

IN-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION IN GRENADA, 1981-1983:

CASE STUDY OF A PROBLEM SOLVING STRATEGY

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts
(Education)

of

The University of the West Indies.

Anne Hickling-Hudson

1986

Faculty of Education,
Mona Campus.

ABSTRACTIn-Service Teacher Education in Grenada, 1980-1983:
Case Study of a Problem Solving Strategy

Anne Hickling-Hudson

This study examines aspects of Grenada's National In-Service Teacher Education Programme (NISTEP), 1980-1983. NISTEP is analysed in the historical context of the social and educational changes which occurred in Grenada during this period. The writer first describes the strategies and innovations used by the People's Revolutionary Government to establish the programme as a comprehensive, national teacher training approach for all unqualified Primary school teachers. This replaced the inadequate system that had left Grenada with the problem of having a large proportion of its teachers untrained for their profession. NISTEP is then described from the perspective of its aims, its component sub-systems, and how it operated.

It is argued that NISTEP developed certain features which helped it to overcome the obstacles that are commonly experienced by educational innovations. Structures of collective administration, a participative decision making process, and a characteristic style of interaction are seen as some of the main features which formalized NISTEP into an institution capable of survival.

The organisational leadership of NISTEP was embodied in the weekly Staff Meeting. The collaborative problem solving that took place in the Staff Meeting stressed survival efficiency and adjusting means to ends in policy making. It also facilitated clear communication and feedback, and the achievement on the whole of good interpersonal relations. Policy was implemented on a day-to-day basis by a team of three Coordinators who were also lecturers, and by specific Curriculum and Administrative Panels and subcommittees. These collegial structures combined specialization of tasks, collective decision making, individual responsibility and the coordination of all the complex components of NISTEP in such a way as to achieve the main teacher education aims of the institution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all those who helped me in the task of preparing this study. I am particularly indebted to those educators formerly involved in or associated with Grenada's National In-Service Teacher Education Programme, who generously gave me interviews about their part in and perceptions of the Programme. Their information has proved a valuable supplement to the field notes and historical data that I collected while I was employed as a lecturer in NISTEP.

In accordance with academic practice and in light of political sensitivities in Grenada, I have used pseudonyms when referring to most of the individuals in the study.

Grateful thanks go to my supervisor, Dr. Hyacinth Evans, for her valuable advice, excellent editorial suggestions and stimulating academic approach.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
CHAPTER 1	
<u>Theoretical Framework for a Case Study of Teacher Education in the Grenada Revolution, 1980-1983</u>	
Introduction and Rationale	1
Theoretical Approach to the Study	6
Specific Objectives and Outline of the Study	10
Data Sources and Retrospective Analysis	13
Advantages and Limitations of a Worker-Observer's Role	16
CHAPTER 2	
<u>The National Context of the Case: Educational Developments in the Grenada Revolution</u>	
22	
CHAPTER 3	
<u>NISTEP: Policy and Practice</u>	
Consultative Planning	36
The NISTEP Student Body	41
The 'Mainstream' Students	44
The 'Maintenance' Students	45
The 'Special Year' Students	46
The 'Induction' Students	46
NISTEP's Innovations and Structure	47
The Cost of NISTEP	47
Staffing and Salaries	48
Physical Plant and Materials	53
School and Community Links with NISTEP	54
Curriculum Arrangements	56

The System of Certification	58
Administrative Arrangements	61
The Feasibility of In-Service Teacher Training	62
The Perpetuation of the In-Service Teacher Training Approach in Grenada	64
Questions of National and Institutional Change	66

CHAPTER 4

Collective Administration and Role Integration
in NISTEP

The Development of Collective Administration	71
The Integration of Roles	78
Some Barriers to Innovation: A Comparative Framework	82

CHAPTER 5

Interaction and Task Implementation:
An Insider's View

The Interactive Style of the NISTEP Staff Meeting	93
Salient Matters Discussed in the Staff Meeting	95
Team Teaching and the Curriculum	132
The 'Survival Stage' in the Development of a New Organisation	139
CONCLUSION	142
NOTES AND REFERENCES	149
BIBLIOGRAPHY	159

Chapter 1

Theoretical Framework for a Case Study of Teacher
Education in the Grenada Revolution,
1980 - 1983

Introduction and Rationale

In March, 1979, Grenada, one of the smallest nations in the world (population 110,000), experienced an overthrow of government by a revolutionary political party which then initiated a change process known as the Grenada Revolution. The Revolution introduced several new goals and structures of socio-economic development into the society. One of the major new educational structures that it established was a three year in-service teacher education programme on a nationwide scale to replace the traditional two year in-college system which had served since 1963. The National In-Service Teacher Education Programme, popularly called by its acronym, NISTEP, was "the instrument designed as a result of the deliberations of primary school teachers together with education planners, to train, at one blow, the mass of 600 untrained teachers in the Primary and All Age schools" (Creft, 1981). The fact that 600 or 67% of Grenada's primary teachers and 153 or 72%

of its secondary teachers were, in 1979, still without any academic or professional training at a tertiary level was a result of the small size of the Grenada Teachers' College (GTC), and the rapid rate at which qualified teachers left the profession. With a staff of seven and skimpy resources, the GTC had the capacity to graduate an average of 42 teachers a year. Since 22 trained teachers left the service annually, there was a net addition to the qualified teaching force of only about 20 teachers every year (Brizan, 1981).

The purpose of this study is to examine the major organisational aspects of the National In-Service Teacher Education Programme within the context of the goals of teacher training envisaged by the Grenada Revolution. NISTEP, established by the People's Revolutionary Government (PRG) in October, 1980, was thought by many to be unrealistic given the small scale of its financial and staff resources compared to the magnitude of its task. Yet for three years it operated at a complex level, with its staff on the one hand integrating roles of teacher educators and programme administrators, and its students on the other hand integrating their regular school teaching jobs with academic study, introductory research projects and professional development. Certain aspects of the programme continued after the collapse of the Revolution and

the invasion of the country in October, 1983, in spite of considerable indecision on the part of the Interim Administration (October, 1983 - December, 1984) regarding its future. The year of indecision ended in agreement that in-service teacher training would continue to be an institutionalized part of teacher education. When the newly elected government took over at the end of 1984, it decided that all Grenada's teachers would be trained for the regional Eastern Caribbean Teacher's Certificate by means of a two year in-service programme followed by a one year in-college or full-time course (Pierre, 1984). In light of the fact that an innovative approach to teacher education established by the Revolution became an accepted way of educating teachers, the launching and initial phase of this approach is of great interest and importance.

The importance of Grenada's innovation in extending teacher training goes beyond the boundaries of this small country. A shortage of qualified teachers and inadequate structures and reserves for remedying this situation are typical features of the educational systems of post-colonial developing nations. During the first decades of their independence, most of these nations embarked on a large expansion of schools and began to re-examine their curriculum and instructional materials. Thus

the need for increased numbers and a continuous supply of trained teachers was keenly felt. In this context, experiments took place in several countries with the use of in-service programmes for the initial preparation of teachers, especially at the Primary school level. However, these in-service innovations have often been treated as emergency, stop-gap or supplementary measures (Bacchus, 1975). Once certain numbers of teachers have been trained, in-service programmes have often been discarded or greatly reduced in favour of a return to the full-time training in Teachers' Colleges. Yet this is much more costly and not necessarily more efficient than in-service training. Jamaica is an example of a developing country which adopted an in-service model of teacher education for just over a decade to fill the need for training the large backlog of untrained Primary teachers. Now only a small portion of teachers with special requirements are trained by means of an in-service programme. This is in spite of the continuation of such problems as the rapid attrition of qualified teachers from the profession, the existence of unqualified teachers in many remote rural areas, and a large proportion of secondary school teachers without professional teaching diplomas.

Many developing countries with such problems are still not in a position to make professional qualifications a requirement of a teaching position as developed countries have done. The practice of not requiring teachers to be trained seems an unacceptable solution to the problem of a shortage of resources for teacher education. Because of the high cost of the full-time in-college model, other alternatives need to be considered.

In this context, it is worth examining the advantages of retaining, as Grenada has done, an in-service model of teacher education as a standard part of a national system which provides a continuous supply of trained teachers. A description of the planning and implementation of such a model can be of interest to other developing countries.

Grenada's NISTEP had some unusual features which contributed to the aims of educational transformation envisaged by the Revolution. An analysis of its structure with particular focus on these features may be relevant to other developing countries searching for strategies which may be likely to contribute to fundamental educational change.

Theoretical Approach to the Study

This study of NISTEP will present firstly the contextual background and structural setting of the programme as an educational innovation. Secondly, it will examine certain aspects of the everyday experience of its teaching participants, concentrating particularly on how they interacted within the institution's subsystems to tackle the problems that arose. This involves using the methodology of a case study, which analyses the institution both from an 'etic' and from an 'emic' perspective, to borrow terms coined by Kenneth L. Pike (1967) in his development of guidelines for describing and analysing human behaviour.

Pike, a linguistic specialist, coined the words 'etic' and 'emic' from the terms 'phonetic' and 'phonemic' as they are used in linguistics. 'Phonetic' describes the sounds of syllables and words in a language, while 'phonemic' describes their meaning. The two phenomena are not really separable: one shades into another. The researcher can specialize in one or the other, but both are essential to holistic understanding.

An etic description of the behaviour of individuals or groups inside or outside of an institution puts the main focus on the expectations, activities,

roles, consequences and other aspects of the behaviour as viewed externally by an onlooker. An etic perspective of an institution, for example, might describe what happens in its component parts using familiar organising categories derived in advance of the study, such as the institution's 'administrative arrangements', its 'locus of decision making', and the 'dimensions of its environment'. The etic perspective is an essential starting point for the study of any person, group or institution, and this study will use it as a starting point for describing the social context, background and structural setting of NISTEP.

However, an etic description does not seek to uncover the deeper meanings behind the observed behaviour. The emic perspective, on the other hand, seeks an understanding of the why behind the how, the inner meanings underlying actions, structures and relationships, the subjective opinions and explanations, the everyday interaction. To arrive at this perspective, it is necessary to participate in some way in the everyday life of the people within the group or institution. This means operating from an anthropological base in which shared experience is essential. Shared experience can be gained through the methodology of a case study based on planned observation by a researcher who may assume varying

degrees of closeness to the informants (Gold, 1969). Such a researcher may or may not be a genuine participant member of the institution, and may obtain data with or without the knowledge of the informants (1). Shared experience can also be gained through natural, unplanned interaction by a participant who may subsequently use his or her experiential knowledge as the basis of a retrospective analysis of the case.

This researcher falls into the latter category, having arrived at a position of 'insider' knowledge of NISTEP by participating in it as a lecturer for two of the three years of its first phase. The advantages and limitations of this position from the standpoint of research will be discussed in a later section.

Stake (1978) and Bodgan and Biklen (1982) have made contribution to theoretical analyses of the characteristics and usefulness of the case study method of social inquiry. The study of NISTEP may be located within a summary of some of their main points.

A 'case' is any bounded system of interest which may be researched and described - an individual, an enterprise, an institution, a programme, a group. As is characteristic of case studies, the study of

NISTEP is situated within the tradition of qualitative rather than quantitative research and writing. The natural setting is the most important source of the data, rather than constructs that are preconceived and predetermined. What occurs within the boundaries of the case determines what it is about. For example, there is particular focus on the strategies and innovations which established NISTEP as a national programme, and on the evolution of administrative patterns and an interactive style which formalized it into an institution capable of independent survival. This focus is primarily determined by what occurred, and by what this researcher experienced as being most important, within the boundaries of the case. The national context of educational developments in the Grenada Revolution is also important in explaining the environment of, and influences on, the case. Description is holistic, not quantifying or isolating variables, and analysis is inductive, growing out of the researcher's interpretation of process and meaning suggested by the data.

Stake, and Bogdan and Biklen, argue for the usefulness of the case study in such areas as highlighting the gaps that sometimes occur between policy, rhetoric and practice. Its focus on in-depth description of actual practice can help to identify significant variables which may be further

investigated, for example, variables such as constraints on innovation which may not be apparent to policy makers. A case study is useful for testing hypotheses, especially to examine the extent to which a hypothesis is false. These kinds of outcomes of case studies may provide the basis for theorising about societal processes and institutions that contributes to 'grounded theory'; that is, theory which emerges from the experiences described. As Crossley and Vulliamy (1984) point out, case studies of aspects of education are more likely than traditional research methods, such as questionnaires or experiments, to give an accurate portrayal of the realities of teaching in a natural setting. This is reinforced by the view of Spindler (1982) that "it is better to have in-depth, accurate knowledge of one setting than superficial and possibly skewed or misleading information about isolated relationships in many settings".

Specific Objectives and Outline of the Study

Within the theoretical framework outlined, the specific objectives of carrying out a case study of NISTEP from both an etic and an emic perspective are as follows:

1. To document an important and unique event in the history of Grenadian and Caribbean education;
2. To describe the context and structure of the institution in a way that helps the reader 'gain entry' into NISTEP, to understand its aims, its component subsystems, how it operated, and its innovativeness;
3. To explore NISTEP's characteristic methods of interaction and cooperative administration, highlighting the role of these processes in tackling the problems that arose;
4. To examine factors that enabled the innovation to become permanent and stable.

Chapter 2 describes the role that the Grenada Revolution assigned to education in the development of the country's society and economy during this period and in the future. NISTEP should be seen in the context of the determined effort of the government to educate the country's adults so that they, in turn, could apply their education to assisting the rapid development of the economy and national culture that was taking place. The training of the teachers on a national scale, instead of a piecemeal one, would make possible the

full functioning of the other educational changes described in this section. Chapter 3 examines the strategies taken to plan for and implement a workable and cost-effective model for the in-service system, showing how policy was put into practice. It also presents an outline of the separate innovations which established NISTEP, and provides a description of the teacher education programmes provided for various target groups of trainee teachers.

Combining an etic and an emic perspective, the fourth chapter explores the question of the features of NISTEP that enabled it to survive, given its particular difficulties and the fragility of educational innovations. It argues that NISTEP's particular style of collective administration enabled it to surmount barriers which can cause the collapse of similar educational innovations, of which brief examples are given.

The fifth chapter describes the interactive style and deliberations of the weekly Staff Meeting, the main locus of organisational leadership in NISTEP. It also looks at the process of developing and implementing the teacher education curriculum which was a central part of the everyday life of the organisation.

The focus of this case study is the administrative and professional aspect of NISTEP. The pedagogic details of the curriculum and the experiences and perceptions of the student teachers are not highlighted here, and need to be the subject of another study.

Data Sources and Retrospective Analysis

In the tradition of the case study, much of the data for this study of NISTEP is primary source material collected in the natural setting of the case. A major source of data is my personal record of the weekly Staff Meeting and of the meetings of the Social Studies Curriculum Panel. Attendance at these meetings, together with lecturing and the supervision of teaching practice, comprised the bulk of my work at NISTEP. Other important primary data sources are the official minutes of the Staff Meeting and my personal notes and tape recordings of interviews which I conducted with key participants in the innovation. These included four of the five coordinators in the programme, two lecturers, and three others whose work involved them at times with the programme. The interviews were conducted after my involvement with NISTEP. Supplementing these primary sources are official documents from the Grenadian Ministry of Education which set out the aims and planned structure of

NISTEP, political speeches on its role and importance to the society, and a research study based on documentary analysis and on a questionnaire survey of NISTEP students carried out by a Grenadian researcher at the end of NISTEP's first year (Brizan, 1981).

Becker and Geer (1969: 322) define participant observation as "that method in which the observer participates in the daily life of the people under study, either openly in the role of researcher or covertly in some disguised role, observing things that happen, listening to what is said, and questioning people over some length of time". Assessed against this definition, the writer's role in NISTEP was not exactly that of a participant observer, either overt or covert, because there was no formal intention of carrying out research, and therefore no planned ethnographic research design. However, participant observation was carried out in the sense of observing, participating in and making written records of a selection of events. A distinction has to be made here between the planned participant observation of the researcher and the unplanned participant observation of the interested 'worker-observer' (2). This term seems useful because it does not carry the connotations of planned observational research implied in the term 'participant observer'.

My notes on NISTEP meetings, and on the many other educational planning meetings in which NISTEP staff members participated, were taken, not from the standpoint of one who intended to do formal research, but from that of an interested participant in the process keenly aware of its historical importance. Coming as a fellow Caribbean teacher-educator into NISTEP, I was immediately struck by the uniqueness of many aspects of the programme and by the significance of the process of educational change of which it was a part. Of particular interest were the administrative processes by which NISTEP seemed to be managing the enormous task it had taken on in spite of its shortage of resources: these processes were unlike anything I had experienced, seen or even read about. Also of interest were the similarities and differences in NISTEP's approaches to curriculum planning and development, to teaching, and to student-teacher supervision compared with the teacher education system in Jamaica with which I was familiar. My determination to make a record of these processes was increased when I realized that the keeping of records and minutes of meetings in NISTEP and elsewhere in the education system was sketchy and irregular.

The present study is a retrospective analysis of these written records, supplemented by documents and by interviews collected after August, 1983, when I left Grenada to return to my teacher education post in Jamaica. So the study has elements of the field experience of a worker-observer, elements of interviewing, and elements of historical/documentary analysis, all of which are bound together by the approach of retrospective analysis from the etic and emic perspectives. The role of worker-observer and the approach of retrospective analysis have both advantages and disadvantages which will now be discussed.

Advantages and Limitations of a Worker-Observer's Role

Being a worker in NISTEP afforded me some unique advantages. First was my position of full participation in many aspects of the programme, as cooperative decision-maker, curriculum developer, lecturer and supervisor. This provided both in-depth understanding of these roles and interaction with other related roles in NISTEP in the Ministry of Education and in the Primary schools. It also facilitated an understanding of the distinctive operation of norms and statuses (Zelditch, 1969) embodied in the various NISTEP posts.

A second advantage was that the setting was always completely natural, whereas the presence of someone known to be an observer may have somewhat changed the behaviour of the people under study. All incidents, controversies, issues and personalities were in their natural state. Thirdly, full participation as a worker in the natural setting meant that there was an access to shared meaning and to common understandings of the NISTEP culture which can be fully understood only by the members of a social group (Becker and Geer, 1969).

Bogdan and Biklén (1982) point out that, although methodical observation and description by participants such as teachers of their work environment have similarities to qualitative research, they differ in several ways. These include being limited by time constraints, ethical considerations that may not allow the revealing of certain problems, a possibility of too great an identification with the case being studied, and a possible lack of ethnographic methodology that would guide and inform the research.

These limitations may be to a certain extent applied to my collection of observational data on the NISTEP case. Data collection was secondary to my teaching and supervisory responsibilities, and there are certain deliberate omissions because of

my reluctance to discuss fully all the problems of which I am aware. In addition, I was not present in NISTEP until its second year so I have obtained an historical and not an observational account of the programme's first year and the planning process on which it was based.

In spite of these constraints, my field notes are probably as or more extensive than any that exist. The keeping of records such as minutes was not a highly developed procedure in NISTEP, and my interest in the uniqueness and importance of the process, heightened by a comparative knowledge of the teacher education system in Jamaica, caused me to consider certain events and conversations worth recording which others may not have done.

