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Executive Summary – INSET Project 1996-1998

The recommendations presented below arise from a study commissioned by the Division of Education in July, 1998 to research and make recommendations upon the current teacher inservice education and training (INSET) program in Bhutan’s schools. The study was designed as a collaborative project and conducted by a research team comprising two Australian consultants and two Bhutanese educationists.

The principles that are set out below are in response to a large amount of data gathered from teachers and senior educationists. They have been collected and interpreted against both a theoretical framework and other relevant literature. We have been impressed, and encouraged, by the extent to which the data gathered have uncovered opinions and suggestions from teachers that are highly consistent with the theoretical framework that we have used.

Reconceptualisation of INSET

Classroom teachers must be the central focus of INSET because it is upon them that the pressure and support for change must be applied. The work of all other agencies and personnel must be coordinated to that end.

Secondly INSET needs to be thought of more than a single workshop or even as a series of workshops on any particular topic. Rather it is a process in which the workshop is just the beginning point. Implementation in the classroom or school of the new ideas encountered through workshops is what really matters. In order to ensure that classrooms are affected, a more effective support structure for teachers must be developed.

This reconceptualisation of INSET is thus of a more complex model than is currently the case and carries significant implications for the ways that INSET is conducted, for its leadership and for its coordination.

(i) Conducting INSET Activities

The overwhelmingly clear message from the data is that while teachers acknowledge the need for INSET to address topics of concern to the Division, such as manuals, textbooks and syllabuses, they also want their concerns to be taken into account. It is in the discharge of this latter responsibility that a new equilibrium between the centre’s needs and school/teacher needs must be established. At present the data indicate a serious imbalance.

Recommendation 1:

The INSET program should reflect a balance between courses that focus upon the Centre’s concerns and those that focus upon teachers’ expressed concerns about classroom practices.
This recommendation creates a dilemma because INSET’s course developers are generally centre-based rather than school-based personnel. In our view this dilemma can only be resolved by recourse to data. There are presently many sets of data available and all are potential sources of data for National Based Inservice Programs (NBIPs). In addition, data should be gathered directly by INSET leaders from teachers to identify the problems that they face implementing current curriculum policies. Workshops and other forms of support should be developed in response to those data.

Recommendation 2
Where relevant, INSET courses should be based upon appropriate needs analysis of teachers’ concerns.

Our data indicate that wholesale change is not needed, rather, what we foresee is evolutionary change that focuses primarily on refinements of the existing framework.

Recommendation 3:
NBIPs should be retained, though modifications to their design and delivery must be considered as indicated in Recommendations 8-13 below.

School Based Inservice Programs (SBIPs) must continue in their role as an automatic follow-up to NBIPs. In addition, as the school system matures and the cadre of teachers becomes, on average, better trained and educated, the SBIP will almost certainly become an increasingly important vehicle for staff development in relation to in-school problems. However, it is also clear from the data that the current understanding by teachers of how SBIP might operate remains quite unclear to many.

Recommendation 4:
Immediate steps should be taken to clarify the intended process by which SBIPs might function within schools. As part of this, consideration should be given to the role that Intervision might play, care being taken to address the problems that Thinley’s (1999) research has uncovered. A further consideration should be the issues raised in Recommendation 13.

INSET needs adjustment to improve the impact of NBIPs upon curriculum implementation, that is, upon the work of teachers in classrooms by the provision of support that is much more readily accessible than is currently the case.

Recommendation 5:
A significant consequence of the reconceptualisation of the INSET program is the identification of the means by which expertise in classroom practices can be dispersed across the country with the express task of providing support for curriculum implementation at the school level.

We recognise that already there are examples of clusters of schools voluntarily aggregating to pursue inservice learning and of cluster style workshops and even in-school ‘clusters’. There might be occasions when a Dzongkhag-level program might be deemed useful to teachers, for example as a follow-up to an NBIP, and we argue for its inclusion under this label.
Recommendation 6:
The feasibility of Cluster Based Inservice Activities (CBIAs) being incorporated into, and supported within, the INSET framework should be examined in conjunction with Recommendation 7.

At this juncture it is important to pause to recognise that changes to the modes of INSET, of the kind outlined to date, will not be worth making unless there is commitment to the part they must play in supporting teachers’ learning with respect to curriculum implementation. There is an inevitable tension between what can be afforded and what initiatives are most in need of support.

