.2.3 In the two regions it would seem that the arrangements for implementation of SBTD is carried out differently. In one region SBTD takes place on two half-days per term, in the other it is one-hour weekly (or sometimes fortnightly). The latter system is particularly perceived as too little too often and a majority of professionals consulted regarded it as more of a hindrance than a help to teacher development.

7.2.4 Most responses seemed to indicate that where development (as opposed to informational) issues are addressed the content of such sessions is nearly always top-down determined (ie by HT in case of whole-school meetings, by HOD in case of departmental meetings), though a few HTs and HODs pointed out that they did consult with staff. Similarly, in a large majority of cases the process of such sessions did not seem to take account of participant preferences, and descriptions of such sessions were marked by their essentially one-way transmission approach.

In particular, when talking with staff who were not HTs (some HODs, some SMs and others), there were several complaints that SBTD sessions need to be (and I quote from my notes)

- 'better organised'
- 'more meaningful'
- 'we need advance notice'
- 'teachers should have a free voice... not just told things'.

7.2.5 Almost all HTs, DHTs and HODs feel overburdened with duties and responsibilities, and frequently have heavy teaching loads. Therefore, they feel that they have little time either for the planning or delivery of SBTD activity.

7.2.6 Several HTs, DHTs and HODs admit they are unsure of how to deliver SBTD other than via a transmission approach and a generally 'lecture-based style', and are aware that there might be other more participatory options but do not feel skilled or enabled to implement them.

(It would appear that previous initial training experience or more recent in-service training has not exposed teachers to a range of training methods and activities which they themselves might implement in their own SBTD activity.)

7.3 In addition to this model of SBTD, there exist two arrangements for in-service initiated by bodies and institutions external to the school (eg CPCE in-service, NCERD training initiatives etc). I was not able to consult widely regarding the quality of CPCE in-service. My non-empirical research suggested that such quality is variable and dependent on the skills and knowledge of specific tutors, but that generally only a very limited (and seemingly traditional) range of training modes and activities are utilised.

Several respondents, however, were critical of national and regional training initiatives aimed at subject co-ordinators. There was a strongly held view that such training events tended to consist of little more than lecture-mode information giving, and were frequently poorly organised and made little impact on participants other than of a rather negative kind. There is, it seems, an expectation that this INSET must then cascade to school level. Hence, a bad INSET experience at national level is then developed into a bad INSET experience at regional level and in turn becomes a bad INSET experience at school department level.

Even a good INSET experience at national level will not necessarily become a good INSET experience at regional or departmental level given that the time allowed for such activity and the previous knowledge and experience of the participants is likely to be radically different at the national (or regional) event than the departmental event. In order to cascade effectively, it is essential that participants at the national (or regional) events be guided on how to implement effective and appropriate processes to enable the acquisition of content. The admittedly limited and somewhat hearsay evidence I gathered suggests that at present this does not happen.

7.4 At present there is a strong feeling amongst teachers and senior school staff that regional education officers often do not really understand SBTD, nor are particularly supportive of it. Reports of SBTD, though kept by most schools, are brief in the extreme (in one school the last three reports of SBTD activity described the meetings in 14, 8 and 9 words respectively – clearly little more than a perfunctory recording) with little information on content and none about process, outcomes, follow-up etc. These reports are sent to the regional office but no HTs consulted had ever received any feedback or follow-up.

Furthermore, it must be noted that in region 6 none of the invited Regional Officers (other than the DEO based at the GEAP office) attended the workshops and meetings I led there.

7.5 The current provision of INSET and SBTD is in urgent need of regeneration and enhancement if it is not to degenerate further into a somewhat ritualistic activity that has only the most minimal impact on teacher and school development.

7.6 There are, however, real opportunities for such a regeneration to be effective, as follows:

- SBTD as a notion complies with current MoE policy, and systems already exist for its implementation
- there also exists potential synergy with CPCE moves towards a greater emphasis on school-based training in initial teacher education, and could greatly complement such training
- there is also potential for synergy with the implementation of strengthened SIP (see Hilsum report, 2000)
- the outcomes of the proposed SBTD programme envisage an enabling and capacity-building across the whole staff, making TD the responsibility of everyone within the school, not just senior management.