Regarding methodology, my collection of data was not influenced by a prior research design. The approach of qualitative analysis has had to be applied retrospectively to the data instead of having been applied in an ongoing manner in the field as an ethnographer would have done. The retrospective analysis of NISTEP started after a year of absence from the programme, and interviews were carried out with informants several months after they had left the programme. In a retrospective account it is difficult to capture

the ongoing nature of the growth and development that took place in participants and in the programme itself.

However, even if a complete ethnographic account is not possible with the retrospective analysis of NISTEP proposed, it is my view that there will be as reasonable a level of accuracy as an historian could produce using a variety of sources ranging from field observations to official and academic documents, to personal retrospective accounts.

Though memory may produce to some extent a 'transformation of perspective' (Becker and Geer, 1969), this is not entirely negative. The perspectives on NISTEP of the researcher as well as of the participants interviewed for this study were deepened and enriched by many months of reflection on the programme. This reflection may have enabled us to develop coherent concepts and perspectives about the programme that we may not have been able to formulate while we were in the midst of the intense work, development and change that NISTEP required of us. Lastly, if it is the case that my experience of NISTEP has tended towards a positive portrayal of the programme, there is an attempt to balance this by putting forward some of the differing views and controversial issues of which I was aware.

Robert I. Wise (1979), talking about curriculum development, argues that curriculum literature should contain a much higher proportion of retrospective accounts and analyses by curriculum workers of their experiences because of the importance of such experiences to generating knowledge in the field. In my view, this also applies forcefully to other aspects of education. I have increasingly understood the importance of my experience as an educator, and that of my colleagues, in the last ten years in Jamaica and Grenada, a time of social change and ferment which has greatly affected education. Like many of my colleagues, I am frustrated by the lack of documentation of such experiences, and, as a result, the lack of adequate 'grounded theory'. As Wise says of curriculum developers, educators in the Caribbean have neglected retrospection in favour of other modes of enquiring. I share his view that practical experience is our most precious source of knowledge about our field, and that therefore we should "seriously reflect on our practical experiences and prepare retrospective accounts of them". It is hoped that this study, in spite of its limitations, will achieve the researcher's primary goal - to add to knowledge by

generating description, theory and understanding in the field of the practice of teacher education and educational innovation.

Chapter 2

The National Context of the Case:
Educational Developments in the Grenada Revolution

Crossley and Vulliamy (1984) point out that a potential weakness of case studies is their tendency not to situate action in a social or historical context. They cite several criticisms (1) of the anthropological tradition of educational case studies on grounds of neglecting the social, economic and historical context of schooling. Since educational change can only be understood in this wider socio-economic context, this chapter will describe briefly the role that the Grenada Revolution assigned to educational change in relation to the development of the Grenadian economy and society during this period. This will provide the background for understanding the aspirations for a national teacher training system as an instrument of the improvement of the whole school system.

The People's Revolutionary Government which administered Grenada for four and a half years (13 March, 1979 - 25 October, 1983) consisted mainly of senior members of the socialist-oriented New Jewel Movement led by Maurice Bishop. What is perhaps less well known is that the PRG also included

independent professionals, trade unionists and some members of the nation's older, more conservative political parties (Ambursley and Dunkeley, 1984: 31). These Grenadians represented an apparently widespread feeling of frustration and discontent with corruption in the previous government of Sir Eric Gairy which had been in power from 1951 to 1979 (Epica, 1982: 42-50). Richard Hart (1984, xii-xvi) argues that the PRG showed flexibility and pragmatism in its approach to organising the political and economic development of the country which comprised the adjacent islands of Grenada, Carriacou and Petit Martinique, together occupying an area of 133 square miles or 344 square kilometres. The revolutionary government rejected the model of Westminster Government, bequeathed by the British, as being a barrier to socio-economic development, and worked hard to develop a popular alternative to this model. Its leaders agreed "that a mixed economy would be appropriate for Grenada's stage of development for some considerable time". As a result, they included some members of the private sector in the Cabinet (Hart, 1984: xvi).

In practice, a 'mixed economy' meant that, although traditional private business interests, both local and foreign, retained their dominant ownership of economic resources and activity, the PRG enlarged

public sector ownership and enterprise to about 30 percent of the economy, and encouraged the development of a small producer cooperative sector. It also introduced structured government planning and leadership of the economy which included new trade and aid agreements with socialist and non-aligned countries (Ambursley and Dunkerly, 1984: 31-32, 40; Payne et al, 1984: 22).

The new enterprises in the expanded public sector and the new government's ability to attract greatly increased sums in foreign grants and loans for infrastructural and social welfare projects provided several thousand new jobs. Unemployment, which was 49% of the labour force in 1978, was cut down to 14% by 1983, at a time when most other countries in the region had an unemployment rate of 20 - 30%. There was consistent economic growth measured in terms of the rise in GDP: 2.1% in 1979, 3% in 1980, 3% in 1981, and 5.5% in 1982 (Payne et al, 1984: 24), and an inflation rate of 7%. Per capita income increased, and, taking inflation into account, real living standards rose by 3%. Contributing to this improvement in living standards was increased government expenditure on the social services. This led to more housing provision, more places in secondary, tertiary and adult education, and a rise in the number of

doctors from 1 per 4,000 people in 1979 to 1 per 3,000 in 1982 (Ambursley and Dunkerley, 1984: 9-10, 40-45; Payne et al, 1984: 24, 26).

The effect of the Revolution's economic development on education was not only the increased expenditure which made possible an expansion of places and a granting of subsidies for food, books and clothing to many who needed them. It was also that the thousands of new jobs required higher levels of education and skills in the workforce. As the Grenadian economy grew, it became increasingly obvious that workers in every economic sector needed higher levels of general education and technical and vocational training for the many new projects in construction, in the hotel industry, in craft design, in food technology, in scientific agriculture, forestry and fishing, in economic and environmental planning and in financial and administrative management. The PRG also aimed at providing for the development of higher levels of cultural skills; for example, in the recording and use of folk lore and music for drama, dance, musical and literacy development, and in book publishing. A new type of education and training was needed to 'produce the producers' in all of these areas. Grenadian leaders and technocrats frequently stressed the connection between education and economic development, and urged the

people both to take advantage of, and to contribute to providing, new opportunities for educational advancement (2).

There were many constraints on the educational developments envisaged by the Revolution. The PRG inherited an education system which was dysfunctional for economic development, in that it resulted in waste, underachievement and a poorly educated, largely unskilled labour force. As in other Caribbean territories, the majority of poorer students from peasant and working class families received an inadequate education in Primary, All Age and Junior Secondary schools that left many barely literate and numerate. Only a small proportion of students, mainly from the more privileged classes, were able to attend the fee-paying High schools which took them to matriculation standard.

In schools, education wastage was high because of a combination of dropping out and repetition of grades. In the 1970s some 2,000 children were dropping out of the primary school system every year, and of these dropouts most were functionally illiterate: over 60% had not reached the Common Entrance or 'Eleven Plus' class. In 1979 only 50% of the 12 year old cohort was in the relevant grade across the school types, the rest repeating lower

grades because of underachievement (Brizan, 1981: 37-39). Performance in all national and external examinations was very poor. For example, in the decade of the 1970s pass rates for the British GCE 'O' level exams averaged 33% of all subjects entered, while in the case of local exams an average of 8% of children passed the Common Entrance exam and 19% of 15-16 year olds passed the School Leaving exam taken in the All Age schools (Brizan, 1981: 42-47).

In 1980, some 67% of Primary and All Age school teachers and 72% of Secondary school teachers were professionally untrained, although most of the latter had at least matriculated from High School which was not necessarily true of all of the former. Opportunities for tertiary education were few, and adult education for those who had had little or no school was non-existent (3).

The combination of few educational and economic opportunities led to massive migration which had resulted in 300,000 Grenadians living outside of Grenada, compared to the 100,000 in the country (Coard, 1982). The hundreds who migrated each year further wasted, from the nation's perspective, the resources that had been spent on their education.

Confronting this heritage of deep-seated educational problems, the People's Revolutionary Government put in place structures and programmes to achieve two goals frequently articulated by the political leadership. The first goal was to expand education quantitatively so that all would have more access to it, the second was to bring about qualitative changes that would transform education into an instrument of the economic, social and cultural development of the population. As Prime Minister Bishop put it, "education must enable us to confront the serious problems that we face ... to increase production ... to defeat disease and poor health conditions ... to overcome backwardness and poverty" (Bishop, 1980 in Jules and Rojas, 1982: 162).

In pursuit of its commitment to providing mass education - " ... to develop all our people, not just a few" (Creft, 1981: 5), the revolution did a great deal to increase the provision of both formal and non-formal education. The Primary system already had over 90% enrolment, but the PRG started a process of expansion and upgrading of school plant and administrative structures which, it was hoped, would make possible universal and compulsory Primary education and a unified Primary curriculum by 1984 or 1985. Secondary school fees were abolished and the Secondary system, with its 41%

enrolment, was increased in capacity with the addition of over 2,000 new places by 1983. The plan was to gradually increase plant and the provision of trained teachers until a universal and unified comprehensive secondary system was in place by 1990. A structured system of Child Care centres and Pre-Primary or Nursery schools was introduced to replace the existing unregulated private child-minders. By 1982, some 250 infants under 3 years of age and 2,500 children aged 3 - 5 were benefiting from government subsidised and supervised child care and preschooling, and there were plans to develop and expand this provision with some 2,000 additional places by 1985 (4).

The qualitative change and improvement which was desired in schooling was much less straightforward than this expansion of educational capacity. A start was made at each level of the school system to put in place new projects and approaches such as modern, 'child-centred' methods at the pre-Primary level and the writing of a new series of culturally relevant reading primers (the "Marryshow Readers") for Primary schools. The Ministry of Education organised several short methodology and curriculum development workshops for teachers. A programme of agricultural 'work-and-study' was introduced in some schools where there was suitable land for farming. As part of the plan to rationalise

Secondary curricula, it was decided that the British GCE 'O' Level examinations would be phased out from 1983 and replaced with the regional Secondary school-leaving evaluation system coordinated by the Caribbean Examinations Council. Secondary teachers were encouraged to form Subject Associations to launch the development of curricula which would more suitably prepare students for the Caribbean examinations. In some Secondary schools, there was an attempt to give students the beginnings of some participation in school affairs through new Student Councils.

However, this curriculum change and the process of 'democratising' schooling represented only a modest start, with more extensive changes being planned for the future. The PRG minimised budgetary allocation and skill deployment on these projects because it reasoned that at this initial stage of change, little progress could be made on them until the first priority was achieved - that of improving the general education and professional skills of the majority of teachers through teacher training. The shortage of skilled teachers was part of the general problem of an acute shortage of trained professionals which led the PRG to lay enormous stress on the expansion of tertiary education, including teacher training.

Since it was envisaged that the education of adults would be an important part of the development not only of the economy but also of the school system in the second five-year period of the Revolution (1984-1989), a large proportion of per capita spending was devoted to tertiary education (Education Sector Survey, 1982: 177 and 181).

There was considerable investment in University education, both in financial contributions to the University of the West Indies and in terms of the temporary loss of the work and the production of the nation's most highly educated young people who were given the chance to continue their studies abroad. Compared with the one or two young Grenadians per year who had, in the years just prior to the Revolution, been assisted by the then government to study at University level, by 1983 there were 319 students in University and Higher Technical education. Of these, 66 were studying in the Commonwealth Caribbean, and 215 in socialist countries which had provided scholarships (5).

Investment in the new in-service teacher education programme enabled it to absorb all of the nation's hundreds of untrained teachers, which affected virtually every government Primary school. In-service training was also provided for several other categories of working adults, including tourism workers, civil servants and young people at the new fisheries and farm schools where productive

work and the management of cooperative business enterprises were an integral part of the education offered. In 1980 the Revolution introduced the provision of Adult Education for 1,000 illiterate and functionally illiterate adults through a new community-based structure, the Centre for Popular Education (CPE). By 1982 there were 1,500 adults studying at various levels of the CPE which planned to bring them from functional illiteracy to the stage of the Primary School Leaving examination within three years (6). Non-formal education was further provided to rural and urban communities all over the country through community organisations which organised regular sessions of political and general-interest debate and discussion (7).

This background of educational modernisation and change gives us an insight into the reasons for the PRG's determination to establish a new teacher education system. It was not feasible for a teaching force of which only one-third, at best, had any tertiary education to implement adequately the pressing new tasks in the expanded school system. Well-educated and trained teachers were necessary for tasks such as preparing new curricula and materials, helping to develop and coordinate a new evaluation and examination system, putting in place a work-study approach to education, ensuring greater involvement of the community and pupils in

a democratised education process, expanding and upgrading scientific, technical and cultural education. Other projects which depended on the teachers' assistance were community development programmes, such as health education, the CPE's Adult Literacy drive and the National Women's Organisation programme of nutrition, uniform and book subsidies for needy children. In the PRG's view, teachers were among Grenada's most important change agents for economic and cultural development, and for this role, no teacher could be left untrained. The question was: how could Grenada, one of the poorest countries in the Caribbean, with scarce financial resources for education and very few trained teacher-educators, implement a large-scale teacher education programme?

As was pointed out at the beginning of this study, the existing Grenada Teachers' College, with its small staff of seven lecturers, had only been able to graduate an average of 42 teachers a year between 1971 and 1980. The College provided two years of full-time academic and professional studies to two batches of students, 80 to 90 altogether, and these graduated with a Trained Teachers' Certificate endorsed by the University of the West Indies and recognised regionally. In the 18 years of its existence, the College had trained

651 teachers of whom 380 or 58% had left the profession. An average of 40 teachers (both trained and untrained) left the schools each year. In 1980, the College was costing the country E.C. \$470,000 annually (8). Yet it was making little impact on the large numbers of untrained teachers - 600 in the Primary and All Age schools and 153 in the High Schools - and thus little impact on the deep-seated qualitative problems of education.

For the revolutionary government to achieve its goal of a fully trained teaching force within three years in the Primary and All Age schools, it had to solve three problems:

1. Finding extra funds and extra staff to train about six times the number of student teachers normally trained;
2. Requiring enrolment in the programme for those who were reluctant to be trained;
3. Keeping the schools in operation while the training of more than two-thirds of their teachers was taking place.

It seemed that the only practical option was to use an in-service model which would require the hundreds of unqualified teachers to remain in

teaching and study at the same time; but could the concomitant problems be surmounted? It is within this context of the Revolution's ambitious aims for educational change, and the constraints it had to face, that we now examine specific aspects of the in-service teacher training model, and the particular strategies of resource deployment that the PRG adopted for establishing the programme.

Chapter 3

Nistep: Policy and Practice

Consultative Planning

The PRG's decision, taken in June, 1980, to implement a compulsory national in-service teacher education programme was not arrived at lightly. It was the result of a year of considerable discussion, both at national mass meetings and local parish meetings, between the country's Primary and All-Age school teachers, Ministry of Education officers and politicians on how to prioritise solutions to the country's many educational problems (1). During most of this year, several ad hoc projects were launched by the government to start meeting some of the urgent educational needs. These included nutrition subsidies, the repair of seriously deteriorated school buildings and the provision of more secondary school places. It was decided at this time that school-based curriculum development should become the main lever of educational change. Some qualified education officers started a curriculum development programme in selected schools (Baptiste, 1984). Serious consideration was given to the proposal from a Unesco consultant

that the bulk of Primary teachers could be trained initially by participating in structured curriculum development over some years, after which they would finalise their training for two years at the full-time Teachers' College (Unesco, 1979). Other models of emergency teacher education suggested by the University of the West Indies (Barrie, 1984) and by consultants from Cuba (Rizo, 1979) were carefully weighed up but not, in the end, accepted. All of these models envisaged a combination of in-college full-time training and in-service part-time training which would take a much longer period than the revolutionary government wanted.

It was at the second mass meeting of teachers, other educators and politicians held in January, 1980, that large numbers of the unqualified teachers stressed their desire to be given an opportunity to be trained for their profession. As a result, one of the important decisions taken by the meeting was that the foundation step towards restructuring the schools should be in-service training to qualify the untrained teachers. This was to gain priority in funding and skilled personnel over curriculum development or any other programme. As Finance Minister, Bernard Coard, put it: "The important point in achieving educational change ... is positive teacher expectations and attitudes and excellent methodology. We decided to

... develop the teachers, their capacity to teach, before we tackled the materials, and while the training was taking place, to involve the teachers and teacher-educators in the process of curriculum development for Primary school children" (Coard, 1982). In June, 1980, after more months of deliberation, the decision was made to suspend the existing full-time college programme and replace it with an in-service programme, rather than run them concurrently as alternative routes to the Teacher's Certificate (Coard, 1982; Baptiste, 1984).

It took another four months, from June to September, 1980, of intensive planning and consultation between the teachers' union, school principals and government representatives to formulate the specific design of an in-service programme which would meet all the needs of diverse target groups of untrained teachers while at the same time allowing the schools to continue operations. Brizan (1981: 80-87) has given a detailed description of this process which involved nine or ten meetings and over 600 teachers.

In October, 1980, the PRG opened the National In-Service Teacher Education Programme - NISTEP. It had 16 lecturers who were to provide three years of compulsory Primary level training for 542 young teachers. It also promised one year of in-college

training as well as a twelve week practicum to 40 older teachers who had 15 - 20 years' teaching experience but no formal qualifications. From the outset, its high ratio of students to lecturers, its compulsory involvement of every untrained Primary teacher, its disregard of the diversity of entry levels of the student teachers and its inadequate materials represented a departure from the tradition of teacher education in the Caribbean. It was implemented despite cautionary warnings about all of these features from most of the University-based external examiners of the former full-time Teachers' College (Barrie, 1984), and some pessimism from the staff of seven who had taught at this College. Some of their reservations against NISTEP were that it was unrealistic, being on far too large a scale given the inadequacy of staff, library and other resources, that it was too hastily and inadequately planned, that it would be difficult to teach student-teachers with widely different educational levels, and that three years was too short for an in-service programme as student workloads would be too heavy (Barrie, 1984; Baptiste, 1984). Logical though the criticisms seemed, the government countered that the majority of Grenadian children had been long enough left without adequate schooling, that training all the teachers was the pivotal step in achieving this, that many serious teachers had been urgently

pressing for training, and that, though NISTEP would be bound to have problems, it was more important to make a start than to wait to solve them (Coard, 1982).

It was obvious from the mass meetings that most Grenadian educators were convinced of the importance and urgency of training the nation's teachers, but it also became clear that many shared the misgivings expressed by the university personnel and others about the size and rapid implementation of the training programme as envisaged by the revolutionary government. One of the more cautious education planners explained the hasty launching of NISTEP in this way: "George (Louison, the then Minister of Education) pressed us to start. The U.S. Presidential Elections were coming up and there was a fear that the Revolution would be overthrown, so there was a sense of urgency to start a structure" (2). However, not all the professionals needed to be 'pressed': it seems that there was also a small core of leading educators who threw their weight and skills behind the PRG's insistence on starting NISTEP immediately. Others, though seeing it as a gamble, went along with it, and a combination of these groups agreed to form the initial core of the NISTEP staff.

To make teacher training compulsory was going against the tradition which had established that it was optional, undertaken only by those who envisaged staying in teaching, who could afford to take two years' leave, and who had the matriculation requirements of four GCE 'O' levels. Brizan (1981), in a survey conducted at the end of the first year of NISTEP, found that 73% of the trainees felt that the programme should have been optional and only 27% that it was correct to make it compulsory (3), although nearly all recognised the need for training. The PRG's position on this question was that teachers, like doctors, nurses and other professionals, had an obligation to their clients, and ultimately to the nation, to be trained for their profession. This point of view, a norm in wealthy, developed countries, is usually shared by developing countries, but many, on grounds of resource scarcity, have failed to establish compulsory training programmes. What was unusual was that Grenada, despite its poverty and resource scarcity, was determined to, and found a way to, put the goal into practice.