Recommendation 7:
All modes of INSET should be supported by an appropriate budget. Determination of the overall INSET budget should be the responsibility of the Director of INSET (see Recommendation 14) working through the Teacher Education Board (TEB).

Regardless of the mode of INSET that is chosen, or the topic being dealt with, workshop activity needs to focus first upon the concrete dimensions of teaching materials and practices. The theoretical assumptions underpinning those practices should be addressed on subsequent occasions. The workshop must not be a ‘one-shot’ wonder. Change takes time, commonly several years.

Recommendation 8:
When major curriculum initiatives are being mediated through workshops of any mode, a suitable delivery strategy should be devised that recognises the need for teachers to gain first-hand experience with the materials and practices of the initiative before elaboration of its theoretical assumptions is undertaken through follow-up workshops or cluster activities.

We question the wisdom of lengthy workshops, partly because of our experience as workshop resource persons at our University and in schools with which we have worked, and partly because of our knowledge of the adult education literature. It is crucial to keep in mind that the purpose of INSET is to assist the learning of teachers and even if long workshops leave resource persons and central administrators satisfied that much has been covered, we believe that teachers’ learning will have been limited.

Recommendation 9:
The practice of holding long NBIP workshops should be re-appraised with a view to developing an alternative model based upon shorter, and perhaps more, workshops.

Although this recommendation specifically mentions NBIPs, it makes little sense for SBIPs to be more than one half to two days in length, which means that there will be a need to have more of them.

With respect to timing, our reactions to these data again are largely informed by our awareness of the adult education literature as well as our theoretical framework, and we...
again suggest that, workshops be held more frequently. Apart from the psychological comfort for participants, we note that such a schedule of support for teachers is consistent with the understanding that the learning associated with educational change must be seen as an on-going process rather than an event.

**Recommendation 10:**

*In conjunction with the investigation of shorter lengths for workshops, the possibility of scheduling NBIP workshops more frequently across the year should be considered.*

The issue of venue is related to length and timing in relation to NBIPs. Not surprisingly, here the issue of participant comfort was raised directly with respect to the cold of winter and the lack of adequate heating at venues. Again, we point to the adult education literature: if participants are to engage the workshop effectively, then they must be physically comfortable. This is a fundamental tenet of the most basic of psychological models of human needs, such as Maslow’s well-known hierarchy. Shorter, more frequent and more regionalised, and so smaller, workshops would become the norm.

**Recommendation 11:**

*As part of the investigation undertaken in response to Recommendations 9 and 10, alternative venues should be identified that could be used to deliver workshops in periods other than mid-winter.*

The data have revealed that as far as teachers are concerned, the process by which participants are selected to attend NBIP workshops is seriously flawed. Their solutions to this problem were many, the most common being that principles of equity should be applied and that criteria of ‘interest’ and ‘relevance’ be used. A related concern was the frequency with which participants were transferred to a different school shortly after returning from a workshop.

**Recommendation 12:**

*A major task that the Director of INSET (see Recommendation 14 below) should engage immediately is the establishment of a clear policy governing the selection of workshop participants and take steps to ensure that the policy is administered uniformly.*

With respect to workshop delivery, it is apparent that the central role of resource persons in the conduct of an effective workshop has not been adequately recognised. More attention to their preparation as adult educators is needed. Planning in NBIPs appeared too often to be hurriedly done.

**Recommendation 13:**

*More attention should be given to the appointment of resource persons, particularly for NBIPs, with emphasis upon the relevance of their expertise, their skill as adult educators and the adequacy of planning time available prior to the workshop.*
The following recommendations address the overall interconnectedness of the entire INSET framework, fundamentally in order to maximise both the support for teachers as they strive to implement curriculum policy, and the pressure upon them that seems necessary to maximise the outcomes. We address these concerns through two related ideas, leadership and co-ordination.