In addition, many of the issues addressed in the Education 5-year Strategic Plan would seem congruent with the notion of SBTD, specifically:-

- ”
- Improvement of managerial capabilities...
 - Decentralisation
 - Increasing the level of participation and commitment of stakeholders
 - Better standards for inputs, processes and outcomes...
 - The production of competent teachers for the system and the provision of better support
 - The reduction of the loss of valuable human resources”
- (from Guyana Chronicle 28.6.01 ‘Education Minister wages return to basics’)

Managerial capabilities can be strengthened by incorporating within a trainer training programme a strand focussing on managing people and management of change in an educational context.

Decentralisation is at the very heart of SBTD in that it empowers teachers to address change and development within their own contexts and of their own volition. This bottom-up approach encourages and feeds upon the participation of teachers and enhances commitment.

Trainer training will result in a better standard of inputs through experience of a wide-range of process options. Outcomes will be determined by the participants themselves. An incidental but crucial side benefit here is that such person-centred approaches have applications in classrooms too and can thereby enhance the quality of teaching and pupil learning in schools.

Better support can be developed through a focus on mentoring practice to ensure that schools develop an ethos of constructive support from the most senior to the most junior staff members.

It is to be hoped further that through empowering teachers to take charge of their own development the attrition rate amongst teachers might be diminished. The reduction of the attrition rate might also be affected through the establishment of appropriate resources and incentives to SBTD.

7.7 It is therefore recommended that, as was suggested in the Lowe report (2001), a cadre of trainers be developed through participation in a tailor-made trainer training programme.

The details of the proposal which follows come about as a result of extensive discussion with stakeholders at all levels and with the GEAP team. They are:

7.7.1 The tailor-made trainer training programme should consist of three ‘modules’ each in the region of 40-50 hours contact time over a period of two weeks, or thereabouts.

In addition, there should be a further 1-2 week manual writing workshop for a team selected from the participants to develop activity sheets, trainer notes and SBTD guidelines to serve as aid to further development (eg into primary sector) or replication (eg into other regions) later.

- 7.7.2 The modules should be full-time and residential and be held in a secure and comfortable environment. Georgetown would seem to offer the best choice of venues in this respect.
- 7.7.3 The programme should be timetabled according to MoE/GEAP requirements, though through consultation it is clear that finding windows of opportunity seems to be difficult, and opportunities limited.

Specific times which might be seen as most suitable are given in Appendix I Proposal. They are, in summary:

- Late October – Early November 2001 (Total 9-10 days)
- 3-7 January (incl) and 10-13 January (incl) 2002 (Total 8 days)
- 2-5 April (incl) and 8-12 April (incl) 2002 (Total 8 days)
- within summer break 2002.

The rationale for the above is to try to split the contact time between holiday and term-time to minimise disruption to schools and children's learning whilst at the same time recognising teachers need for vacations.

Further to this, it is proposed that each module be split to allow a full 2-day break for participants to return to their regions and spend time with their families.

- 7.7.4 The proposed content of the course appears in Appendix I (item 2). Specific details of content cannot be specified until a) it is decided who shall comprise the cadre and b) negotiation has taken place between the selected participants and the tutor(s) leading the programme.

In summary, however, it is proposed that the course is likely to include:

Educational Management eg

Management Styles
Leadership
Decision-making
Delegating
Problem-solving
Dealing with resistance
Conflict management
Managing meetings
Time management
Motivation
Team-building *etc*

All these sub-topics would be placed in the Guyanese educational context. They should develop skills, abilities and knowledge generic enough to enhance the effectiveness of education professionals in management roles whatever their formal present position within the school hierarchy.

INSET/SBTD Management eg

Training v Development
Models of Training
Identifying Needs
Training Methods and Activities
Follow-up and Evaluation
Individual, Departmental and Whole-school development
(eg Exploring issues, framing problems, tackling problems, collecting information, establishing resolutions, implementing resolutions, monitoring and evaluation)
Organising Development Meetings
Record-keeping and monitoring *etc*

Developing Teacher Support Structures eg

Models of Mentoring
Skills of Mentoring
Developmental Observation
Supervision, feedback, counselling
Collaborative teaching *etc*

All of the above should be carried out through a participant-centred approach. By this I mean allowing participants to negotiate details of content to be covered, but also to have choice concerning the processes engaged in (ie how they work) and the outcomes to be generated. This would mirror the principles of SBTD itself as a person-centred, participatory and empowering process.