The NISTEP Student Body

The government's determination to establish teacher training as a norm in a country where it had always been optional and restricted received a twofold

response from the NISTEP students. On the one hand there was a high dropout rate from the programme, but on the other, the majority who stayed worked hard and successfully to fulfil the requirements of the courses.

It was widely known that some trainees resented having to participate in NISTEP, especially the ones who were using their employment in teaching as a temporary bridge to another job. But what was somewhat unexpected, at least on the part of the NISTEP staff, was the number of trainees who dropped out of NISTEP and therefore out of teaching. Some 160 students left NISTEP in its first two years, so that about 380 'mainstream' trainees, together with the 40 older student teachers in the 'Special Year' remained (see p. 44 and 46). This attrition rate was consistent with the common phenomenon of a high dropout rate from in-service programmes. However, it exceeded Grenada's average yearly figures of 40 leaving the teaching profession (4).

One of the reasons for the attrition from NISTEP was the lack of commitment of many to teaching. Another was the attraction of the new opportunities offered in careers and opportunities for tertiary study. The government had obtained over 300 overseas tertiary level scholarships (5). It was

having difficulty in finding enough Grenadians who were sufficiently qualified to take up these scholarships and the new jobs that became available each year. Since the majority of the country's young people with any 'O' level Secondary school qualifications were in NISTEP, the PRG found itself having to encourage some of the students to leave the programme in order to work in or train for some other urgently required field. As a result, new recruits to teaching were constantly entering the schools to replace those who had left. This led to the PRG's asking the already overtaxed NISTEP staff to design and implement an emergency "Induction" course in basic teaching methods for these young beginner teachers.

The PRG had taken a gamble in launching a comprehensive programme despite insufficient resources to fund and staff it. But the gamble paid off in that the majority of student teachers successfully completed their course in the specified time. NISTEP, with a staff that started with 16 in Year 1 and grew to 28 by Year 3, gave from one to three years' academic education and professional training to the country's entire complement of unqualified elementary teachers, organising them into the following batches, each with a specific programme according to their needs:

The 'Mainstream' Students

These were the initial 542 trainee teachers who started in NISTEP in October, 1980. Their numbers were reduced to 380 by the end of the second year, and to about 320 by the end of the third year. During the primary school term they attended NISTEP each Friday, and they were given eight weeks of all-day courses during the three vacation periods. This amounted to as many or more hours of tuition as the old full-time college had provided for its students.

The Mainstream 'stayers' carried out a very demanding schedule of NISTEP study combined with school teaching. Most of them successfully completed their studies in the target period of three years. In the second year exams, taken in August, 1982, there were 303 passes and 77 referrals (Pierre, 1984). Final results for the 320 who took the third year exams are not known, but it is likely that a similar proportion passed. Referrals were given two chances to resit the exams they had failed (6).

The 'Maintenance' Students

These were the student teachers who were allowed to take both the NISTEP exams and the regional Teachers' College exams supervised and accredited by the University of the West Indies. Their four 'O' Level High School passes matriculated them to take the latter exams which were scheduled one year later than the NISTEP exams. The NISTEP lecturers agreed to give this group extra tuition in three-hour classes on Saturdays so that they could maintain their studies over the one-year gap between exams: hence the name given them of the 'Maintenance' group. As well as providing for revision of the subjects, the Saturday classes also covered topics emphasised in the regional curriculum but not in the NISTEP programme.

Although 153 trainees had the matriculation requirements for sitting for the regional exams, in the end only 54 sat for them (Notes, Staff Meeting, July 4, 1983). It was made clear to them that their regional teacher's certificate would not be regarded by the Grenadian Ministry of Education as in any way superior to their NISTEP certificate. The main reason given by many of the 54 for wanting a regional as well as a NISTEP certificate was that the regional one was internationally accredited, which would suit them if they wanted to migrate or

The 'Maintenance' Students

These were the student teachers who were allowed to take both the NISTEP exams and the regional Teachers' College exams supervised and accredited by the University of the West Indies. Their four 'O' Level High School passes matriculated them to take the latter exams which were scheduled one year later than the NISTEP exams. The NISTEP lecturers agreed to give this group extra tuition in three-hour classes on Saturdays so that they could maintain their studies over the one-year gap between exams: hence the name given them of the 'Maintenance' group. As well as providing for revision of the subjects, the Saturday classes also covered topics emphasised in the regional curriculum but not in the NISTEP programme.

Although 153 trainees had the matriculation requirements for sitting for the regional exams, in the end only 54 sat for them (Notes, Staff Meeting, July 4, 1983). It was made clear to them that their regional teacher's certificate would not be regarded by the Grenadian Ministry of Education as in any way superior to their NISTEP certificate. The main reason given by many of the 54 for wanting a regional as well as a NISTEP certificate was that the regional one was internationally accredited, which would suit them if they wanted to migrate or

do further studies abroad. The reasons given by some of those who decided not to take the regional exams included lack of intention to migrate and the heavy extra workload. Others told members of the staff in Year 3 that they had by then become more confident about the quality of their training in NISTEP and did not see the need to sit for regional exams as well (Notes, Staff Meeting, May 13, 1983).

The 'Special Year' Students

This group of 40 older student teachers were given a different and shorter programme from the 'Mainstream' group in recognition of their 10 - 20 years of teaching experience. An intensive fifteen month programme was organised for them from October, 1981 to December, 1982. In this they had three terms (one year) of lectures on four full days per week, and a practicum of one term (three months) to end their studies. The 'Special Years' received their Trained Teacher Certificates (7) and the appropriate salary increments in September, 1983.

The 'Induction' Students

These were the 160 new teacher recruits who replaced those who had left teaching during 1981 and 1982. Starting in October, 1982, they were

given an introductory course one day per fortnight in order both to equip them with some basic methodological competence in the classroom and to prepare them for starting a three year certificate course in NISTEP in October, 1983 as the second batch of teacher trainees.

NISTEP's Innovations and Structure

NISTEP showed flexibility, innovativeness and, at times, almost a quality of recklessness that made it tackle problems without knowing exactly what the outcome would be. Some of the strategies by which NISTEP was established and implemented were innovative in the Caribbean context, others adaptive. An outline of the most important ones serves as a framework within which to consider later the internal operations of NISTEP.

The Cost of NISTEP

An in-service teacher education structure decreases the cost of teacher training. This happened in Grenada because of the adoption of this structure combined with innovative and cost-effective approaches to organising it. Costs were cut down by means of certain strategies of staff recruitment and deployment, inviting school staffs and

community members to assist with the programme, and an economical use of physical plant and resources.

On the one hand, the per capita cost of educating student teachers was much lower in NISTEP than in the full-time College programme. On the other, the economic growth that took place during the Revolution made it possible for the PRG to increase the annual budgetary allocation for teacher education. The old Teachers' College with 80 or 90 students cost EC\$470,000 annually. NISTEP cost \$600,000 in Year 1 for 450 students (8) and \$746,146 in Year 2 for about 380 'Mainstream' and 40 'Special Year' students (9).

Staffing and Salaries

The recruitment of additional staff was the most pressing problem of NISTEP. Seven Grenadian teacher-educators were available to start the programme, but a student teacher body of 500 needed a staff of 25 if student-staff ratios were to be 20 : 1, or a staff of 35 if ratios were to be 14 : 1, closer to the regional average. In the summer of 1980, while NISTEP was being planned, no one knew where and how the additional staff needed was to be found and paid for, in the situation of scarce resources and an extreme shortage of highly qualified people.

However, by the third year of the programme the necessary numbers of staff had been obtained. Resources were husbanded as much as possible in four ways: by tolerating higher than usual student-staff ratios, by using certain curriculum strategies which included timetable flexibility and team work, by the incorporation of some staff who had fewer qualifications than was normal for College lecturers, and by a somewhat unusual use of funds granted by external project agencies.

Two things were done to enable the in-service programme to start in October, 1980. Firstly, nine additional lecturers were recruited, four from abroad and five from Grenada, making a total staff of sixteen for the 500 students. This meant tolerating a student-staff ratio of 33 : 1. Secondly, it was decided that teaching would start in only three subjects; those for which tutors could be found - Language Arts, Mathematics and Education. These core subjects were offered during the first two years of NISTEP. Meanwhile, additional staff were sought to teach four other subjects needed by Grenada's Primary teachers - Science, Social Studies, Agriculture and Health Education - by the third and final year of NISTEP. Lack of staff made it impossible to offer the other specialist areas usually considered important in Primary teacher education, such as Art, Music and

Physical Education. It was hoped that these would be offered in 1984 in intensive workshops and seminars for interested teachers, including those from the first 1983 batch of NISTEP graduates. Plans were to use the workshop approach in other subjects also to provide for the continuing professional development of the NISTEP graduates and other teachers who needed strengthening in particular areas.

Over the three years of NISTEP, 21 new lecturers were employed in addition to the original Teachers' College staff of 7. The second year had 20 staff, and there were 28 in the third year. 14 of the new lecturers were recruited from abroad which, in most cases, necessitated the payment of passages for the appointee. It would seem that using staff from abroad (they were called 'internationalist workers' rather than 'foreigners' or 'expatriates') must have been prohibitively expensive but, in fact, costs were maintained at a feasible level. Of the the 14 'internationalist' staff, 9 accepted local salaries, paid out of the local education budget. The remaining 5 were were paid for out of financing granted by various international project agencies for curriculum development and other educational projects. The project tasks assigned to these 5 were combined with teaching and supervising in NISTEP. In some cases where the project

recommended a relatively high salary to one appointee, the PRG offered half that sum, and this made it possible for the money intended for, say, two salaries to be shared by four (10).

Of the new NISTEP staff, 7 were Grenadians, 2 of these being university graduates. The PRG paid these 2 out of the annual teacher education budget. The other 5 were not university graduates but outstanding and experienced Primary school teachers with Grenada Teachers' College certificates. They were seconded from their schools to assist with NISTEP teaching. Their salaries therefore came out of the Primary school budget. This use of some non-graduate trained teachers as well as some graduate untrained staff (11) was a controversial approach to the problem of staff shortage. It was one of the reasons, together with the too high student-staff ratio, for which those with a traditional approach could criticise NISTEP. However, most of the staff were qualified at levels normal for College lecturers, having degrees or postgraduate degrees as well as professional teaching diplomas and years of school experience (12).

The structure of curriculum teams or 'Panels' helped all of the staff members to learn their new tasks and, at the same time, to contribute their

particular strengths. This curriculum process will be outlined on pages 56-57 and discussed further in Chapters 4 and 5.

The local budget, besides meeting new staff salaries, also paid lecturers their travelling expenses to and from the NISTEP centres, expenses which included car mileage, allowances, and plane fares and accommodation costs for those who travelled regularly to Carriacou to help teach at the NISTEP centre there. In addition, it financed 2 staff development workshops in which NISTEP staff, assisted by UWI lecturers, gave considerable thought to some of the pressing problems of NISTEP and worked out solutions over several days of retreat held at a rural camp centre with dormitory accommodation.

The PRG found it possible to offer a salary increment to the trainees for each year they stayed in NISTEP as long as they passed the end of year exams. They were promised the same pay on graduation as teachers who had been new graduates of the Grenada Teachers' College, which meant that the government had to prepare to add some \$1,000,000 to the Primary teachers' salary bill by January, 1984 (Notes, Staff Meeting, May 13, 1983). Student teachers were also reimbursed for their bus fares to and from NISTEP centres during the 8 weeks

of vacation classes, but were expected to meet their own bus fare expenses during term time. Teacher Partners and Primary school Principals were also given salary increments of \$350 per year for their support services to NISTEP.

Physical Plant and Materials

No money was spent on constructing extra buildings for the NISTEP trainees. The Grenada Teachers' College, with its 5 classrooms, accommodated the trainees who lived and taught on the western side of the island in the parishes easily accessible to the capital, St. Georges. Those in the eastern parishes had their classes in some of the classrooms of a Junior Secondary school in Grenville, a town in the parish of St. Andrews, while the 53 trainees in Carriacou and Petit Martinique, Grenada's sister islands, attended NISTEP classes in a grammar school in Carriacou. These were the 3 NISTEP centres to which trainees and staff travelled for classes each Friday during school terms and daily for 8 weeks during vacation periods. Additional schools were used for the methodology seminars with the 'Induction' students.

During the first year extra chairs and desks for the hundreds of NISTEP trainees at the St. George's centre had to be borrowed from nearby schools. A

Public Works Department truck collected this extra furniture each Friday, delivered it to the College, and delivered it back to the schools at the end of the NISTEP day (Baptiste, 1984). By the beginning of the second year, an adequate supply of furniture had been obtained.

Funds from externally financed projects covered the setting up of a very basic Materials Production Unit where stencilled curriculum materials were rolled off for the trainees. This was a 'crisis management' arrangement to help compensate for the lack of adequate library resources which had been chronic for years, even with the much smaller former College. Project finances also helped to buy a small number of new library books and to pay some of the travelling expenses of Primary teachers who came to the curriculum development workshops coordinated by NISTEP staff and held in the various NISTEP centres.

School and Community Links with NISTEP

Regular supervision of the practical teaching of NISTEP trainees was increased by the system that was introduced of 'teacher partners'. In this, the already qualified teachers in the schools shared in the supervision and guidance of the trainees in their daily teaching. NISTEP lecturers held a

series of teacher partner workshops to update the methods and approaches of the qualified teachers so that they would be in tune with what was being expected of the trainees. This was, in effect, a type of refresher course or upgrading for teachers who had studied under the old system, some a long time ago. Although it was carefully worked out how many hours of supervision would be expected from both NISTEP staff and teacher partners, there were many problems with the teacher partner system and it did not work as efficiently as had been hoped. Nevertheless, students got some extra assistance, teacher partners got some upgrading, and both gained more familiarity than they might otherwise have done with assessment techniques based on the 'A.P.T.' (Assessment of Practical Teaching) instrument worked out by a UWI School of Education lecturer and modified by NISTEP staff.

The problem of how to keep the schools open each Friday when there was an exodus of student teachers to NISTEP classes was solved by the development of the Community School Day Programme or CSDP. This applied the concepts of integrating work with study and forging links between the school and community. The CSDP invited skilled members of the community into the schools each Friday to share their skills with the pupils, teaching them craft, agriculture or home economics, and organising folk culture and

oral history projects. In many schools the CSDP remained hardly more than embryonic, suffering from too few coordinators and sometimes from community apathy where there was little or no tradition of community-school involvement. However, the experiment provided some signposts for the expansion and improved implementation of the concept in the future.

Curriculum Arrangements

By the second year of NISTEP, a structure of curriculum teams or panels had evolved which helped to meet several staffing problems. Among these were uneven levels of qualification or of experience in teacher education, inadequacy of staff numbers in some subjects, and the frequent arrival of new staff.

In each curriculum panel, the syllabus and teaching materials for the subject were collectively planned with input from all panel members so that those with advanced academic qualifications and those with long and valuable experience of teaching Grenadian school children interactively enriched the NISTEP curriculum. The chairperson of a panel was responsible for coordinating and leading the

meetings, supervising the production of curriculum materials and allocating panel members to teaching tasks.

The panel structure made it possible, when necessary, to prepare a staff member who had specialised in one subject to teach another subject with which he or she was less familiar. For example, in the Social Studies panel there were two graduates whose specialist field was not the Social Sciences but Literature and Language, and in the Health Education panel there were some Humanities graduates without much knowledge of the Biological Sciences. However, since each panel contained some members with a specialist graduate or postgraduate knowledge of the subject, curriculum planning could be oriented towards the requirements of the discipline. At the same time, it was enriched by perspectives from additional disciplines, as well as by the school teaching expertise of some panel members.

The organisation of the NISTEP timetable over a three-year period compensated, to some extent, for the adverse effects of staff shortages. The timetable provided students with more course hours of tuition and more teaching supervision than did the previous two-year College programme. For example, each core subject in Language Arts,

Mathematics and Education was taught to NISTEP's 'Mainstream' group for at least 240 hours compared to the 186 hours allocated to these subjects in the previous programme. The four subjects taught in NISTEP's third year were allocated 70 hours each. 'Mainstream' students had their teaching practice supervised at least 36 times by NISTEP lecturers and on an ongoing basis by their 'Teacher Partners', whereas the previous programme had provided for students to be supervised about 18 times (13). The 'Maintenance' students who were being prepared for regional as well as NISTEP exams received some 36 additional hours of tuition in each subject, as well as extra supervision.

The System of Certification

NISTEP's flexibility and determination to push through traditional constraints was illustrated by the handling of the question of certification.

Grenada had formerly shared in the Eastern Caribbean system of teacher education. In each island's Teachers' College, the curriculum was monitored, exams coordinated and standardised on a regional basis, and certification accredited by the UWI's School of Education in Barbados.

NISTEP differed in many respects from the regional Teachers' Colleges. The PRG nevertheless envisaged that all of the NISTEP students would write the regional exams, and sought UWI accreditation for the new programme.

However, the School of Education refused to accredit a programme which, against its advice, had not adhered to the normal entry requirements. In addition, it objected to NISTEP's high ratio of students to staff, inadequate library resources, and new course content in some subjects which had not been developed before the programme started (Barrie, 1984).

This lack of university accreditation concerned many NISTEP students deeply and raised their doubts about the quality and even the validity of the programme (Brizan, 1981: 95). The attitude of the School of Education frustrated both NISTEP staff and the government. The latter saw it as one of the many problems in the relationship of Grenada and other small Caribbean territories to the regional university. As Prime Minister Bishop put it, after raising arguments and figures to show that the University was not giving the smaller participating territories a fair deal, " ... On top of all the other problems ... even what would seem to be a relatively simple question, the question of

accrediting official certification to ... our countries which do our own (teacher education) courses is a struggle we still have to fight" (Bishop, 1982: 14).

The PRG was prepared to 'go it alone' with NISTEP by authorising it to grant its successful graduates local Teachers' Certificates which would be valid in Grenada. At the same time, however, it regarded as important the maintenance of a working relationship with the UWI School of Education. Thus Grenada's Ministry of Education frequently invited university lecturers to NISTEP to assist the staff, particularly in matters of working out evaluation procedures for the academic courses and for teaching practice, and agreeing on approaches to certification.

It was during one of the week-long planning retreats in Year 2, involving UWI and NISTEP staff, that both sides finally arrived at a solution to the problem of certifying students with different entry levels. The 153 NISTEP students who had the 4 '0' Levels required for entering the regional teacher education programme would be allowed to sit for the regional exams as well as the local NISTEP exams. Those who chose to do so became the 'Maintenance' group described above (14). This mutually acceptable outcome, as well as the working

relationship maintained with the university, helped to contribute to a growing confidence among many of the trainees about the validity of NISTEP's courses, examinations and certification.

Administrative Arrangements

The pressing problems of administering and organising NISTEP were met by a collective administrative structure which started in Year 1 and was developed and systematised during Year 2. This structure included a weekly staff meeting, lasting for several hours, in which problems were discussed and policy worked out, and a system of subcommittees or panels responsible for carrying out tasks as directed by the staff meeting.