(ii) Exercising Leadership

In the more complex conceptualisation of INSET that we propose, it is evident that leadership will be required throughout the system. We understand that at present the overall coordination of the INSET program is the responsibility of the HRD/TEB. Collectively, comments from people well placed to make valid judgements give a clear indication that any review of the INSET program must include its leadership and management structure. It is now timely for it to have a designated and expert leadership. INSET needs to be coordinated and managed by a person or persons who have direct oversight of the vision and day-to-day practice of INSET. The need is especially important now as the reconceptualisation of INSET will require a champion, one who can make sure that the full range of recommendations can take shape over the next five years or so.

Recommendation 14:

Funds should be allocated for the creation of a leadership position for INSET (that is referred to throughout this report as the ‘Director of INSET’).

Dzongkhag level support for teachers is needed in the form of an experienced educator who can be called upon by schools when extra help is needed as well as for co-ordination. To our mind the fundamental orientation of the support person needs to be that of a person working with, not substituting for, the work of the teacher. The position could be a promotion position for able Bhutanese teachers with incentives to reflect the level of importance of the position. We note the proposed build up of resources at the Dzongkhag level and strongly endorse this decision.

Recommendation 15:

The feasibility of establishing educational leadership positions, to be located regionally, perhaps within each Dzongkhag, should be seriously considered. Such Dzongkhag Educational Leaders (DELs) would provide a complementary service to that of current DEOs and should not be involved in essentially administrative matters.

In the event of DELs being appointed, we suggest that their further professional development also be considered, and as circumstances permit, they be offered inservice support aimed at honing their skills as resource persons and in the role of consultants in the change process.
Recommendation 16:

As soon as possible, DELs should be assisted to develop their skills as consultants through suitably designed and delivered inservice education and training.

The key person in school level educational leadership should be the Head Teacher. The reason for this is that the Head Teacher is the one that must deal with all of the day-to-day issues relating to whether or not students are learning and the extent to which teachers are facilitating that learning. There is a tension for Head Teachers between their administrative/managerial responsibilities and their educational leadership responsibilities. As a tool for exercising curriculum leadership, Head Teachers should devise School Development Plans that include short-to-medium term staff development plans, linked in with the development activities designed by Headquarters and for priorities that they themselves determine.

Recommendation 17:

Head Teachers should be supported to develop their role as educational leaders and in particular assisted to resolve the relative tensions that will arise between managerial and educational roles.

We note with concern the development of the ‘Network of Focal Persons’ being established by the EMSS for Head Teachers to undertake contradictory roles of monitoring and support for other schools. We argue that Head Teachers have more than enough to do as it is, so that asking any of them to take on more is quite unreasonable and contrary to the tenor of our argument. In our view, if Head Teachers can, with assistance, provide educational leadership in the development of their own staff over time, as well as attend to their other responsibilities, that will be as much as can reasonably be expected of them.

(iii) System-wide Coordination

INSET should move away from an annual series of NBIP workshops, with follow-up SBIP workshops, to a more complex, iterative system. The new INSET will be more responsive to the needs of teachers in various ways and the needs of central curriculum initiatives. It will also be much more concerned about follow up in the forms of pressure and support. There can be no doubt that sections of the Division exist primarily to support the work of teachers in schools. This is where a major coordinative task arises because the key policies of curriculum (CAPSS), examinations (BBE) and monitoring (EMSS) are the ones that most powerfully direct the work of teachers. It seems logical that these three agencies should be the key players in any small coordinating group. We have included representatives from TTC/NIE for their significant role in resourcing INSET workshops, and Personnel Services for the central role played in the coordination of INSET in the past and in the deployment of teachers.
Recommendation 18:

A working party, under the chairmanship of the Director (or his nominee) should be formed immediately to work out the ways in which CAPSS, BBE, EMSS, TTC/NIE and Personnel Services can, and should, work together to coordinate the INSET program. Careful consideration should be given to the establishment of a standing committee to exercise this control and leadership. It should report directly to the Teacher Education Board and have the Director of INSET as its executive officer.

In the recommendations above we have set out the essential ideas for the development of INSET over the short to medium term.