Such outcomes might include: - observation checklists, codes of practice, training session plans, training activity plans, evaluation instruments, action plans, etc.

- 7.7.5 Participants on such a course might be drawn from a number of sources from within schools (HTs, DHTs, SMs, HODs, SAMs, AMs, etc) and from 'external' agents (eg Regional education office personnel, NCERD trainers, LRC co-ordinators, CPCE in-service personnel).

It is strongly recommended, however, that such 'external' personnel participate. SBTD is one way forward to enhance teacher development but should run in conjunction with other avenues which might offer alternatives especially in subject-specific contexts and/ or at regional meetings level.

- 7.7.6 It is also strongly recommended that each participating school send a 'team' (preferably of 3 persons) to participate in the training. History strongly suggests that a team returning to an institution charged with implementing change has a much better chance of success than any individual, no matter how committed or diligent.

- 7.7.7 Further recommendations concerning who should comprise the participants and how they might be selected appear in Appendix I (Proposal Section), but in summary it is recommended that participants should:

- include HT or DHT from each participating school
- represent a broad band of seniority within each school (eg one HT or DHT, one SM and one more junior 'cadet' member)

- focus on those who have shown previous commitment to development activity in the past
- represent a range of subject specialisms (eg one Maths, one English, one Science specialist)
- include 'external' agents eg NCERD trainers, regional subject co-ordinators (if not accounted for previously above), LRC co-ordinators, CPCE personnel (if not accounted for previously above) and regional office representation (eg DEO Secondary)

7.7.8 Through consultation it became clear that incentives might be needed to motivate potential participants. As stated earlier, a good venue (see 7.7.2) is one incentive. Beyond this the programme should lead to formal certification valid in the UK Higher Education sector. This might then in turn serve as the basis for accreditation valid in the Guyanese context (eg as credits towards degree awards through University of Guyana, CPCE etc).

At the time of writing this report the precise level of certification that might be offered cannot be specified. It might be necessary to first confirm the entry qualifications and/ or previous professional experience of participants and the number of modules and contact hours that the programme will supply. It is recommended, therefore, that Steve Bradley (GEAP PD) liaise with Marjon over this issue if and when a decision is made to implement this or another similar proposal.

7.7.9 Further incentives could include GEAP led IT training (for those who have not yet had the opportunity) through which some of the outcomes noted in 7.7.4 could be produced.

It is for MoE to decide whether other incentives might be appropriate and practicable. There are a wide range of possibilities some of which are noted in Appendix I, Section 5, though in my view after consultation with a range of potential participants all incentives mentioned thus far should be seen as essential. If, in addition, all participants successfully completing the course are granted incremental progression, this would further enhance motivation to succeed through the programme.

7.8 It is also recommended that GEAP consider resourcing LRCs. In both GEAP regions there is, in different ways, considerable potential for developing LRC activity. If LRC tutors were to be equipped with the necessary training skills and abilities through the trainer training course envisaged in this report that potential would be enhanced. But investment in teaching and training resources and materials would also be required. Were this to be done LRCs could begin to fulfil their objectives as stated in 'Regional Learning Resource Centres' (NCERD 1996) which they are currently unable to fulfil in any way, in my view. This would in turn allow them to provide a base for GEAP teacher training initiatives already undertaken to multiply and simultaneously serve as a base for replication/ extension of trainer training (eg to primary level and/ or in other regions) and for enhanced regional or cluster subject-specific training initiatives.

Furthermore, through making teaching/ learning resources available across the curriculum, subject-specific content deficiency amongst teachers might also be addressed, using the cadre of trainers developed through the envisaged trainer-training programme as potential deliverers.

7.9 If such a programme is to be taken up, given the limited opportunities to run such modules (see 7.7.3) a decision on its implementation and the parameters within which it should operate would need to be finalised by no later than August 31st, 2001.