At the end of Year 1, the staff meeting agreed to replace the single coordinator who had led the programme until then, with a team of three administrators. These three shared the responsibility of coordinating administrative tasks, but, at the same time, they continued their tasks of teaching and supervising trainees. The system of weekly staff meetings, administrative panels and shared administrative leadership made it possible for the entire staff, as a whole or in

work groups, to plan and carry out all NISTEP tasks in a collective way, and to discuss and tackle each problem as it occurred.

NISTEP's first year was, from all accounts, beset with problems and breakdowns, which was almost certainly the result of the unmanageably large student-staff ratio of 33 : 1, and of the scale, complexity and newness of the task which faced the staff. But over the second and third years NISTEP, with a student-staff ratio of 20 : 1, learnt to work with reasonable efficiency in the teaching and supervision of the target groups and the coordination of inputs from Primary school staffs and from the community. This was not only because of the more manageable student-staff ratio but also, in my view, because of the role played by the cooperative structures of internal organisation developed by the NISTEP staff, a point that will be explored in more detail later.

The Feasibility of In-Service Teacher Training

NISTEP was made cost-effective and feasible by financing and resource deployment, together with the staff's innovations in the organisation of the programme and the dedicated hours of extra work that they contributed to it. NISTEP was able to train 380 'Mainstream' student teachers over three

years, plus the 50 older 'Special Year' and 150 'Induction' trainees, with a staff that grew from 16 to 28, and at an annual cost that varied between EC\$600,000 and \$750,000. Since NISTEP's annual per capita cost was so much lower than the per capita cost of the old in-College programme, Grenada would have been able to afford to continue using the in-service method to guarantee professional training to all teachers, even if the accustomed annual resignations of teachers from the schools had continued.

The successful completion of the planned NISTEP courses by the majority of 'Mainstream' student teachers and by all of the 'Special Years' showed that the idea of providing a fully trained Primary teaching force in a small, poor country over a relatively short period was not an impossible dream. The government's determination to establish teacher training as a requirement for a practising teacher had succeeded.

Because of this, the PRG started in July, 1983 to make plans for the continuation of NISTEP in 1984. In this second phase, the three-year in-service programme would be given to the 'Induction' trainees as well as all other new recruits to Primary teaching. Moreover, it was hoped that over the next five years a similar in-service programme

could be provided to train all unqualified teachers in the Secondary schools, so that by 1990 Grenada's entire teaching force would be trained (15).

The Perpetuation of the In-Service Teacher
Training Approach in Grenada

The NISTEP graduation planned for December, 1983 never took place because of the overthrow of the revolutionary government with the invasion of Grenada in October, 1983. For many months it was undecided what, if any, recognition would be given to the three-year training of 382 teachers provided by NISTEP. In the meantime, the NISTEP staff, now reduced, continued to provide some teacher training as far as they were able to. With the accession to power of a new, elected government at the end of 1984, it was confirmed that a compromise would be acted on.

The Grenada Teachers' College would be reinstated and would resume operations as part of the Eastern Caribbean Teachers' College system, but it would now offer teacher education through a programme of two years of in-service study as well as one full-time year in the College. The approximately 100 NISTEP graduates who had not taken the regional exams, in spite of having the four 'O' Levels

subject passes which qualified them to do so, would be allowed to take them after one further year of study at the Grenada Teachers' College on a full-time basis. There were about 200 who did not have the required four 'O' Level subjects. These student teachers would have to get the four passes in these subjects or their Caribbean equivalents before being allowed to enter the full-time year to prepare for the regional exams. For those who had been 'Induction' student teachers and for all other new teachers entering the schools, the new programme of two years' in-service and one year of full-time teacher education would be the requirement for the granting of a Trained Teachers' Certificate (Pierre, 1984).

Therefore, the in-service approach developed for Grenada by the Revolution is continuing to influence the island's teacher education system. Over 300 teachers with three years of NISTEP training will graduate, after one year of further study, with a regional Trained Teachers' Certificate to which the vast majority of them would have had no immediate access had the revolutionary in-service programme not been implemented. New entrants to teaching will receive in-service training for two-thirds of their course. It seems likely that, through the continued use of the in-service structure on a national scale, the

dream of having a fully trained Primary teaching force in Grenada will be achieved.

Questions of National Policy and Institutional Change

The way in which NISTEP was planned and implemented illustrates a particular approach to carrying out changes in education policy at a national or macro level, and at an institutional or micro level.

At the national level, ideas and the drive for change can come from several different sources: from professionals, from pressure groups or a wider popular base, or from a combination of these. In the case of Grenada, the revolutionary government, like many other post-colonial governments in the Caribbean, was committed to educational change, and spent its first year of office searching for priorities and the most feasible paths. From that year of myriad suggestions and ad hoc programmes, including experiments with curriculum development, two things emerged clearly. One was that very little could be achieved in curriculum development because most of the teachers lacked the skills and training to implement it at the required school-based level. The second was that there was a strong demand being expressed by 'serious teachers', as the PRG put it, to be given an

opportunity to be trained and qualified. This demand fitted in with the PRG's growing emphasis on expanding tertiary education, and the government decided to make teacher training a priority, seeing it as the chief fulcrum for changing the wider educational system.

It was at this point that the PRG took the demand for teacher education further and faster than most senior professionals considered feasible. Few people of a cautious outlook could agree with such radical measures as closing down the traditional Grenada Teachers' College, disregarding entry levels so that teacher training could be required as compulsory for all unqualified teachers, and starting the training programme after only four months of planning. However, in its determination to start, the PRG was able to persuade the reluctant to become involved with the programme. It may be that two of the factors enabling it to do this were the opening of a major part of NISTEP's planning to the interested public, and the support and skills of a core of educators committed to the concept.

At the institutional or micro level, the NISTEP staff was given complete freedom to exercise its professional creativity in establishing different programmes of teacher education for different

target groups, and in shaping suitable administrative structures that enabled these programmes to be implemented. NISTEP leaders, and many of the staff, were committed to the programme and were willing to devote much effort to solving its problems and making it work. The staff knew that it could always rely on government support and also on the assistance of university personnel who had traditionally been linked with the Grenada Teachers' College. The fact that this link was maintained in spite of difficult relations at times was important in helping the staff to find a way through some of the knotty professional problems of NISTEP. One member of the University team which assisted NISTEP from time to time saw the team's role in this way (though it is doubtful that most of the NISTEP staff would have accorded it such importance): "The U.W.I. School of Education undertook to give sterling service at the planning stage, also at the implementation stage. Through frequent visits and the conduct of workshops and discussions, U.W.I.'s School of Education saved NISTEP from floundering and sinking before it started. The School of Education offered suggestions and criticisms in the Education, Language Arts and Mathematics programmes; also in the delivery of the package. A strategy for teaching and supervision was prepared in workshop sessions" (Gabriel, 1984).

NISTEP, to use an analogy, can be regarded as 'a plane that first starts its engine and begins rolling', while the support of the PRG, together with advice from university personnel, can be seen as the 'runway' that supports the plane "until it accumulates enough momentum to take off, to continue in motion on its own, generating the forces that carry it to higher altitudes and greater speeds" (Smith and Keith, 1971: 85).

Chapter 4

Collective Administration and
Role Integration in NISTEP

It was suggested earlier that the main factor contributing to the survival of NISTEP was its collaborative administration. This consisted of a full-scale staff meeting which usually met weekly to discuss problems and plan policy, three administrators who shared day to day coordination of the programme, a variety of organisational subcommittees, and a system of curriculum panels. This chapter will explore the importance of these administrative forms of NISTEP in helping participants to overcome its major problems and achieve its intended aims. To consider the role of staff collaboration and participative decision making in accounting for the implanting of an educational innovation, reference will be made to selected studies of such innovations which may throw some light on the question.

The Development of Collective
Administration

The revolutionary government prepared the ground for a completely new type of administration in teacher training when it took the drastic, and in some quarters unpopular, decision to close down the Grenada Teachers' College and replace it with what was called a 'Programme'. This word carried the connotation of an experimental approach that could be modified or changed if necessary.

The closure of the College meant doing away with its posts of Principal, Vice-Principal and lecturers, and with them the traditional, hierarchical division of labour. The former College staff of 7, including the Principal and Vice-Principal, was now put on a par with the 8 new lecturers recruited to initiate the in-service programme. The newly-appointed Coordinator (never called 'Principal') was charged by the Revolution's political leaders to work collectively and democratically with the new NISTEP staff to put the flesh of a workable programme on the skeleton of the structure brought into being by the 'year of talk' and planning. From the outset, therefore, the basis was laid for a type of administration along the lines of what Carver and Sergiovanni (1973) call the 'Human Resources' model, in which

leaders treat their staff as creative problem solvers, giving it collective responsibility for important rather than only routine decisions, relying on it for real decision making rather than merely for cooperation with decisions already made by superiors.

NISTEP's new administrative structure was at first very sketchy and tentative. There was a Coordinator and her staff of 15 who met each week in a full staff meeting to work out the details of the new teacher training programme which it was at the same time operating. As the first Coordinator put it in her recollections of this process, "The first year was taken up with planning and implementation all at the same time" (Baptiste, 1984). By the mid-point of Year 2, a completely new and very complex administrative system had been established and was being operated by the NISTEP staff.

The old administrative hierarchy of the Grenada Teachers' College could be represented as a line of vertical decision making from administration to staff to students. In contrast, the new NISTEP administrative structure encouraged horizontal, collaborative processes of decision making as is suggested in Table 1 below. By collaborative, it

is meant that the entire staff operated or had direct input into each level of administration (organisational leadership and technical management). By horizontal, it is meant that the decisions made at each level were first discussed between levels rather than being handed down from one level to the next.

Table 1

The Administrative Structure of NISTEP

	ENTIRE NISTEP STAFF	NISTEP COUNCIL	
POLICY AND LEADERSHIP	All structures were established, all major decisions made, by the staff in weekly Staff Meetings and supplementary meetings.	Elected representatives of students and staff, advised on policy and discussed practice.	
	OVERALL COORDINATOR	PEDAGOGICAL COORDINATOR	ADMINISTRATIVE COORDINATOR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Coordination of all components . Relations with Minister of Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Curriculum panels . Examinations . Timetable . Teaching . Subject liaison with University 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Student affairs . Records . Accounts . Salaries . Physical plant
COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITIES OF 3 COORDINATORS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Preparing information and agenda for weekly Staff Meeting. . Making up and implementing Budget. 		

The evolution of this administrative structure was slow and sometimes painful because it was the result of trial and error. The main forum in which structures and responsibilities were worked out, often in response to difficulties that arose, was the NISTEP Staff Meeting, held every Monday morning for three to four hours. As problems cropped up in the day to day operations of the programme, as lecturers raised their professional and personal concerns, as the Ministry of Education made requests for advice or action, the Staff Meeting confronted the issue and argued it through until, either by consensus or (less frequently) majority vote, an adequate decision was reached. By means of this process, augmented occasionally by extra meetings or by a weekend or week-long retreat, the NISTEP staff worked out, established and directed the technical and operational tasks shown in Table 1 above. At the same time, the Staff Meeting was informed and guided by the work and advice of the panels, committees and their coordinators. This two-way process also took place between the Staff Meeting and the NISTEP Council, which was a body established in Year 2 by the staff in order to have trainees share in the drawing up of a Code that set out rules of conduct, rights and responsibilities of all members of NISTEP. The Council, comprising elected representatives of staff, students and the Ministry of Education,

of Education, organised a meeting once or twice a term of the entire body of students and staff to have them discuss with each other their concerns and make suggestions relating to the programme.

The Staff Meeting established not only management structures but also fundamental operational procedures that needed to be agreed to by the whole staff. Amongst these were specifications for contact hours for each of the target groups, assessment methods, rules and deadlines for exams and assignments. Additionally, the Staff Meeting was a forum for discussing wider educational issues and problems which had an important bearing on teacher training, such as the extent of stratification in the education system or the wide acceptance of harsh physical punishment in schools (1). Many of these could not be immediately tackled in spite of the more liberal views of the new era, and were put on 'hold' by the NISTEP staff for further thought and deliberation in the future.

The replacement of the single Coordinator by three Coordinators was agreed to by the NISTEP Staff Meeting at the end of Year 1. This decision was made in response to the crisis of the resignation of the first Coordinator who wished to return to her substantive post in the Ministry of Education. She recollects that "In discussions at Staff

Meetings near the end of the first year ... it emerged that one Coordinator was not enough ... The experience of the first year showed that there was need to separate administration and finance from pedagogy and from student affairs, and, of course, all of these had to be coordinated... From these discussions, the three-administrator structure emerged" (Baptiste, 1984). The initial idea of tripartite leadership came from educational experiments in Mozambique via a British lecturer in NISTEP who had taught there, and who was asked by the Grenadian Minister of Education to accept the post of the programme's new Coordinator. Reluctant at first to accept this responsibility, he proposed "an administrative coordinator, a pedagogical coordinator and a general coordinator who had final responsibility. I had seen this working very well in Mozambique and argued that we should democratise (NISTEP's) administration further as a model for procedures in the rest of the programme. The proposal was ... discussed in the General Staff Meeting. Most thought it was a good idea and (the meeting) discussed how it could work in NISTEP. So that started in September, 1981, NISTEP's second year, and after that, staff discussions brought about the NISTEP Council and some of the other structures the programme needed" (Simons, 1984).

The establishment of the new system of tripartite leadership illustrates the role of the NISTEP Staff Meeting in discussing major issues and coming to important decisions. The three administrators were finally appointed by the Ministry of Education, but the new system had been suggested by a staff member and discussed by the Staff Meeting before its adoption was agreed to.

Special talents were carefully matched to the new posts. As the first Coordinator put it, "By the end of the first year we were able to assess who was good at what. Edwin was very good in pedagogy; Frank was good at coordination - he had been energetically running NISTEP in Carriacou. Edwin was asked to lead Pedagogy and Frank was asked to be the overall Coordinator. They wanted me to keep responsibility for administration, but I preferred to leave and return to my work in the Ministry of Education. Monica was asked to take on the administration post. She was a qualified and experienced teacher who had come up through the system. She had taught for years, was trained at the Grenada Teachers' College, and was Principal of a Primary school. She was able to keep in close touch with the NISTEP student teachers and understood their problems" (Baptiste, 1984). The recollections of the second Coordinator, Frank, reaffirmed these observations: "Edwin's special

talents were right for the job of Pedagogical Coordinator. His teaching methods were outstanding, and so was his ability to relate well to other people. Monica was an excellent choice for Administrative Coordinator for she knew all the teachers through her work in the Grenada Union of Teachers and talked with them regularly. She knew, inside-out, the infrastructure of the school system and of the Ministry of Education. So, what I would have needed to spend a day doing, she did in an hour!" (Simons, 1984).

The Integration of Roles

The operations of the three administrators illustrated also the integration of roles in NISTEP as they combined the tasks of lecturing and supervising teaching practice with their administrative tasks. They were responsible, administratively, for preparing the basic agenda items for the weekly Staff Meeting; for day-to-day supervision and coordination of the technical management structures set out in Table 1; and for maintaining the communication flow between NISTEP and other educational bodies and community groups. They met regularly with each other to coordinate these tasks (DeCoteau, 1984). At the same time, Frank, the overall Coordinator, lectured in Language Arts; Edwin, the Pedagogical Coordinator,

lectured in Education and chaired the Education and the Teacher-Partner panels; and both supervised teaching practice in the schools. Monica, the Administrative Coordinator, also supervised teaching practice and regularly sat in on the meetings of each of the Curriculum Panels. Her knowledge of curricula, timetables and conditions in the Primary school system was valuable to these panels.

The collective planning and collaborative task approach was repeated in each specialized aspect of technical management. It was particularly strong in the panels and committees which carried out pedagogical responsibilities, such as planning the curriculum and examinations, marking, supervising student research projects, coordinating teaching practice, implementing the special courses for the 'Induction' students and the older 'Special Year' trainees, and other tasks which were assigned by the Staff Meeting. Again, the implementing structure of each panel had clearly defined responsibilities.

This is not to say that things always happened as planned. Mistakes were often made, confusion sometimes occurred, and conflicts did arise, especially in some of the Curriculum Panels, as individuals shaped by a different system tried to

operate in their new roles. For example, in some of the Curriculum Panels, collective planning of the syllabus and teaching materials did not go smoothly at first. Some lecturers deviated from the agreed syllabus, assuming that it was merely a guide which they could alter as they were accustomed to doing. Sometimes the Chairperson did not know how to coordinate the contributions of panel members to the curriculum, and would try to push through his or her own ideas. It caused offence amongst panel members when their proposals were not accepted. Conflicts and difficulties of this kind will be discussed in Chapter 5.

However, the existence of the framework of collegial structures and staff members' increasing familiarity with using them for collaborative problem solving, combined to ensure that the major areas of confusion and difficulty could be overcome. By Year 3, the organisational components of NISTEP, as illustrated in Table 2, were operating with enough smoothness to carry out the basic aims of the programme, and regular routines of work and interaction had been established for the student groups and other related bodies shown in Table 3.

Table 2

Organisational Components of NISTEP

ACADEMIC - ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF:						
General Staff Meeting						
3 Lecturer-Coordiators						
<u>Curriculum Panels</u>						
Language Arts	Education	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	Agricultural Science	Health Education

Language Materials Workshop		Maths Workshop	Science Workshop			
<u>Organisational Panels</u>						
Academic Panel	Teacher-Partner Panel	Special Year Panel	Individual Studies Panel	Sub-Committees on Emulation, Discipline etc		
NISTEP Council (staff and student representatives)						
CLERICAL STAFF:						
Typists						

Materials Production Unit						

Table 3

Groups Involved in NISTEP

STUDENTS	OTHER RELATED BODIES
Mainstream: 3 Centres (St. George's, St. Andrews, Carriacou)	NISTEP Pre-primary Teacher-Partners in schools
Maintenance: 1 Centre (St. George's)	Schools in which trainees taught
Special Year: 1 Centre (St. George's)	CSDP Worker Education meetings
Induction: 4 Centres	Ministry of Education National Curriculum Unit
Student Council	UWI School of Education Politicians Visitors Population

Some Barriers to Innovation:

A Comparative Framework

In the literature on the role of decision making in educational organisations, there seems to be widespread agreement that horizontal and collegial structures facilitating participative decision making are more likely to bring about willing commitment of the participants to policies, programmes and institutions than are vertical or hierarchical structures characterized by authoritarian decision making (2). There are several research studies that illustrate this in Jamaican schools (Persaud, 1976; Bell, 1978; Feurtado, 1979), but I know of no observational case studies that explore, in a Caribbean context, how a particular style of decision making or other factors contribute to the success or failure of educational innovations. Two North American ethnographic case studies of Primary school experiments in establishing innovations are useful in their analysis of some of the major factors contributing to the failure and eventual abandonment of these innovations, for these imply the factors that may be necessary for success.

Smith and Keith (1971) carried out a participant observation study for one year of the Kensington

Elementary School, a new public school whose entire programme was an innovation. Kensington sought to exemplify some important ideas of progressive education, including team teaching, multi-age groups and combining individualized with group instruction. These methods aimed to bring about capacities of self-direction in the pupils. After a year of experimenting with such organisational forms, the innovative Kensington programme was abandoned as a result of pressures from the community and school district authorities. It was replaced with a traditional, conservative programme. Many dilemmas had developed in the school's attempt at a new style of democratic administration and teaching. The following dilemmas discussed by Smith and Keith may throw light on NISTEP's experiences:

1. In the school's attempt to develop an 'upside-down' authority structure in which decisions and authority were supposed to flow from the staff to the administration, difficulties arose which were not solved. Internal leadership roles, including that of the Principal, were ambiguous and never formalized. This led to confusion, uncertainty and conflict. When arbitrary decisions were made, there were no norms or rules to protect individuals from them.