Conclusion

In proposing a fundamental reconceptualisation of INSET in Bhutan, we recognise that we are asking those concerned with inservice to think differently and hence to plan and act differently. Any large group of people with a common concern can be thought of as sharing a culture that has developed over time. Certain values, beliefs, rituals and practices define that culture and we recognise that it has nurtured remarkable development in Bhutanese education in the modern era. In this report we are, to some degree, challenging that culture. We are questioning the ‘way things are done around here’ in relation to INSET by suggesting some changes while recognising the appropriateness of some existing assumptions and practices. Consequently, if our recommendations are taken up, they will, to some extent create a certain uneasiness as familiar habits, that are routine and anxiety free, are replaced by new ones. This is entirely natural and appropriate and is essentially the same kind of learning process that teachers are subjected to each time a curriculum change is introduced.

Dr DJ Laird  Dr TW Maxwell  Mr Wangpo Tenzin

20 October 1999
Background to the INSET Project

Introduction

This Report is the result of a project commissioned by the Division of Education within the Second Education Project that is funded through the World Bank and the Swiss Development Corporation.

Below we set out the Project Brief, our Rationale for the conduct of the Project and the Research Questions.

Project Brief

In Phase 1 (August to September 1998) the following major objectives of the Project were specified in the Brief:

‘(i) Review INSET reports and meet some of the course organizers and facilitators for the last three years’;

‘(ii) Develop instruments to survey the general inservice training impact for classroom teachers’; and

‘(iii) Pre test the survey instruments in selected schools’.

After consultation with the Task Force, data gathering was extended to interviews with key persons, Course Directors and Resource Persons, Head Teachers and teachers as well as collection of available documentation.

During the inter-phase period, the following Project Brief objective was set out:

‘(iv) The local INSET Task Force will carry out the survey between September 1998 and August 1999.’

Additional interview data were conducted during this period.

In Phase 2 (September to October 1999), the following objectives were specified:

‘(i) Analyze the survey data;

(ii) Finalize the study report and findings; and

(iii) Develop Inservice Master Plan for the next 5 – 7 years’.

Rationale for Project Involvement

In brief, we believe that staff inservice is a major tool by which the nature of classroom teaching and learning can be influenced by central administrators. Unfortunately, it
seems that in most advanced systems, such as Australia’s, this influence is not maximised because the relationship between educational change and staff development is not fully appreciated. However, there is now a substantial international literature that reflects a growing knowledge of principles by which educational change can best be managed, including explicit advice about the planning and implementation of staff development at the school level to complement system initiatives.

We saw the Project as an ideal opportunity for Division of Education staff and others to participate in the research of the project. After all, the consultants will eventually depart. In this sense then, we preferred to think of the Project not so much as a consultancy but more as an instance of collaborative research and development, under the overall guidance and responsibility of the consultants.

Such a team approach was based on the assumption that control of the project would be vested in a Task Force comprising senior Bhutanese educators and the consultants. This group sought to work by negotiating consensus on the overall plan of the project at the start and periodically reviewing progress. In that sense, it provided advice to the Sub-task Force as and when required. The Sub-Task Force included the two consultants, Mr Wangpo Tenzin, CAPSS and Mr Sangay Jamtsho, NIE (from August 1998 to April 1999).

Through such a collaborative project, it was thus possible to enhance in-country knowledge of, and skills in, educational research in general and inservice education in particular. Consequently in-country infrastructure and expertise was enhanced, especially in terms of the development of (1) research expertise by Mr Wangpo Tenzin and to a lesser extent Mr Sangay Jamtsho and of (2) research infrastructure (electronic software capability).

We understood that this study was just one of several commissioned by the Division of Education, that were in varying stages of progress. In our opinion, it was important that the relationships among those several studies was clearly understood, and that cooperation across studies was maximised. This has, by and large, been achieved as we have had access to recently completed work and to work in progress.

Finally, this project is underpinned by a conviction that there exists a substantial international literature on the issue of educational change and the place of staff development in supporting change. While this proposes some fundamental theoretical constructs upon which the study has been based, considerable care was needed to ensure that it adequately acknowledged the specific Bhutanese context. The in-country knowledge of both local researchers and the local Task Force consequently played a vital role in both conducting the research and developing this Report.