2. The Principal tended to prefer to push 'pervasive' rather than 'gradualist' change, whereas it may be best for the leader to take the gradualist strategy early in the life of the innovation to ensure survival. The pervasive scale of change at Kensington may have placed it too far ahead of its social base, the school district, whose 'old guard' was not persuaded of the value of the change.
3. Kensington lacked adequate human resources. Its unique programmes needed extra staff, but instead it had limited resources, including a predominance of young and inexperienced staff, for creating organisational structures and processes.
4. Because of lack of experience, there were many difficulties in carrying out team teaching, and this sometimes led to conflict. The teams were collegial in structure, so help tended to be informal (one friend would help another) but was not guaranteed: no structured, vertical use was made of the few, more experienced teachers.

... 85.
... 5.

5. Kensington's staff showed the high idealism and enthusiasm of crusaders and gave extraordinary expenditures of time, effort, creativity and loyalty. Work beyond the call of duty was the norm as the staff tried to carry out tasks which involved time and specialized personnel far beyond what is normally available to a school, despite inadequate resources. Such tasks would be deemed unrealistic by non-crusaders, and the over-aggrandisement of many of the teachers led to problems of anxiety, personal debilitation or illness. Some even withdrew from the programme, especially when it ran into problems.

Another team of ethnographic researchers in the USA, Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein (1975) investigated, through participant observation and interviews, a primary school innovation which was similar to the Kensington one in that it tried to implement a new role for teachers as facilitators of pupil-centred, largely self-directed learning in the children. Over a period of seven months, the researchers observed that the teachers, in spite of having initially very positive attitudes about the innovation, continued to behave mainly in their traditional, didactic role. Finding change difficult, they were devoting little time to trying

to implement the innovation. The small extent of their attempts to innovate did not conform to the school's expectation of change. Again, the experiment was abandoned within the year. The researchers suggest that the failure of this innovation cannot be conceptualized in the traditional terms of people's resistance to change as most of the teachers wanted the change. Rather, it was a consequence of organisational barriers to the teachers' implementation of the innovation. Their identification of these barriers may be useful in a consideration of how NISTEP coped with its problems in these areas.

The researchers observed, and confirmed by interview, that the teachers did not have a clear image of what was expected of them. Most teachers said that when they tried to carry out the new role, such great problems arose that they could not cope with the children. They lacked the preparation, skills and knowledge to perform the required new tasks. The new model of pupil-centred learning depended on a much greater variety and richness of classroom materials, but these were never made available to the teachers. Nor were the old administrative and operational arrangements changed. For example, the old, rigid timetable remained instead of being replaced with flexible

scheduling, and the old evaluation system of grades for subjects was not replaced with new assessment techniques for the children's operational competencies.

These problems stemmed from severe inadequacy in the school director's change strategy. The key weakness seemed to be that it lacked adequate communication and feedback mechanisms; frank discussions never occurred. Hence the teachers' lack of clarity about their role, their lack of opportunity to air their problems, and the lack of planning for problem solving. Over time, increasing resistance to the continuation of the innovation developed among teachers who were at first positively disposed to change, because of the frustrations they encountered in attempting to implement it.

The innovative in-service approach of NISTEP succeeded in being implanted whereas these experimental Primary school innovations in the USA did not. However, the insights developed by the US case researchers as they observed the sequences and factors leading to the abandonment of the innovations will assist in an analysis of the features of the NISTEP innovations that led it to survive rather than collapse, in spite of the fact

that it had arguably as many problems as occurred in the US experiments.

In the case of the two US schools, it became clear to the researchers that there was an inadequate relationship between the bulk of the staff, the structures of organisational leadership responsible for policy direction and task coordination, and those of technical management responsible for tasks such as the preparation of new syllabi and timetables. In both schools unclear lines of authority and unclear communications led to misunderstandings, confusion and resentment. This eventually meant that the impetus for sustaining the innovations throughout all their difficulties was lost.

In NISTEP, on the other hand, an extremely unusual relationship was worked out between staff, organisational leadership and technical management, in which all three overlapped and integrated. Through the general staff meeting, all teaching staff shared in policy making. In addition, most had at least one specific administrative responsibility, such as that of convening a subcommittee or leading a materials production workshop. Several added to these roles wider responsibilities for technical and organisational

management, such as those of coordinator or panel chairperson. A free flow of communication resulted from this overlapping of roles.

Moreover, because individuals constantly shifted between roles, questions of status became unimportant. This, in my view, helped to lessen potential division. For example, an Overall Coordinator who was also a Curriculum Panel chairperson would frequently get on the bus with other lecturers and travel out to a country school where they supervised student teachers together. The same Coordinator worked under the leadership of the chairperson of another Curriculum Panel. Yet, lines of authority were clear because responsibilities were specifically stated, usually during the Staff Meeting, so that everyone knew who was to carry out particular tasks and when. In these ways, the system of role integration and overlapping enabled the staff to arrive at a modus operandi that succeeded in implementing the essential tasks of change.

Organising the technical management of NISTEP in the way that has been described combined specialization of tasks, collective decision making, and coordination. The panels were participative enough to allow for creativity and

group work, specialized enough to allow for the implementation of the separate aspects of a complex, multi-faceted programme, and coordinated enough to allow for high interaction between groups and an efficient deployment of scarce human and material resources. The fact that the staff engaged both in these technical tasks and in a long, weekly staff meeting meant that one area informed the other, which enhanced the communication flow. The interactive style of the Staff Meeting (to be discussed in Chapter 5) helped, in my view, to develop in staff members a sense of identity with NISTEP. The importance of the problems that were tackled in the Staff Meeting and the measure of success in most of the solutions worked out led to a growing confidence in the usefulness of this 'upside-down authority structure' of organisational leadership. I would like to argue that it was these characteristics of NISTEP, particularly its integration of organisational leadership and technical management and its processes of interaction, which enabled the innovation to become implanted, in contrast to the fate of the two school system innovations described above.

Smith and Keith (1971) suggest that new institutions have to develop an institutional core, namely a staff whose identity and cohesiveness are sufficiently strong to motivate members to learn new roles, formalize new procedures, and carry out the work assigned them. They observed that the Kensington staff did develop identity, in that it internalized and identified with the school's mandate for a new, learner-centred system of education. But the teachers did not develop sufficient cohesiveness and unity; they did not reach agreement on how the mandate was to be carried out. An important symptom of this lack of unity was that clarity was never developed about such important administrative patterns as the role of the Principal or of team-teaching leaders. Some confusion and conflict resulted, and teachers ended up teaching according to the style they were individually most comfortable with (for example, some used didactic teaching and did not cooperate with team attempts, while others tried to make team teaching work). In the case of the school described by Gross et al (1975), which had basically similar aims of establishing a more discovery-oriented, child-centred curriculum, the teachers developed even less clarity and cohesiveness because unsuitable administrative structures did not encourage this and left

organisational barriers in the way of the new curriculum.

NISTEP, on the other hand, developed a viable institutional core. The staff had enough cohesiveness to reach agreement, after considerable trial and error, on key issues such as administrative structures and roles and teaching tasks, and enough unity to carry out these roles and tasks. Through the Curriculum Panels, lecturers in each subject area, in spite of the different backgrounds, standardised the syllabus, curriculum materials and assessment system, and reached a measure of agreement about teaching styles. Other panels ensured the coordination of the variety of other tasks set out in Tables 1 and 2. In the Staff Meeting, clarity developed about administrative patterns and roles. There was enough confidence to change them when needed, as in the case of the single Coordinator being replaced by three. The Staff Meeting contributed to interaction, cooperation and the development of identity and commitment, which, in turn, brought about sufficient motivation for an unusually demanding level of work.

It is therefore appropriate at this point to consider in more detail both the Staff Meeting and the curriculum process. The next chapter will explore the interactive style of the Staff Meeting and the range and outcome of some of its work, and will finally look briefly at the curriculum process in order to raise some issues concerning the experiments in team teaching that took place.

Chapter 5

Interaction and Task Implementation:An Insider's View

An analysis of the Staff Meetings in NISTEP's second and third years shows that the matters dealt with fall into four general categories: the evolution of organisational structure; a consideration of curriculum issues and the practicum; some problems of the Primary school environment; and some of the personal concerns of the staff.

The evolution of organisational structure was discussed previously. This chapter will consider the remaining categories, examining how they were dealt with in the interactive style of the Staff Meeting. It will also discuss the experimental procedures of team teaching shaped by the Curriculum Panels. Use will be made of the verbatim notes which I took on the proceedings of the weekly meetings, as well as of official minutes where they existed. This internal view, available only to a participant, will flesh out aspects of the work and style of the NISTEP Staff Meeting already described.

The Interactive Style of the NISTEP Staff Meeting

From the insider's perspective which I gained from being a NISTEP staff member during its second and third year, it soon struck me that the weekly Staff Meeting was acting as the decision making heart of the institution. The meeting dealt with an unusually wide range and scope of matters. The style of interaction between staff members was characterised by a combination of informality, frankness and concentration. These and other features of the Staff Meeting became clearer as I took notes, participated in and reflected on the process.

The informal, frank, conversational atmosphere encouraged participation. It gave rise to the feeling, even for newcomers, that no one needed to be hesitant about asking questions, relating an experience in the field, expressing an opinion, or bringing up a problem that needed to be addressed, even if it was not on the agenda. This is not to say that everyone participated to the same level; as in all meetings, some people were much quieter and less forthcoming than others. But in the lively, often anecdotal exchanges, most people seemed to be mentally grappling with whatever problem was under review. There was a feeling that we were all in the same boat, working in crisis

conditions together. Each person's problem in teaching, supervising or marking was a collective problem capable of some measure of group solution.

There was an atmosphere of complete equality between the coordinators and other staff members. One of the three coordinators would always chair the meeting and guide the discussion, but because of the high degree of group decision making, it was clear that the coordinators were not a superior administrative hierarchy whose opinions and decisions carried disproportionate weight. They were simply our colleagues, lecturers as we all were, of the same 25 - 40 age group of the majority, struggling with the development of their teaching and administrative skills as we all were. There was a keen awareness of the extra workload that each of the coordinators had, and perhaps an extra willingness among some staff members to assist them by taking on additional duties.

The flexible style of the discussion, combined with the three or four hour length of the meeting, gave participants time for thinking through problems. Sometimes the problem would be left for a while and the discussion would centre on another matter which may or may not have been part of the prepared agenda. By the time the coordinator brought the meeting's attention back to the original problem,

someone would usually have thought of a workable solution and would put this forward for the meeting to consider. If it seemed feasible, the meeting would adopt it and instruct the relevant technical management structure to take it to the next stage. It was accepted that some solutions would be temporary, and that others needed to be delayed as long as circumstances allowed. Some matters, because of their very complex nature, were discussed again and again and took a long time to be worked out; for example, it required many Staff Meetings, over several months, plus consultations with university staff in a week-long planning retreat, to standardise certification requirements and to develop the structure for the preparation and examination of the 'Maintenance' group.

From time to time, the Staff Meeting brought to the surface problems of personal interaction which seemed less capable of solution than the educational ones. However, by the very fact that they were expressed, listened to, and followed up, if possible, they perhaps caused less simmering resentment and discontent than can be the case in a traditional educational institution where personal hurts and frustrations have little or no outlet. This alleviated at least some of the underlying tension left by the PRG's abolition of all previous posts in the Grenada Teachers' College which

caused, in some sense, a demotion either in position or in area of responsibility for all of the seven staff involved. It brought into the open problems such as that of the anxiety of some of the overseas staff members that there were instances of anti-foreign hostility against them in the society. Usually there was a feature of the meeting that would tend to allay or smooth over the difficulty. This was sometimes the skill of the coordinator as chairperson, the sympathy or support expressed by other members of the meeting, or simply the sense that there were so many other pressing operational problems to tackle and reach agreement on before we went out into the schools to supervise trainees the next day or the next week.

On one occasion, a lecturer whose opinion was disagreed with expressed the feeling of being 'disliked' by the rest of the staff. The Overall Coordinator immediately asked this person to have a talk with her after the meeting. This enabled her not only to alleviate the concerns expressed but also to become aware of a weakness in one of the administrative structures which had been contributing to these concerns. When this weakness was later discussed in the Staff Meeting, an alternative arrangement was worked out.

A heated debate about whether there was anti-foreign hostility in certain remarks and actions in the society occupied about twenty minutes of another Staff Meeting. This was one of the discussions that was not taken any further because more pressing tasks had to be dealt with. However, in my view, the airing of the problem helped increase the level of advice and assistance given by local to overseas staff members in their carrying out of certain tasks.

The tension left by the loss of status of some staff members was perhaps a more difficult problem. It was alleviated only to a small extent by the allocation of new responsibilities to those whose previous positions of authority were displaced. Apparently, some bitter feelings about the new programme continued to be harboured and were expressed after the revolution collapsed.

Although some problems were not solved, the interactive and non-authoritarian style of the Staff Meeting played an important part in facilitating open communication and feedback. All important matters came before the meeting. It was clear that everyone's views and observations were of value, seriously considered by the meeting before being accepted, modified or rejected by a process of consensus. At each meeting, something

tangible and worthwhile was accomplished. All of this contributed to the clarity, motivation and high morale necessary for a sustained process of confronting and solving problems.

In my experience, the intense process of working together in several areas meant that lecturers more quickly developed friendships and more readily got to know each other's views, style and idiosyncrasies than is sometimes the case at traditional educational institutions. The participation encouraged by the Staff Meeting and other collective structures led people to appreciate how the ideas and experiences of individuals contributed to the problem solving process. This enabled the staff to overcome what Smith and Keith (1971: 131) describe as the hurdle of 'social relations among strangers' faced by new organisations in which relations of trust are much more precarious ... than in old organisations. In NISTEP, because of the interactive style which pervaded all of the structures, the staff was relatively quickly able to establish relations of trust.

Salient Matters Discussed in the Staff Meeting

1. The Grouping of Trainees in Non-Specialist
Classes

During Year 1, the trainees, despite their different entrance levels, had been taught in randomly selected class groupings. At the beginning of Year 2, the Staff Meeting discussed whether the trainees should be regrouped to be trained as specialists in the teaching of a particular age group of children, or regrouped according to their performance levels as revealed by the Year 1 exams. Some argued that training could be made much more efficient and relevant if students were grouped for specialization as infant teachers for the 4 - 6 age group, general primary teachers for children aged 7 - 11, and junior secondary teachers for adolescents. Others argued that their training should give them enough flexibility to teach any primary group, especially as it was a common practice for schools to transfer teachers from one age group to another. It was pointed out that NISTEP had only one lecturer whose specialization was in infant teaching. The meeting eventually decided to continue the generalist grouping of trainees and to put those who had failed the first year exams into an 'upgrading' class which would give them extra tuition for re-

sitting the exams and re-entering the general groups. During vacation classes, trainees would be regrouped for specialist, grade-level training (Notes, Staff Meeting, September 24, 1981). The decision to offer specialist training in the vacation classes was not, however, implemented as it was found too difficult to regroup the trainees and find sufficient early childhood lecturers for those who wanted this training (Notes, Staff Meeting, July 4, 1983).

2. The NISTEP Timetable

At the beginning of each year the Staff Meeting worked out an overall weekly timetable, assigning days, contact hours and staff to the various target groups (Notes, Staff Meeting, September, 1981; October 19, 1981; September 13, 1982; October 12, 1982; October 18, 1982; November 1, 1982). Further details of staff allocation (assigning lecturers to each training centre) were worked out by the Curriculum Panels.

The Staff Meeting also established general timetable guidelines for the eight weeks per year of vacation classes, agreeing on contact hours per day for each subject, and deciding that the

subject-divided day would be easier to implement than allocating a day to each subject (Notes, Staff Meeting, September 24, 1981).

3. NISTEP in Carriacou

There were about 40 NISTEP trainees from Carriacou and Petit Martinique, Grenada's 'sister islands' which, though in theory an equivalent part of the nation, had long been neglected by previous governments (Searle, ed., 1982). Because of the shortage of tutors, money and teaching materials, especially library books, it was found particularly difficult to service NISTEP's weekly classes in Carriacou, and the Staff Meeting regularly had to make decisions of 'crisis management' about it. Only one NISTEP lecturer lived in Carriacou. Airfares had to be obtained from the Ministry of Education to fly additional lecturers over, as well as money to pay for the trainees from Petit Martinique to travel to Carriacou by boat. Since there was a shortage of staff in Grenada, it was always difficult to decide who should teach in Carriacou at a particular time and how the Grenada timetable was to be rearranged to cover for the absence of that person for a few days (Notes, Staff Meeting, October 18, 1982; December 10, 1982; December 17, 1982; January 17, 1983; January 24, 1983). In this extract from a Staff Meeting at the

beginning of Year 3, one of the coordinators gave this report on the Carriacou situation:

"It isn't possible to start our classes in Carriacou now because of the shortage of staff. There is only one staff member, Cde. Belaire, for Social Studies, but none for Science or Health Education, and the tutor for Agricultural Science is away from the island. So it was decided to postpone the opening ceremony. Cde. McQuade has gone over to help Cde. Belair with supervision of teaching practice and of individual studies.

If we could possibly enlarge the Science panel, perhaps one solution would be to ask a Science tutor to go to Carriacou on Thursdays to assist with supervision and stay to teach Science and Health Education on Fridays. An attempt is being made to get a suitably qualified person from abroad as a search has shown that there is no one in Grenada. But this has not been tied up yet."
(Notes, Staff Meeting, October 18, 1982).

In spite of NISTEP's difficulties in Carriacou, the trainees there showed a high level of initiative and of application to their coursework assignments, and most of them achieved high grades. For this, they were often commended by staff members.

4. Exam Management

The Staff Meeting worked out uniform marking procedures, including a control system of sample marking, for examination papers and individual research studies. It discussed and agreed on matters such as the 60/40% weighting for examinations and coursework, and the system of setting supplementary exams to provide two chances of resit for trainees who failed an exam at the first sitting. It set up an Academic Panel to codify these and other regulations in an Examination Code, and delegated to an Examination Committee the responsibility of drawing up exam timetables and deadlines for marking papers, and of coordinating the management of the regional exams for the 'Maintenance' group. All decisions on these matters were reported back to the Staff Meeting which could then make any necessary modifications (Notes, Staff Meeting, July 5, 1982; September 13, 1982; September 27, 1982; October 12, 1982; July 4, 1983).

This examination system which ran smoothly in Years 2 and 3 was the result of a great deal of thought and discussion at many Staff Meetings after the trial-and-error implementation of the exams in Year 1. The Year 1 exams seem to have been uncoordinated and somewhat chaotic, as is suggested

by this extract from the two-day Staff Meeting held on September 24 and 25 to prepare for Year 2.

- What should we do about the kinds of problems that cropped up in the Year 1 exams? A student of mine in his paper wrote quotes from class handouts of up to 18 lines long. How do we stop that kind of cheating?

- We need to follow stricter exam procedures. When the trainees come into exams, they must have nothing but pens with them. They must sit in alphabetical order so that friends are separated.