**Project Questions**

The project questions and their related sub-questions, which guided the INSET Project, were suggested by the Project Brief but nevertheless can be seen to follow from the

---

1 A full listing of acronyms can be found on p. 118.
literature reviewed below. The questions addressed in the research phase of the Project were:

1. What are the current INSET practices?
2. What has been the impact of INSET?
3. How might INSET be improved?

To these pivotal questions about the nature of INSET in Bhutan we brought an understanding, from experience, of educational change. This experience is crystallised in the Theoretical Framework that follows.
Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework chosen for this study serves several purposes, the underlying premise being that there is nothing as practical as a good theory. We subscribe to this premise on the grounds that a good theory serves to provide a structure to thinking about the phenomenon to be studied, providing key concepts and relationships to consider at the outset of a study. Accordingly, it presents, for all readers to see, the conceptualisation that we brought to the study and assumptions that inevitably have influenced the questions that we have asked, the meanings we have made of the answers given by respondents, and the recommendations that we have subsequently made. It is, therefore, a centrally important component in the research report and should be critically appraised by anyone seeking to understand the research and its recommendations.

The framework that is outlined below is based heavily upon the work of two main theorists, not because theirs is the only literature pertinent to the INSET study, but because their major works are reasonably accessible to senior Bhutanese educationists in an ongoing way. While we would not normally rely upon such a narrow literature base, in this case we think that this is justified especially since these two works are seminal in their fields.

In considering the research brief, in the context of our understanding of the Bhutanese school system at that time, we judged that our framework would need to embrace at least two main themes. The first was the context of Bhutan as a developing country that is committed to developing its formal, public school system as quickly as possible. The second was that INSET’s role in support of this goal has been, and will continue to be, in essence, the support of educational change. These themes provide the structure to the theoretical framework that is outlined below.

Growth of School Systems in Developing Countries

Our thinking about the nature of curriculum policy and the support of teachers’ work in implementing that policy has been influenced significantly by Beeby’s treatise on school systems in The Quality of Education in Developing Countries (Beeby 1966). In essence, that hypothesis may be summarised as comprising four main propositions (Guthrie 1980b, p.413):

1. There are four stages of growth in a primary school system, identified in order as ‘Dame School’, ‘Formalism’, ‘Transition’ and ‘Meaning’ (see Table 1);

2. movement through these stages is evolutionary, except that overall a school system might begin at the Formalism stage, thence move slowly through the rest, it not being possible to ‘leapfrog’ a stage;

3. the rate of progression through the stages depends upon the ability of the school system’s teachers to implement appropriately the curriculum policy that defines each stage; and
### Table 1. Stages in the Growth of a Primary School System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Dame School</th>
<th>Ill-educated, untrained</th>
<th>Unorganised, relatively meaningless symbols; very narrow subject contents—3 R’s; very low standards; memorizing all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Formalism</td>
<td>Ill-educated, trained</td>
<td>Highly organised; symbols with limited meaning; rigid syllabus, emphasis on 3 R’s; rigid methods—‘one best way’; one textbook; external examinations; inspection stressed; discipline tight and external; memorizing heavily stressed; emotional life largely ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Transition</td>
<td>Better-educated, trained</td>
<td>Roughly the same goals as stage II, but more efficiently achieved; more emphasis on meaning, but it is still rather ‘thin’ and formal; syllabus and textbooks less restrictive, but teachers hesitate to use greater freedom; final leaving examination often restricts experimentation; little in classroom to cater for emotional and creative life of child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Meaning</td>
<td>Well-educated, well-trained</td>
<td>Meaning and understanding stressed; somewhat wider curriculum; variety of content and methods; individual differences catered for; activity methods, problems solving and creativity; internal tests; relaxed and positive discipline; emotional and aesthetic life, as well as intellectual; closer relations with community; better buildings and equipment essential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Beeby, 1966, p.72
4. the capacity of teachers to implement curriculum policy depends upon their confidence in their role, this confidence (or ‘security’ as Beeby 1966, pp.63,67 defines it) being dependent upon the standard of their personal education and the nature of their professional training.

With respect to Guthrie’s reference to ‘objections to the formal properties of the model’ some further comment is needed on some of these, in the context of the INSET study, as they apply to each of the four main propositions.

(i) Criticism of the Validity of the Hypothesis of Stages.

While we are aware of criticisms of the proposition of stages of growth (see for example, Vaizey 1966; Guthrie, 1980a and Beeby 1980a), we also note Guthrie’s acknowledgment that in respect of his observations of classroom practice in Papua New Guinea:

I found (the) description of Formalistic teachers and the reasons for their formalism was by far the best available explanation of what I had seen … Despite my objections to the formal properties of the model, this is still the situation (Guthrie 1980a, p.447).

Over the several years that we have been facilitating the study and research of senior Bhutanese educators through formal courses at the University of New England, these educators have consistently identified with Beeby’s general thesis, leading to our belief in its analytical utility and its congruence with observations. Beeby reported a similar identification by practitioners with his hypothesis (Beeby 1980b, p.455).

Criticism of the validity of the stages is based firstly upon their apparent teleological nature and secondly upon their apparent assumption of an essentially Western view of what is ‘good’ and desirable in education. In response to the latter criticism, Beeby noted that in his view this wasn’t a matter of Western imposition:

In the early 1960s … the mood of poor countries struggling for development was such that what they wanted of the schools was the kind of education that had apparently brought such prosperity to the rich countries of the West. … Their five-year plans called for education in ‘problem-solving’, ‘entrepreneurial skills’, ‘imagination’, ‘creativity and responsibility’ – very much the qualities of my stage of Meaning. They usually demanded also ‘respect for traditions and historical and cultural heritage’, but they didn’t stop to ask if there was any conflict between the two sets of virtues (Beeby 1980a, p.443).

While this might well strike a chord in Bhutan, particularly among educational leaders, it is more appropriately the province of CAPSS (and ultimately of the government) through their review processes than it is of the INSET program, though clearly the two ought to be closely linked. The INSET study is more narrowly focussed upon the provision of support services to teachers as they strive to implement the policies of the day, and so the question of stages and their validity (or not) is not of central concern to this report.

Beeby accepted Guthrie’s judgement that his stages were ‘only convenient labels for “typical” or modal behaviour of teachers at different points of the general and
professional continuum’ (Beeby 1980b, p.454) while previously he had countered the criticisms with the assurance that

The central idea I wanted to get across was that the growth of an educational system cannot be explained simply in terms of quantity and types of school, but involves the gradual development of powers to handle new aims and methods of teaching. It was the nature of growth I was concerned with, and the idea of stages was of secondary concern to me (Beeby 1980a, pp.439-440).

Consequently, we do not regard criticisms of the validity of stages as being a significant impediment to the utility of Beeby's framework for the INSET study. For those interested in Beeby's own shift in thinking, his revised description, on his chart, of the stage of meaning was:

Meaning and understanding stressed, variety of content and method to cater for individual differences; problem-solving plays an increasing part; pupils’ own active thinking and judgement encouraged, and the control of language appropriate to this developed (Beeby 1980b, p.457).

(ii) Evolutionary Growth.

The proposition that all schools evolve slowly from one form to another, as changes in curriculum policy dictate is, however, a matter for more serious consideration within the INSET study. Beeby's statement of this proposition was explicit:

there are certain stages of growth through which all school systems must pass; although a system may be helped to speed up its progress, it cannot leapfrog a stage or major portion of a stage because its position on the scale of development is determined by two factors, the level of general education of the teachers and the amount of training they have received (Beeby 1966, p.69).

While Guthrie subsequently acknowledged that the weight of experience has vindicated Beeby’s emphasis upon ‘gradualism’ he questioned the accuracy of the proposition that it was the teachers’ capabilities alone that determined the speed with which progress could be made (Guthrie 1980b, pp.425,426). And as noted below (see p.16), Beeby acknowledged the validity of that criticism.

(iii) Teachers’ Capabilities and the Rate of Growth.

Column 4 of Beeby's chart entitled ‘Distribution of Teachers’ (see Table 1) is meant to summarise the premises that help us understand why stages cannot be leap-frogged. In essence, Beeby argued that the teaching cadre of any system cannot be assumed to be uniform in terms of their abilities to support curriculum implementation; to do so would be ‘an obvious simplification’ (Beeby 1966, p.70). Instead, it will comprise teachers of varying levels of personal education, professional training. The line A-B-C is meant to illustrate this point, though it doesn’t adequately show the distribution that be encountered. Three hypothetical examples of possible spread might are illustrated below (see Figure 1). Beeby argued that it is up to system administrators to determine the actual distribution (in the form of a profile) that best describes the capabilities of their particular system’s teachers as a background against which to make the appropriate judgements about curriculum policy and associated inservice provisions.
Returning to column 4 of Table 1, the line P-Q-R represents the shift in the overall capacity of the system’s teachers to implement a new curriculum policy after an effective inservice program has been provided over a period of ‘t’ years. By comparison with the A-B-C location on the continuum, the P-Q-R location is further along the continuum towards the most desirable Stage IV. One significant implication of the diversity of teacher capability is that in relation to any particular curriculum innovation, no single inservice program can be assumed to equally meet the needs of all teachers within the system. This is because teachers have differing academic and professional backgrounds, and differing experience.