- We really did nothing to create an exam atmosphere. Students chatted throughout the exam, and when I reprimanded them they just chatted more. They took this thing as a joke.

- We need to start organising the exams about three months before they start. Let's give them exam numbers and use more rooms so that we can separate their desks.

- Another thing was that there were not enough invigilators, and the papers were not all distributed at the same time. When I told them to stop writing, they just carried on.

- But that may have been a problem of lack of exam organisation. The students writing the Education exam did not display undisciplined behaviour to that extent.

- I think there were more invigilators in that exam. We only had two invigilators although six were supposed to come.

- Remember that we, the tutors, have to take some of the blame. Some of us were late in rolling off exam papers, and there were many typing errors in the papers which we had to get the students to correct before the exam, thus delaying it and setting a poor tone.

- In the centre where I was invigilating, poor organisation wasn't so much the problem. The main problem was that I wasn't told what policy NISTEP had, if any, about cheating. I caught two students passing pieces of paper to each other and confiscated the pieces of paper they were passing. But I didn't know what to do to discipline them - whether they were to be thrown out or what. I had to just do what I thought best, which was to take away the answers they were passing to each other. But the students were angry with me for doing that!

- We need to type up and circulate a set of exam regulations long before the exams. Perhaps we should set up an Academic Panel to draw these up.

- Perhaps we could set trainees some assignments during the year which they have to do under exam conditions.

- Those are good ideas that I think we should follow up ...

- One of the weaknesses I found was that at no time did we spell out to the students exactly what was expected of them. We need to say to them at the beginning of the year: You are expected to pass, say, four exams; there are these consequences if you fail; there are these penalties for lateness and absence; subject assignments are due at such and such a time and constitute a percentage of your final grade. For us as tutors, this has to mean that we don't have three panels setting them assignments at the same time.

- This was the intention originally; that panels would stagger assignments. I don't know what happened to that - it got thrown to the winds.

- We need to put in print that people missing exams must have a medical certificate or a valid

excuse. And it's very important for us to give regular assignments because this is what gives students practice in organising their thoughts.

- The Ministry of Education will have to help us in disciplining those students who are giving problems, imposing sanctions if necessary ...

(Notes, Staff Meeting, September 24, 1981)

After this discussion, the Staff Meeting directed the Academic Panel to draw up a Code of Regulations to systematize examination procedure. The Code drawn up was accepted by the Staff Meeting, and it was decided that the following organisational arrangements should be implemented for the Year 2 exams:

- (i) that more invigilators would be allocated to each exam room than in the Year 1 exams;
- (ii) that the invigilators would be the tutors in the subject being examined;
- (iii) that extra desks would be borrowed from the neighbouring school;
- (iv) that exam papers would be laid out on the desks and no candidate allowed into the room until starting time;

- (v) that candidates should be prepared with the Examination Code and would be assigned cards with their examination numbers;
- (vi) that panels would have to meet deadlines for preparing and proof-reading examination papers.

(Notes, Staff Meeting, July 5, 1982)

5. Administrative Tasks Recognised but Inadequately Implemented

As regards outcomes, the areas of greatest weakness for the NISTEP Staff Meeting included programme evaluation, staff development, forward planning for future phases of NISTEP, and liaison with the Community School Day Programme (CSDP). These areas, though recognised as important, were relatively neglected because of the small size of the staff compared to the scale of its task. Teaching, supervision, timetabling and examination management so dominated the time and attention of the whole staff that other tasks which the Staff Meeting saw as desirable, and recommended structures for, were simply not followed up. For example, during Year 2, the staff agreed to devote a specified amount of time out of selected Staff Meetings to staff development sessions in which each Curriculum Panel would conduct a workshop or

seminar to familiarise the others with school syllabi and desired teaching methodology in the particular subject. This would have greatly assisted the staff to carry out better supervision of teaching practice in subject areas outside of their specialization. But in the three brief attempts to hold the seminars, more questions were raised than there was time to deal with, and subsequently other administrative matters became so pressing that the sessions were abandoned.

Staff members frequently raised the matter of the necessity of course evaluation and more detailed forward planning than had been started by a subcommittee of NISTEP lecturers at the end of Year 2 (Minutes, Staff Meeting, December 17, 1982; February 3, 1983). At the mid-point of Year 3, the Staff Meeting was asked by the Ministry of Education to institute internal structures to carry out its own evaluation of NISTEP, as well as assist external evaluators (the Grenada Union of Teachers and an independent scholar) to carry out a separate evaluation of the programme (Minutes, Staff Meeting, January 10, 1983). Nothing came of this, not least because the staff at that point was almost overwhelmed with the curriculum and supervisory demands of the third and final year of Phase 1 of NISTEP.

The NISTEP staff was constantly called upon by the Education Ministry to assist with educational planning and development throughout the school system; for example, the Staff Meeting was asked to help draw up a 20 year plan for comprehensive teacher training (Minutes, Staff Meeting, April 25, 1983), establish a Child Care and Protection Unit, implement a plan for a Young Scientists' Movement and assist in the organisation of more extra-curricular activities in primary schools (Notes, Staff Meeting, May 13, 1983). NISTEP cooperated with these requests when it could by allowing individual staff members time to sit on various committees which were working out these plans. However, this was resented by some tutors who argued that when the Education Ministry took a staff member away for committee meetings and other tasks, it increased the workload on the others.

A close planning liaison between NISTEP and the Community School Day Programme (CSDP) was desired by the staff of both programmes, but time and staff constraints made it impossible for this to be carried out. This extract from a Staff Meeting at the mid-point of Year 2 illustrates the link that the NISTEP tutors wanted to make with the CSDP:

- Shouldn't NISTEP and CSDP be trying to establish a closer relationship with each other?

They're too separate at present. Could we invite CSDP staff to join NISTEP's weekly Staff Meetings?

- Frank has been meeting with the CSDP coordinator on a regular basis to discuss problems, but there has not been much feedback from this.

- What children are doing in CSDP should be closely coordinated with what they're being taught in General Science, Agricultural Science and Social Studies. So the NISTEP curriculum in these subjects and the CSDP activities should be integrally related.

- Maybe our three coordinators could meet once a month with the CSDP staff, and reports of their discussions could be made to the NISTEP and the CSDP meetings. Then a closer integration would develop."

(Notes, Staff Meeting, January 4, 1982)

6. Curriculum Issues and School Structures

Since the details of the NISTEP curriculum were collectively handled by the Curriculum Panels, those curriculum matters which the Staff Meeting discussed touched on broad concerns that crossed subject boundaries and dealt with the context of the existing school environment. In the following

extract from the two-day Staff Meeting of September 24 and 25, 1981, the staff reflected on the issues that had been thrown up by the experience of Year 1 concerning NISTEP's role in laying the basis for a restructuring of the curriculum in Grenadian schools.

- The students' first year exam papers were very revealing. What happened in many cases was that those at the bottom of the class in December still rated 'E' in the exams seven months later. That means they didn't improve. Did our teaching do enough to help them? Did NISTEP have enough of an impact on our primary school system? We have got to be very aware of this. Sometimes, on supervision, I see the same errors being made by student teachers as are made by youngsters in their school leaving exams. It's obvious that these teachers are impressing on the youngsters their own errors, and failing to improve them. We have to try to help them overcome their weak standards.

- The report on Grenadian education done by the Cuban team also pointed out that much more attention needs to be paid to the lower primary levels of training.

- How many people here feel competent to tutor students in infant teaching? ... See? Only Ellen.

I find that whenever I'm faced with questions on infant methodology, I feel absolutely incompetent.

- I don't see how infant and primary school teaching can continue to be so divorced as it is at present. We have to try and lay the basis for a much greater liaison between them.

- I thought the Women's Desk was responsible for infant education?

- No, they have preschool. The classes called 'Infant 1' and 'Infant 2' are the first stage of a child's primary education.

- We should gather together the most competent and experienced infant teachers in the country and ask them to make an input into NISTEP.

- There is a real problem with Maths. People come into NISTEP with a very low level of Maths education. Very few have '0' Level Maths; the rest had dropped it early. With such low levels, it is extremely difficult for them to catch up to the standards of Mathematics at a teacher-education level.

- It's been found, too, that our students in Cuba have so much difficulty with Maths and Science

that a lot of them have to be put in special remedial programmes. One of the areas of Cuba's educational assistance to us is that they will send two experts to help with Maths teaching at the Institute of Further Education.

- But it's at primary level that we most need help with Maths and Science! It's there that the weaknesses start.

- We are fortunate this year to have five staff members who are experienced in curriculum development, Roland, Victor, Amy, Ellen and Robert. Unfortunately, Sister Francine, who started off the process last year, may have to leave us this year as she may be continuing her postgraduate studies abroad. She has left us with a good beginning, but we hope that this year we can take the process much further. I would ask Sister Francine to give us a brief update on where we stand.

- So far we have identified topics for the core curriculum for Grades 1 - 5. We hope to develop material and activities to go with these topics. We want to have a panel in each subject working with the teachers in the schools. As soon as curriculum material is ready for a Grade, it will be sent out to the schools. This material will be based on feedback from the teachers in the schools.

- Are the 11 - 15 year olds in the Junior Secondary and the Senior Primary system going to be left out again in this process of curriculum development? They were left out ten years ago and it would be a pity if they were to be left out again. In the School Leaving exams they make the same mistakes year after year.

- We intend to develop materials for all the Grades right to the Junior section of the High School. We're starting with the first stage, Grades 1 - 5 ...

- I was interested in the question as to whether the Senior Department of a Primary school should be dealt with by itself or together with the Junior Secondary system or with the Junior section of High Schools. Let's not lose sight of that question ... The other question is about the curriculum development team. To my mind, NISTEP is a full-time job - supervising in the field, preparing classes and exams. Would it not be wise to have two people, at least, working full-time on curriculum development, with part-time assistance from other tutors?

- Curriculum development is not an appendage to the education system but the very foundation of the system. At some stage every person in here will be

working in curriculum development because our aim is change. We have to answer the question: are we just going to revise the curriculum or change it totally?

The question of the model is very important, for without it curriculum is just a hit-and-miss process ... Currently educators favour the process model which, in our case, would involve the students, the teachers, the NISTEP tutors and the Ministry. I would like to ask Francine what model you have been using. Is it the behavioural model? That's what it sounds like to me, from what you said. If it is, there could be a lot of disadvantages in it - some categorise it as a non-democratic model.

- But not all educators agree with that. No model in itself is, per se, the model. One fits one situation, another fits a different situation.

- Nobody has answered my question as to whether there will be any full-time curriculum developers.

- Brother Roland, I think, will be full-time in curriculum.

- But what Roland was saying was that everybody will be involved in curriculum development if a democratic model is followed.

- And all the people involved in curriculum would have to start with surveys of the schools to find out what they want.

- It is interesting to hear Brother Victor, echoed by Brother Guillaume, raise the question as to what curricula would be prepared for the upper levels of Primary schools (that is, Grades 7 to 9 of the All Age schools(, the Junior Secondary schools and the Junior section of the High Schools. That seems to indicate the answer to the question I raised yesterday as to how far Grenada's education system is stratified. Sister Carelle replied to me that it isn't as stratified as the system in other territories, especially Jamaica. But right here we seem to be talking about exactly the same three social types of school as there are in Jamaica, the All Age, the Junior Secondary and the High School. This affects the Curriculum Development Panel. Are they to prepare different curricula for those three different school types?

- But what you were suggesting yesterday is that children from a particular social class tend to go to a particular type of school. Here in Grenada you can only get into High School if you pass the Common Entrance. Lots of poor, working-class children, as well as middle-class children, pass the Common Entrance and go to High School.

- Yes, that's the situation too in all of the Caribbean countries which use the Common Entrance. But not one of our territories has yet succeeded in changing the stratified education which the British left us with. It's only a minority of working-class kids, compared to their numbers, who get into High Schools by doing well in the Common Entrance. But have you ever seen a middle-class child in the Senior section of an All-Age school? Or even in a Junior Secondary? Even if they don't pass the Common Entrance, they always get to go to High Schools, the best in the system.

- Yes. As a school Principal and also in my years of teaching experience before that, I have observed that it is mainly middle-class children who pass that Common Entrance exam and go to High School.

- Actually, the Junior Secondary school is simply another type of All-Age school ... Here we have to get Ministerial advice. What is the purpose of the Junior Secondary school? Many of those schools regard themselves as being a place to prepare students for 'O' Levels. They push the students into 'O' Level and the vast majority of them fail. In contrast, at High School the majority pass at least some 'O' Levels.

- Let me ask: are the children who take and pass Common Entrance exams prepared for the work expected of them in High School?

- It depends on what you mean by 'prepared', and also on the children you are looking at.

- Tentatively ... I think that middle-class kids, partly because of their literate and literary home background, are better prepared than rural and urban kids from poorer families for the kind of curricular and extra-curricular activities in High Schools.

- I think these questions are too complex for us to discuss now. The curriculum team has to deal with them.

- But we simply cannot work as a separate curriculum development team. That team must get direction in terms of how this country is going to restructure its still colonial education system. Otherwise, the curriculum developers will be organising the production of material for three different strata of schools, or at least two strata, given that High School teachers generally teach what they individually decide on.

- Guyana informed its curriculum development process by stating its national goals. I think that Grenada must articulate its national goals in order to inform the whole curriculum development process.

The Curriculum Unit in Guyana involves the school teachers a lot in writing materials, and always prints the names of the teachers and of the schools involved. They also publish a lot of the children's work, with names, forms, etc. All this is very encouraging to the participants. There's also a section which develops education material for parents ...

- What are Grenada's national goals? What I keep hearing is that we aim to feed and clothe the people more adequately. If that is all that we have articulated so far, it's not enough to be a basis of educational goals.

- That's misrepresenting the situation. There are a lot of different documents in which national goals have been articulated. The one we should particularly look at is the document drawn up by the teachers at the seminar run by Paulo Friere in March, 1980, which dealt with goals of educational restructuring ...

(Notes, Staff Meeting, September 24 and 25, 1981)

It can be seen that the issues raised in this Staff Meeting were discussed in an exploratory and non-prescriptive way. This is a good illustration of the Staff Meeting's initial approach to the problems of structural change that had to be faced. The important starting point was to identify and delimit the contours of the problem - in this case, that of how the NISTEP staff, as the group of most highly qualified educators in the country, should organise curriculum change in an educational system that had not yet changed structurally, and organise it in such a way as to lead and assist that change.

It took some eighteen months of further Staff Meetings and panel activity, closely integrated with educational work outside of NISTEP, to devise and implement experimental solutions to the problems explored in the two-day NISTEP meeting of September 24 - 25, 1981. By the end of that year, the Ministry of Education, whose representatives had participated in the September meetings, had produced a statement of the basic educational goals of the revolution, and by February, 1982, it had established a more structured national Curriculum Unit led by one of the NISTEP coordinators and involving several NISTEP lecturers on a part-time basis. In the meantime, the Language Arts Panel pioneered a democratic approach to the development of school curriculum materials by operating a

Language Materials Workshop based at NISTEP (see Table 2, p. 80). In this, NISTEP staff worked closely with Primary school teachers in producing the 'Marryshow Readers', a series of Infant Reading Primers that portrayed the everyday life of the majority of Grenadian children, using their Creole language patterns as a basis on which to develop their familiarity with more formal standard English. These Language Curriculum workshops influenced NISTEP's Language Methodology classes for student teachers, and vice versa, and served as a prototype on which to base later curriculum development workshops in other subjects.

The weaknesses in infant education and in Primary Maths and Science, discussed by the September meetings, were tackled by such methods as developing a preschool in-service teacher education programme (NISTEP Pre-Primary) and organising a joint team of Cuban educators and NISTEP lecturers to make a detailed survey of Maths and Science in Primary schools and draw up recommendations for change. By the end of 1982, the Ministry of Education had produced a draft Education Plan, based on the deliberations of many groups of educators nation-wide. This set out the stages by which the Grenadian government intended to do away with the country's stratified educational system and develop an egalitarian and comprehensive one.

Many of these educational developments were carried out by collaborative work between the Ministry of Education and NISTEP staff, for which the starting point was a reflective Staff Meeting such as the one described above.

7. The Practicum

The organisation of the NISTEP Practicum frequently occupied the attention of the Staff Meeting, especially during Year 3 when trainees' grades for practical teaching constituted part of their final overall grade.

During Year 2, the Staff Meeting agreed that the emphasis of the practicum would be less on grading the trainees in practical teaching than on guiding them (Notes, Staff Meeting, January 4, 1982). Each trainee was to be seen by a NISTEP staff member every three weeks, and during the rest of the time, cooperating teachers or teacher-partners in the schools were to guide their teaching practice. Sometimes complaints would be brought to the attention of the Staff Meeting; for example, teacher-partners deplored the fact that they were allocated insufficient time from their regular classroom duties to assist trainees. Others complained that some trainees were adopting a 'know-it-all' attitude when their teaching was

discussed, or teaching a different curriculum from the one prescribed by the school (Notes, Staff Meeting, April 5, 1982). On the other hand, there were occasional complaints from trainees that their teacher-partners rarely assisted them or gave them incorrect advice.

NISTEP coordinators reminded the other lecturers that they should systematically involve school Principals in all matters concerning the supervision of trainees, and that they should offer to hold staff development sessions for the school teachers if the Principal thought this desirable (Notes, Staff Meeting, June 28, 1982).

By Year 3, the emphasis in Staff Meetings was on refining the instrument devised by the University for the assessment of practical teaching (Notes, Staff Meeting, October 18, 1982; November 1, 1982). Practical sessions were held to standardise the marks assigned by different lecturers and teacher-partners to the various attributes of a trainee's lesson (Notes, Staff Meeting, November 7, 1982). Between January and June, 1983, NISTEP lecturers graded each of the trainees assigned to them on ten sessions of practical teaching, and the Staff Meeting instituted a system of cross-assessment of the trainees by two additional lecturers (Notes, Staff Meeting, April 25, 1983; May 29, 1983).

In June, 1983, the 54 trainees who had entered for the regional Teacher's Certificate examinations were assessed in practical teaching by a joint team of lecturers from the University of the West Indies, some NISTEP staff members, and Education Officers from Grenada's Ministry of Education. A control group of twelve trainees was graded by various members of the assessment team independently of each other. Then meetings were held between the assessment team and the rest of the NISTEP staff to discuss the teaching performance of a sample of these students and to moderate their grades.

The following report from the university lecturer in Science Education on the grading of Science lessons taught by three of the control group, and the comments that follow, give an example of the procedure used by the meeting to discuss the trainees' strengths and weaknesses in each subject taught before finalising their grades:

UWI Science Lecturer:

For the three trainees whose Science lessons we saw, there was a very high level of consistency in all our grading.

The objectives written by the three teachers tended to be behavioural ones and well written, but a common fault was to try and include too

much in one lesson; for example, the parts of a plant and the function of each part.

Motivation Techniques: These seemed to be mainly social, in that the teachers would praise and encourage. However, even this tended to be mechanical - sometimes the 'good' did not sound sincere. We saw one good example of achievement motivation in an infant class when children were given tasks and praised for carrying them out.

Questioning: The spread tended not to be wide enough; for example, instead of asking questions of twelve different children, the teachers would ask several questions to five of them.

Feedback: There was a tendency not to use the children's answers enough - whether right or wrong.

Teaching Aids: Usually of a high standard, especially in one lesson on insects.

Teaching Strategies: Readiness was generally well organised; for example, in one case there was a little rhyme to get the children to focus on the topic.

Grouping: We found that, although grouping was used, it was not properly organised. Sometimes, putting children into groups disrupted the smooth flow of the lesson; for example, one teacher teaching the sense of taste put them into groups and blindfolded each of twenty children so that they could guess what they were tasting. The

bell rang by the time she finished.

Personal Qualities: Good.

Knowledge of Subject: We found that the teachers' level of knowledge in this subject tended to be low. They would have been able to get themselves out of many a sticky situation if their knowledge had been deeper..

Classroom Environment: Generally lively, a lot of activity, although we felt that the teaching and the activity would have benefitted if the children had been given more material to handle.

NINSTEP Science Panel Head:

The Science course at NISTEP only started in October, 1982, and the amount of work covered is not enough - it is affecting their teaching of Science. This would improve if they had more content.

A NISTEP Coordinator:

We are very aware of this shortcoming. Remember, NISTEP tuition, especially in these third year subjects, is to be continued in a series of workshops in 1984 after the trainees have graduated. Also, the teachers doing the regional exam have another year of coursework before they sit Science and Social Studies next year.

UWI Team Head:

What the Science Panel seem to be saying is that there are critical gaps in the knowledge of most of the teachers. Is that the consensus of the panel?

UWI Team Member:

Science is traditionally one of the weakest subjects in the region's Primary schools. And children ask very searching questions; for example, "Does the mosquito excrete?", that trainees can't answer ... Science has only been examined for the past two years.

(Notes, Staff Meeting, June 17, 1983)

The detailed and serious evaluation of the trainees' teaching performance in this Staff Meeting lasted for some four hours. As part of the evaluation, the meeting discussed whether some teaching grades should be adjusted up or down. It ended by considering areas of the school system, and of NISTEP, which would particularly benefit from improved organisation to enhance curriculum development. The University Team Head introduced this last section of the meeting with these words that seemed to indicate that some significance was, by now, being accorded to NISTEP as a training approach:

"NISTEP has everything to be proud of to be able to produce a set of grades like these. We have done a very careful assessment exercise, and, comparatively speaking, these are good grades, to compare well to good grades in Trinidad, Jamaica and the Eastern Caribbean.

We wish very much to have NISTEP seen as a top programme of teacher training, so if some of the statements I am going to make seem harsh, it is in the context of seeing how best NISTEP can improve. And I am glad that at this point we have with us the Minister of Education who has overall responsibility for NISTEP ..."

(Notes, Staff Meeting, June, 1983)

After participating in this Staff Meeting which came near the end of the first three-year phase planned by the revolutionary government for NISTEP, I was aware that it represented a high point for many of the staff. Staff members were happy with the meeting and with the evaluation exercise carried out jointly with the University, an exercise which we had carefully and anxiously planned. There was a feeling that most of our students had been a credit to us, that the hard work of integrated teaching and administration had paid off, that we had mastered the most difficult

aspects of our task. It seemed possible that the institution we had moulded might yet gain some degree of regional recognition, but even if it did not, it suited Grenada's needs and was worth continuing and improving. I was aware of a softening in the attitude of some staff members towards the University's School of Education compared to the hostility which had initially been felt, not only because of its refusal to endorse the training given by NISTEP but also for what was suspected, rightly or wrongly, of being its arrogance and 'know-it-all' attitude concerning programme design and curriculum matters. The June 17th Staff Meeting suggested that the UWI lecturers were critical but fair and positive, and that their evaluation and standards were similar to our own. There seemed to be a greater chance, after this, of working more closely with them as colleagues for our mutual benefit, and, indeed, this is what seems to have happened in the design of the new teacher education approach after the collapse of the revolution.

Team Teaching and the Curriculum

Besides the practicum, the management and implementation of the academic curriculum were the daily concern of the NISTEP staff. The curriculum was managed by the various Curriculum Panels. Our

last section will briefly explore some of the important issues which arose in this area.

From the first term of Year 1, it was realized that the organisation of the teacher education curriculum into Subject Departments, traditional in the Teachers' Colleges of the region, would be inappropriate at NISTEP. Customarily, a Subject Department has a common syllabus, but each lecturer uses an individual approach to choosing suitable content and teaching methodology. Meetings with the Department Head usually occur only two or three times a term to coordinate materials and examinations. In NISTEP, the varying backgrounds of the staff and their desire to implement a common curriculum with unified standards made it essential to plan the curriculum collectively every week. Curriculum planning meetings took as much time as, or more time than, Staff Meetings. Each panel worked out its own way of preparing lessons and materials. The Social Studies Panel used a variety of approaches that exemplified the possibilities.

The approach to preparation in the Social Studies Panel tended to depend on the topic. Sometimes, a draft lesson would be drawn up by one panel member, then it would be discussed and modified by the rest of the panel, and finally written up by the original presenter as collectively agreed. (The

Educational Panel almost always used this approach.) On other occasions, the Social Studies lesson would be prepared collaboratively from start to finish by the panel. Still another way of preparing it was for one person who was particularly strong in a topic to be asked to take the main responsibility for preparing it, then to go over it with the rest of the panel. It was understood that the Panel Chairperson had the ultimate responsibility for seeing to the typing and production of all material for student handouts and all lesson guidelines for the lecturers, but usually other panel members also assisted with this task.

The curriculum was thus prepared by the panel, but each lecturer then taught the lessons on his or her own to assigned classes. It was in this respect that conflicts sometimes arose, since some lecturers tended to revert to their independent ways of presenting content reminiscent of their individualism in the Subject Departments of colleges or schools in which they had previously taught. Occasionally, individualism went so far that the original intent of the collectively planned lesson was all but lost. The trainees would then complain that they were being differently taught from the other groups, and the lecturer would be taken to task by the rest of the

panel or the Panel Head - not a pleasant encounter. At least some panel members were frustrated by this method of operating, but since it had obvious advantages of efficiency, standardisation and the collective preparation of lecturers who were not all specialists in a particular panel subject, the panels persisted with it and most members learnt to accept and appreciate it.

Retrospectively, I consider that the skills and outlooks of all of us were further developed and enriched by the approach of the Curriculum Panels. The curriculum taught to the students was less variable than it would otherwise have been, and social interaction amongst the staff was, on balance, enhanced, although there was at least one worrying occasion for all when a panel member resigned from NISTEP because of irreconcilable differences that had arisen in the collective teaching process.

These observations by an overseas staff member who joined NISTEP's Language Arts Panel in Year 2 give us a deeper insight into how the Curriculum Panels played their valuable educative and socialization role:

"Coming into NISTEP with long experience in teaching but none at all in teacher education, I had to learn the ropes quickly. But I didn't have to go through any long initiation. Frank (Overall Coordinator in Year 2) was very accessible if I had any questions. And right away I was involved in the work of the Curriculum Panel; I didn't just sit in, I contributed from the start. The other panel members explained things very clearly. So I was learning on the spot, learning on the job.

There were few library facilities so it was important to get information on the course word-of-mouth from someone who understood it, then I practised it immediately. There was no time to go and study in the library the way you do to prepare for, say, being a UWI lecturer.

The way NISTEP staff were involved in panel work was so effective that there were few complaints from the trainees that 'she knows her stuff but can't impart it'. The lessons were well planned, and the lecturers understood them because they had participated in the planning." (Curzon, 1984)

As regards curriculum content, at present an insufficiency of materials makes it impossible to

adequately assess the academic education that NISTEP provided for its students. A valid assessment of NISTEP training would need to compare its courses, examinations and research requirements with those offered by the pre-existing Grenada Teachers' College, making a detailed comparative analysis of aims, content, contact hours, evaluation procedures including coursework and Eastern Caribbean Regional Examination papers, and students' research projects. Without this, observations on NISTEP's curriculum content can be no more than tentative and subjective, but may perhaps provide a lead for further thought.

Some Curriculum Panels, particularly Language Arts, Social Studies and Health Education, experimented to a certain extent with new content that seemed relevant to the country's new situation. Other panels tended to conform more closely to the conservative content and theoretical, didactic approach of the previous system. Outstanding shortcomings in most subjects which were recognised and, from time to time, discussed by some of the staff, included the lack of a practical orientation, the insufficiency of field trips, the virtual absence of examples for the trainees of how to develop a work-study approach in the school curriculum, and the lack of involvement with communities. NISTEP's teaching supervision model

too conformed to the traditional supervisor-dominated approach with its predetermined checklist for evaluating technical teaching competencies. The alternative approach of clinical supervision which places the trainee in a key self-evaluative role was never considered.

The conservatism of much of the curriculum was not surprising in the circumstances of NISTEP. Most of the staff had been educated along traditional, highly theoretical lines, and there was insufficient time to develop new skills and content even on the part of those staff members who wanted to. In the situation of acute staff shortage, each was stretched to the limit. Nearly all the time in plenary planning meetings was spent not on discussing curriculum philosophy but on trying to forge the administrative structures that would make the new teacher education system work. Curriculum Panels had not much more than a week to develop coursework before teaching it. Innovations were bound to be hasty and somewhat fragmented. Those panels which did not find it necessary to innovate simply tended to take the very practical course of using, with slight modifications, materials and approaches that had been used in the old system. Another factor that made attempts at innovation fraught with difficulty was that new topics tended

to draw complaints that they did not help trainees to teach the existing school curriculum.

Desirable as it would have been, there was simply no time for the body of NISTEP staff to undertake a careful, professional study of teacher education which would have allowed them to reconsider traditional approaches and integrate content, methodology and the practicum with the stated development needs of the society. The result was that, to a large extent, the 'old wine' of the traditional Anglophone Caribbean teacher education curriculum was poured into the 'new bottle' of an innovative teacher education structure. However, at least some of the NISTEP staff, including, importantly, the coordinators, were increasingly aware of the urgency of putting aside time, in NISTEP Phase 2, to allow for a collective exploration of solutions to this problem.

The 'Survival Stage' in the Development
of a New Organisation

Smith and Keith (1971: 202) hypothesise that for new organisations to become established the overriding emphasis must be on the organisational leadership that stresses survival efficiency and interpersonal goals - 'the technology of adjusting means to given ends'. After this the new

organisation can move to the next stage in which 'institutional leadership must take the surviving and efficient organisation and ... reformulate its goals towards broader, deeper or higher objectives'.

The NISTEP Staff Meeting concentrated on the most pressing tasks necessary for moulding the new institution, and simply delayed decisions on those which were less immediately pressing, though vital in the long run for improving the organisation. The data on the proceedings of the staff meeting shows that it was primarily concerned with the 'survival stage' - building structures for the administration and operation of teaching and supervision and developing the efficiency of these structures. During this process, a reasonably harmonious level of interpersonal relationships was developed.

The important tasks which the staff had to delay included establishing regular liaison with the Community School Day Programme, professional development amongst the staff, and programme evaluation and improvement. Only brief and insufficient attention was given to developing a closer social relationship with the trainees, and to the urgent matter of planning for the synchronisation of change in the NISTEP curriculum and in the schools' curriculum that would be

appropriate to the country's development goals. Attention to such matters would have helped to improve several aspects of the programme, but it was necessary that priorities should be structured as the NISTEP staff structured them for efficiency and survival to be achieved.

The problems of team teaching that Smith and Keith identified in the Kensington School also occurred in NISTEP's Curriculum Panels. Like the teams at Kensington, Nistep's panels experienced problems in learning how to work collaboratively and interdependently in contrast to the traditional professional autonomy which they were used to. They had to learn to overcome incompatibilities of personality and background, to survive conflict, and to work out different patterns of curriculum development for different teaching tasks in a way which would satisfy all team members. The panels achieved the 'survival stage' which was, in the case of the curriculum, forging a workable syllabus and materials and teaching these according to standardised criteria. The 'higher objectives' of improving curriculum content and methods and synchronising this with changes in the school system would, in the normal course of events, have taken place in the second stage that was planned for NISTEP.

Conclusion

Grenada's National In-Service Teacher Education Programme was an innovation not only of national but also of regional importance. It was an example of a comprehensive teacher training approach in a group of post-colonial countries which were left with inadequate structures for rectifying the problem of having a majority of teachers untrained.

NISTEP was in many ways unique in the Anglophone Caribbean. In the first place it established in-service training for all unqualified teachers instead of being a supplementary or alternative approach to full-time teacher education. Secondly, it broke with many of the region's traditional methods of selecting, training and providing certification for student teachers. Thirdly, its staff developed and operated unusual structures of collective administration and teaching. All of these strategies and innovations succeeded in establishing NISTEP as a national programme.

In spite of its radical innovativeness, the national in-service approach survived two periods of political uncertainty. First, it survived its birth pangs during the Revolution. Although the political climate provided impetus and support in this initial period, the difficulties of operating

such a large-scale educational innovation could have caused it to flounder, and thence to substantially scale down its efforts as many cautious advisers wished. Next, it survived the collapse of the Revolution. During the uncertain and confusing year of the 'Interim Administration', it maintained operations when other educational programmes of the Revolution were being abandoned. Then it was adapted to become a major part of the new teacher education system agreed on by the government elected at the end of the 'interim' period.

Some of the problems of operating NISTEP during the first three years of its life seemed almost insurmountable. Yet the staff faced and overcame most of the important ones to a level which enabled them never to compromise the main aim of providing adequate initial teacher training on a national scale. A major difficulty, for example, was that the shortage of staff made the workload of lectures and supervision much heavier than previously. It also raised questions regarding the sheer feasibility of devising different courses for the four target groups with their uneven levels of secondary education. NISTEP lecturers, however, devised and implemented the four training programmes needed. In the process they provided a course for the 'Mainstream' trainees that was at

least as adequate as the superseded full-time one in terms of contact hours, academic and professional content, teaching supervision and methods of evaluation. Motivated by the challenge and responsibilities of the role, many of the lecturers threw themselves into a workload of ten to twelve hours a day, sometimes including weekends, and some voluntarily gave up the entitlements of vacation leave to which the regulations entitled them.

Three factors helped to compensate for the inadequacy of staff numbers as well as for its uneven levels of skill and experience in teacher education. One was that, although the student-staff ratio was always too high, it became more manageable each year as the numbers of 'Mainstream' students decreased and the numbers of staff grew. Another factor was the use of human resources outside of NISTEP to assist and support the staff; for example, the technical support that came from teacher-partners and staff from the University of the West Indies. The third factor was that collective curriculum and administrative work helped to prepare and develop the teaching and organisational skills of all staff members to a greater or lesser degree according to need.

NISTEP, like all new institutions, had difficulties stemming from what Smith and Keith call 'the liability of newness', a situation in which groups of relative strangers have to carry out shared tasks before they have had a chance to develop interpersonal trust and confidence. The potential problem of the newness of the NISTEP staff was compounded by the fact that it had displaced the traditional role of a previously long-standing staff. Adding to the difficulties were the rapid increase in the number of staff members from 16 in Year 1 to 28 in Year 3, and the mixture of nationalities, with 14 Grenadians, 9 from other Caribbean countries, 3 from Britain, and 2 from the USA. The staff had to be frequently introducing and incorporating new members, some of whom were coping with the demands of settling their families into a new country as well as being plunged into a heavy work schedule. Staff members from non-Caribbean countries, particularly those from the USA or educated there, often had very different work styles and teaching approaches from the Caribbean-trained staff.

All this meant that a new and complex programme had to be carried out by a staff which, at the same time, had to learn to develop the cohesion and the motivation necessary to forge NISTEP's unusually collaborative structures and to work together in

them. In spite of these difficult circumstances, work relations became reasonably harmonious, and a level of identity was developed that seemed to form the basis of high morale and commitment in most, judging from the conscientious and energetic carrying out of tasks.

Another potential problem was that there were many criticisms of the programme, from those who felt displaced by it, from those who felt that its scale was making it unworkable, and from those trainees who resented its compulsory nature. Yet most of the NISTEP staff maintained a positive attitude, defending the value of the programme and constantly trying to improve it.

NISTEP's weekly problem solving Staff Meeting was extremely important in helping to overcome the potential and actual interpersonal problems which inevitably occurred among the new staff. The intense participation of the staff in thrashing out the problems brought up in the meeting helped to develop cooperation and a sense of appreciation of the worth of individual contributions to shaping the institution. The informal, interactive style of the meeting not only encouraged this participation but also facilitated the open communication and feedback necessary to identify and solve problems which may otherwise have proved

insurmountable barriers to progress. The collective curriculum structures which had to overcome the difficulties of implementing team teaching and evaluation also helped to develop closeness and a sense of interactive work achievement amongst most of the lecturers.

Administrative panels and sub-committees, as well as the structure of a three-person administrative leadership team, were established and endorsed by the Staff Meeting and worked closely with it. This allowed for the division of labour, coordinated decision making and group interaction which provided the basis for the carrying out of complex organisational tasks.

Taken together, NISTEP's collective processes of administration and curriculum implementation facilitated the level of efficiency necessary for the institution to achieve its 'survival stage'. They also helped to develop work satisfaction, a degree of interpersonal harmony and a sense of responsible interdependence amongst the NISTEP staff. This is the basis of the view put forward in this study that NISTEP's collective processes of administration and teaching were the chief factors that enabled the institution to overcome its major technical and interpersonal problems and become established as an important part of the education

system. Through NISTEP, the Grenadian government was able to carry out its ambitious aim of training Primary teachers on a national instead of a piecemeal scale. This laid the basis for implementing more effectively the educational changes desired in the school system as a whole.

NOTES AND REFERENCESChapter 1

1. Gold (1969) describes field researchers as generally assuming one of four roles in collecting their data:
 - (i) The complete participant who joins and interacts naturally with a group to study it without its members knowing that research is being carried out.
 - (ii) The participant-as-observer, who participates in the daily life of the group which knows that it is being studied.
 - (iii) The observer-as-participant, where the observer makes a brief visit to the site of the case and gets information mainly by formal interviewing, sometimes also by brief observation.
 - (iv) The complete observer, in which role 'a field worker attempts to observe people in ways which make it unnecessary for them to take him into account' - he is

'entirely removed from social
interaction with informants'.

2. The term 'worker' seems natural for describing a tutor in NISTEP because in the development of the Grenada Revolution there was an ethos in which everyone, including professionals, was described as a 'worker'. For example, in NISTEP, as in many other workplaces, attempts were made to have occasional or regular 'worker education' sessions in which tutors, clerical and domestic workers gathered to discuss problems in the Grenadian society and economy and the changes put in place or aimed at by the Revolution.

Chapter 2

1. For example, criticisms cited by Whitty (1981), Reynolds (1980-1981) and Foster (1972), listed by Crossley and Vulliamy (1984).

2. All of these points are made in the following speeches: Education and Society: the Need for Transformation; address by Prime Minister Maurice Bishop at the Grenada Boys' Secondary School Speech Night, Dec., 1981.

Address to the Grenada Chamber of Commerce Management Training Seminar; Jacqueline Creft, Minister of Education, June 14, 1982.

The Importance of the Centre for Popular Education, Phase 2; J. Creft, 15 Jan., 1983.

3. Information on the weaknesses of the traditional education system in Grenada may be found in the following studies:

Celia Rizo: Proposed Reorganisation of the Educational System in Grenada (Oct., 1979).

George Brizan: The Education Reform Process in Grenada (Nov., 1981, 19 - 67).

4. This information comes from the Education Sector Survey, produced in June, 1982 by the Grenadian Ministry of Education. This survey presents a detailed examination of problems in each sector of the education system, together with facts and figures on its development between 1978 - 1981. It ends with the PRG's draft perspectives and draft plans for future developments in each sector.

The Ministry's survey must be differentiated from the Education Sector Survey on Grenada, produced by a team of Unesco consultants also in June, 1982. There were many omissions in this Unesco survey and several of its sections, including its analysis of teacher training, were rejected as incorrect or inappropriate by the Grenadian Ministry of Education. This is why the Ministry produced an alternative survey. In this study the Government's education survey will be quoted.

5. From Survey of Numbers of Grenadian Students at Tertiary Institutions Abroad, Ministry of Education, Grenada, June, 1983. At this date, there were 161 students at Universities and Higher Institutes in Cuba, 18 in the GDR, 14 in the Soviet Union, 35 at the University of the West Indies, 31 at other tertiary institutions

in the Anglophone Caribbean, 12 in the United Kingdom, 5 in the United States, and 4 in Tanzania. The Cuban Government had provided another 46 tertiary scholarships by September, 1983.

6. For information on in-service training for adults and on the Farm and Fisheries Schools, see Education Sector Survey, Ministry of Education, Grenada, June, 1982, pp. 114 - 119, 145 -155. The adult education programme in the CPE and perspectives for its development are outlined in *ibid.*, 168 - 172, 260 - 261.
7. An account of aspects of this process is given in Is Freedom We Making, The New Democracy in Grenada, by M. Hodge and C. Searle; see especially the description of a Workers' Parish Council meeting, p. 1 - 14, the National Women's Organisation, p. 15 - 21, and public discussion of national issues, p. 27 - 29.
8. See Brizan, 1981, 48 - 53, and Education Sector Survey, Ministry of Education, Grenada, June, 1982, 100 - 111. Note that the Unesco Education Sector Survey assessed the teacher turnover from the schools as 80 - 100 per year (p. 10), while the Ministry's survey (p. 107) puts it as about 40 per year.

Chapter 3

1. The Peoples' Revolutionary Government organised the following meetings of teachers, other educators and politicians to discuss the needs of educational change:
 - (i) National Seminar on Education, July-September, 1979.
 - (ii) National Training Seminar, January, 1980.
 - (iii) Workshop for Primary School Teachers, led by Paulo Freire, 20-28 February, 1980.
 - (iv) One-day Parish Workshops for curriculum development held in each of the five parishes, 21-26 April, 1980.

(Source: Brizan, 1981: 5-6)
2. This source shall be nameless.
3. Brizan found that 24% of the trainees definitely did not want to make teaching their career and a further 35% were undecided about staying in the profession. There was a high correlation between the lack of commitment to

teaching and the view that teacher training should be optimal (Brizan, 1981: 105).

4. As educational planning and record keeping was underdeveloped in Grenada, it is sometimes difficult to get accurate figures. The Unesco Education Sector Survey (1982: 10) estimated that 80-100 teachers left the profession each year (see Note 8, Chapter 2), and if this is correct, it would be consistent with the figure of 160 trainees dropping out of NISTEP in the first two years.
5. See Chapter 2, Note 5 (p. 152) for details on scholarships available.

It is interesting to note that many of the young Grenadians who were awarded scholarships to socialist countries were not qualified to begin tertiary studies at the level required in those countries. Most who went to study in Cuba were so weak in Mathematics and Science (in spite of having completed secondary school) that the Cuban authorities had to provide them with intensive remedial training for one or two years in these subjects before they could start degree studies.

6. The timetable planning for resits took place in two NISTEP staff meetings in July, 1983 (see Notes, Staff Meeting, July 4, 1983 and July 7, 1983).

7. The academic levels of the 'Special Years' varied greatly. Some were highly competent students and performed well in the NISTEP courses; others had difficulty in holding their own. Three had such minimum academic competencies that they consistently performed below the required standard. The problem of whether to qualify these or to have them resit exams as the 'Mainstream' referrals did was discussed at several staff meetings. Finally, a majority vote of the staff decided that they should be awarded Trained Teacher Certificates along with the rest of the Special Year class (Notes, Staff Meeting, August 2, 1983).

8. This number completed the first year.

9. See Brizan, 1981: 52-53 and Education Sector Survey, Ministry of Education, 1982: 181. I have no figures for the 1982-83 academic year.

10. International project agencies usually pay their professional contract staff much higher salaries than professionals earn in most Caribbean countries. Even when the PRG halved an international salary, it was still higher than the local salary.
11. 'Graduate untrained' refers to those with Bachelors' Degrees but no specialist professional training in Education.
12. The Education Sector Survey (Ministry of Education, Grenada, 1982: 108) described the NISTEP staff in 1981 as being highly qualified: "Tuition and training is carried out by 16 tutors and assistant tutors. Of these 2 have Ph.Ds, 7 have Master's Degrees, 4 have Bachelor's Degrees, others have advanced professional teachers' qualifications (Diplomas). Not all of the tutors have had experience in training teachers and this has been a shortcoming. But the majority, apart from being qualified, have had years of classroom experience, both as teachers and as teacher trainers".
13. Based on data in the Education Sector Survey (Ministry of Education, 1982: 104-105), as well as on my knowledge of the timetable.

14. See page 45.

15. The process of team and community planning for NISTEP Secondary started in June, 1983. As a member of the planning team, I took detailed notes on its deliberations (Hickling-Hudson, A. Planning Committee for Secondary Teacher Training, Notes, 22 July and 30 July, 1983). The proposed system of providing in-service education for Secondary teachers (Grenada, Ministry of Education, NISTEP Secondary, July, 1983) was discussed with several groups of teachers throughout the country.

Chapter 4

1. The NISTEP staff described several instances of 'physical and psychological cruelty to children' practised by some teachers who punished children by 'flogging, insults and abuse' (Notes, Staff Meeting, 18 April, 1983). It was not clear what could be done to stop this, and the Staff Meeting noted that NISTEP should further discuss the issue in order to arrive at agreed recommendations.

2. See, for example, MacGregor (1960), Carver and Sergiovanni (1973).

DOCUMENTS, REPORTS AND UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- Bell, Jennifer. Decision-Making Processes, Organizational Climate and Teacher Morale in Some Post-Primary Institutions in Jamaica. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of the West Indies, 1978.
- Bishop, Maurice (late leader of the People's Revolutionary Government, Grenada). Education and Society: The Need for Transformation. Address at Speech Night, Grenada Boys' Secondary School, December 1981. (Typewritten.)
- Bishop, Maurice. Closing address to the Education and Production Conference, Carriacou, Grenada, 1982. (Mimeographed.)
- Brizan, George. The Education Reform Process in Grenada, 1979-1981. Institute for Further Education, Grenada, November, 1981 (Report).
- Campbell, Hyacinth. Factors Related to the Problems Experienced by Jamaican Educational Administrators. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of the West Indies, 1979.
- Coard, Bernard (Former Minister of Finance in the P.R.G., Grenada). Opening address to the Education and Production Conference, Carriacou, Grenada, November 1982.
- Centre for Popular Education. Education for True Liberation and Economic Independence. A Handbook of Norms and Guidelines for the Primary Adult Education Programme, C.P.E., Grenada, 1982 (Mimeographed booklet).
- Creft, Jacqueline (late Minister of Education in the P.R.G., Grenada). Address to the Grenada Chamber of Commerce Management Training Seminar, June 14, 1982 (Typewritten).
- Creft, Jacqueline. The Building of Mass Education in Free Grenada. Address to the first Conference of International Solidarity with Grenada, November, 1981, St. George's, Grenada. (Mimeographed pamphlet.)
- Creft, Jacqueline. The Importance of the Centre for Popular Education, Phase 2. January, 1983. (Typewritten.)
- Feurtado, I.E. Communication in the Process of Decision Making and Supervision at the Primary Level. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of the West Indies, 1979.

- Grenada, Ministry of Education. Community School Day Programme. Report of Work for the Period January to April, 1983. (Typewritten.)
- Grenada, Ministry of Education. Education Sector Survey, Grenada, June, 1982. (Report.)
- Grenada, Ministry of Education. Information: National In-Service Teacher Education Programme, 1983. (Mimeographed.)
- Grenada, Ministry of Education. In-Service Teacher Education: A New Kind of Teacher for the New Society, 17 October, 1980. (Mimeographed.)
- Grenada, Ministry of Education. NISTEP Secondary. Draft Proposal for an In-Service Teacher Education Programme for Secondary School Teachers, July, 1983. (Mimeographed.)
- Grenada, Ministry of Education. Summary of Comments on NISTEP Secondary, 30 July, 1983. (Typewritten.)
- Grenada, Ministry of Education. Survey of Numbers of Grenadian Students at Tertiary Institutions Abroad, June, 1983. (Typewritten.)
- Grenada, Ministry of Education. Teachers Speak on Education for National Development, National Teachers' Seminar, Workshop Reports, Grenada, January, 1980.
- Grenada, Ministry of Women's Affairs. National In-Service Teacher Education Programme for Day Care Workers, no date (1982?). (Mimeographed.)
- Hickling-Hudson, Anne. Field Notes on NISTEP Staff Meetings, St. Georges, Grenada:
- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 24 September, 1981 | 3 January, 1983 |
| 25 September, 1981 | 18 April, 1983 |
| 4 January, 1982 | 13 May, 1983 |
| 14 January, 1982 * | 29 May, 1983 |
| 15 January, 1982 * | 12 June, 1983 |
| 1 March, 1982 | 17 June, 1983 |
| 5 April, 1982 | 4 July, 1983 |
| 7 November, 1982 | 7 July, 1983 |
| 29 November, 1982 | 2 August, 1983 |
| 17 December, 1982 | |

* These refer to a series of meetings held on two days of a week-long 'retreat' involving NISTEP staff and lecturers from the Faculty of Education, University of West Indies. The retreat was held at Pope Paul's Camp.

Hickling-Hudson, Anne. Notes of Meeting of Social and Cultural Committee, NISTEP, 30 September, 1981, Grenada.

Hickling-Hudson, Anne. Notes of Meeting to Plan Secondary Teachers' Subject Associations, 17 January, 1983, Grenada.

Hickling-Hudson, Anne. Planning Committee for Secondary Teacher Training, Notes of Meetings on 22 July, 1983, 30 July, 1983, Grenada.

National In-Service Teacher Education Programme (NISTEP). Cross Assessment List (List of schools and numbers of trainees assigned to tutors for cross-assessment.) 1982-1983. (Mimeographed.)

NISTEP. Curriculum Outlines: Social Studies, Education, Language Arts, Health Education. 1981-1983, Grenada. (Mimeographed.)

NISTEP. Emulation Committee Meeting Report, June 11, 1982, Grenada. (Mimeographed.)

NISTEP. List of Individual Studies, 1980-1983. (Mimeographed.)

NISTEP. Official Minutes of Staff Meetings, St. Georges, Grenada:

19 October, 1981
 28 June, 1982
 5 July, 1982
 13 September, 1982
 27 September, 1982
 12 October, 1982
 18 October, 1982
 1 November, 1982
 10 December, 1982
 17 December, 1982
 10 January, 1983
 17 January, 1983
 24 January, 1983
 25 April, 1983

NISTEP. National In-Service Teacher Education Programme: Teaching Manual (adapted from Broomes, D., "Dimensions of Practical Teaching"). Grenada, Ministry of Education, 1981. (Mimeographed.)

NISTEP. Professional and Disciplinary Code for Teachers and Tutors, Grenada, 20 October, 1981. (Pamphlet.)

- NISTEP. Proposals (for) National In-Service Teacher Education Programme in 1982-1983, Grenada, September, 1982. (Mimeographed.)
- NISTEP. Proposals for Teacher Partner Handbook, Grenada, September, 1982. (Mimeographed.)
- NISTEP. Towards a Professional Code for NISTEP, Grenada, October, 1982. (Mimeographed.)
- NISTEP. Structure of Certification Agreed on at Retreat, 14-15 January, 1983, Pope Paul's Camp. Letter from Overall Coordinator of NISTEP, Grenada, 12 February, 1983. (Mimeographed.)
- NISTEP. Supervision Schedule. Lists of schools assigned to lecturers for the supervision of teaching practice, Grenada, October, 1982. (Mimeographed.)
- Olliverre, I. "NISTEP, A Revolutionary Approach to Teacher Training in Grenada." Paper at Education and Production Conference, Carriacou, Grenada, 1982. (Mimeographed.)
- Persaud, G. School Authority Patterns and Students' Social Development in Selected Primary Schools in Jamaica. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford University, USA, 1976.
- Rizo, Celia. Proposed Reorganization of the Educational System in Grenada, Grenada, October, 1979. (Report.)
- Unesco. Grenada: Education Sector Survey. An analysis of the education and training system and recommendations for its development, Paris, June, 1982. (Report.)

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- Ambursley, F. and Cohen, R. Crisis in the Caribbean. London: Heinemann, 1983.
- Ambursley, F. and Dunkerley, J. Grenada: Whose Freedom? London: Latin American Bureau, 1984.
- Bacchus, M.K. "Education for Development in Underdeveloped Countries", Comparative Education. Vol. 17, No. 2, June, 1981.
- Bacchus, M.K. Education for Development or Underdevelopment? Canada: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980.

- Bacchus, M.K. "Some Developments and Problems of Teacher Education in the Third World", Caribbean Journal of Education. Vol. 2, No. 1, June, 1975.
- Baldrige, J.V. and Deal, T.E. (eds.). Managing Change in Educational Organizations. Sociological Perspectives, Strategies and Case Studies. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.
- Becker, H. and Geer, B. "Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison", in McCall and Simmons, 1969, below.
- Bishop, Maurice. "Education for the New Grenada", 1979 in Forward Ever! Sydney: Pathfinder Press, 1982.
- Bishop, Maurice. "Education is a Must!" Speech to Inaugurate the National Teacher Education Programme, October, 1980, in Searle, C. (ed.), 1984, below.
- Bishop, Maurice. "For the Cultural Sovereignty of the Caribbean People". Address at the Opening of the Caribbean Conference of Intellectual Workers, Grenada, November, 1982, in Searle, C. (ed.), 1984, below.
- Bishop, Maurice. National Broadcast to Declare the Literacy Campaign Open, July, 1980, in Jules, D. and Rojas, D. (eds.), 1982, below.
- Bogdan, R.C. and Biklen, S.K. Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. USA: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1982.
- Bredo, A. and Bredo, E. "Effects of Environment and Structure on the Process of Innovation", in Baldrige and Deal (eds.), 1975. above.
- Broomes, D. "Planning and Evaluating Innovations in Teacher Education from Three Perspectives - Teachers, Pupils and their Community". Paper at Fourth Biennial Eastern Caribbean Standing Conference on Teacher Education, Barbados, April, 1983.
- Carver, F. and Sergiovanni, T. The New School Executive. USA: Harper and Rowe, 1973.
- Crossley, M. and Vulliamy, C. Case Study Research Methods and Comparative Education", Comparative Education. Vol. 20, No. 2, 1984.

- Forward Ever! Three Years of the Grenadian Revolution. Sydney: Pathfinder Press, 1982.
- Gold, R.L. "Roles in Sociological Field Observations", in McCall and Simmons, 1969, below.
- Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. and Bernstein, M. "Failure to Implement a Major Organizational Innovation", in Baldrige and Deal (eds.), 1975 (above).
- Hart, Richard. Introduction, in Searle, C. (Ed.), In Nobody's Backyard: Maurice Bishop's Speeches, 1979-1983, A Memorial Volume, xi-xli. London: Zed Books, 1984.
- Hodge, M. and Searle, C. 'Is Freedom We Making' The New Democracy in Grenada, Government Information Service, Grenada, no date (1982?).
- Jacobs, W. and Jacobs, R. Grenada, The Route to Revolution. Havana: Casa de las Americas, 1980.
- Jules, D. and Rojas, D. (eds.), Maurice Bishop, Selected Speeches, 1979-1981, Casa de las Americas, Havana, 1982.
- MacGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
- Miles, Raymond E. "Human Relations or Human Resources?" Harvard Business Review. Vol. 43, No. 4, 1965.
- McCall, G. and Simmons, J. (eds.). Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader. Reading, UK, 1969.
- Miller, E.L. Educational Research: The English Speaking Caribbean, International Development Research Centre, Canada, 1984.
- Packard, J.S. "Changing to a Multiunit School", in Baldrige and Deal, above, 1975.
- Payne, A., Sutton, P. and Thorndike, T. Grenada, Revolution and Invasion. UK: Croon Helm, 1984.
- Persaud, G. "The Socializing Functions of Teacher Education: System Maintenance or Change?" Caribbean Journal of Education. Vol. 2, No. 1, June, 1975.

- Ponsioen, J.A. (ed.). Educational Innovations in Africa: Policies and Administration, Institute of Social Studies, the Hague, Netherlands, 1972.
- Prabasi, S.C. "Aspects of Innovation in Education: A Preliminary Analysis", in Ponsioen (ed.), 1972, above.
- Smith, L.M. and Keith, P.M. Anatomy of Educational Innovation: An Organizational Analysis of an Elementary School. New York: Wiley, 1971.
- Searle, C. (ed.). Carriacou and Petit Martinique: In the Mainstream of the Revolution. Ministry of Education, Grenada: Fedon Publishers, July, 1982.
- Searle, C. (ed.). In Nobody's Backyard: Maurice Bishop's Speeches, 1979-1983, A Memorial Volume. London: Zed Books, 1984.
- Searle, C. and Rojas, D. (eds.). 'To Construct from Morning' Making the People's Budget in Grenada. Grenada: Fedon Publishers, 1982.
- Spindler, C. (ed.) Doing the Ethnography of Schooling. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.
- Stake, R.E. "The Case Study Method in Social Inquiry", Educational Researcher. Vol. 7, No. 2, 1978.
- Wandira, A. "Changing the Education Profession", in Ponsioen (ed.), 1972, above.
- Wise, R. "The Need for Retrospective Accounts of Curriculum Development", Journal of Curriculum Studies. Vol. 11, No. 1, 1979.
- Zelditch, M. "Some Methodological Problems of Field Studies", in McCall and Simmons (eds.), 1969, above.

INTERVIEWS

The following educators and officials involved in NISTEP, or connected with it, kindly gave me substantial information and their views about the programme in interviews or in written responses to my questions. I have given them pseudonyms, but have noted their actual positions.

- Baptiste, Julie (First Coordinator of NISTEP).
Personal interview, 13 October, 1984;
telephone interview, 3 February, 1985.
- Barrie, Raymond (UWI Lecturer, Faculty of Education). Cassette tape in response to questionnaire, November, 1984.
- Curzon, Lana (Lecturer, NISTEP). Personal interview, 9 December, 1984.
- Dayton, Jane (Lecturer, NISTEP). Personal interview, 9 December, 1984.
- DeCoteau, Monica (One of the three-person team of NISTEP Coordinators). Personal interviews, 26 September, 1984; 27 October, 1984; 4 February, 1985.
- Gabriel, Carl (UWI Lecturer, Faculty of Education). Letter in response to questionnaire, 7 December, 1984.
- Julien, Don (Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education, Grenada). Personal interview, 17 December, 1984).
- Pierre, Edwin (One of the three-person team of NISTEP Coordinators). Telephone interviews, 21 December, 1984; 13 February, 1985.
- Simons, Frank (One of the three-person team of NISTEP Coordinators). Personal interview, 8 January, 1985.