Beeby emphasised the importance of recognising diversity within the teaching cadre for the wise management of system change.

In both emergent and developed countries many mistakes have been made by administrators, bent on necessary reforms, as a result of their failure to recognise that nothing can make the P-R approximate to a point, that demands can be made on teachers at C that cannot be made on those at A or B. It is possible that, unless the poorer teachers leave the service, the introduction of a teaching reform may even increase the spread between P and R if it enables the best teachers to adopt practices (say at the stage IV level) of which the rest are, for intellectual or other reasons, incapable. The presence of able and progressive teachers in a system is, naturally, to be welcomed since they represent the sole hope of getting changes made, but, especially in a centralised system such as one finds in most emergent countries, a wide distribution of ability and adaptability in the teaching service creates peculiarly difficult administrative problems for the reformer (Beeby 1966, pp.73-74).

He went on to caution that the ‘ultimate skill’ of system administrators is to control advances in curriculum policy so that the majority of teachers can interpret those policies and implement them, rather the just the most able few.

In fact, diversity has to be directly acknowledged, and different inservice programs identified to take these differences into account. Stated alternatively, teachers’ capabilities, and the diversity of those capabilities, must be recognised as a major constraint upon the extent to which change can be sought within a system at any point.
in time. Decisions about curriculum reform should not be made in isolation from this fact, otherwise serious difficulties at the implementation stage will be encountered. The temptation to do so was recognised by Beeby (1980b, p.463):

Many countries want to compress generations of change into a decade. This is a commonplace comment in the literature. What is not so often realized, either in theory or in practice, is that, as a result of this compression, processes that are, by their very nature, successive, must take place simultaneously or almost simultaneously. I suspect that planners' failure to recognize this accounts for the sad history of many national campaigns to improve the quality of education over the past twenty years.

But while Guthrie supported Beeby's proposition of 'gradualness' or evolution of system change, he questioned whether or not Beeby's assumption that teachers' capabilities were the only significant influence upon the rate of change. More specifically, he argued that social and cultural factors also are often constraints upon effective change. In agreeing, Beeby (1980b, p.462) noted that:

All the factors, human and material, that act as constraints on improving education form a complex, interlocking whole – in the modern idiom a system – and it is unreal to treat them, even intellectually, as isolated units (Beeby 1980b, p.462)

As if to emphasise the importance of social and cultural factors in addition to that of teacher capabilities, Beeby made the observation that in subsequent experience he came to understand that 'material problems often obscure the human ones' (Beeby 1980b p.465)

This observation brings a new balance to the consideration of constraints that might inhibit the process of change in any particular situation. While teachers' capabilities are vitally important, so too are contextual factors such as the supply of relevant teaching aids, books, and the physical circumstances (such as class sizes, suitable equipment and materials, and adequate spaces) in which teachers are expected to work.

The implications for the role that any INSET program can play in the growth of a developing school education system, are significant. Put simply, while INSET can support the growth of teachers' knowledge of materials, practices and beliefs that have capacity to transform the teaching-learning process in the classroom, those skills cannot be exercised until the classroom context is conducive. That is, until class sizes are small enough to permit the teachers to work with their students in the manner intended, until accommodation is comfortable and until basic resources such as blackboards and teaching aids are available in every classroom.

(iv) Teachers' Confidence in their Roles.

Much has already been said about teachers' capacities that address their confidence in teaching the syllabuses that are prescribed. What has not been said is that such confidence is not something that can be instilled during pre-service education and expected to endure. Maintaining and developing such confidence further is the major task of inservice education and training. Commenting specifically on inservice education, Beeby (1980b p.466) wrote:

The commonest causes of failure in inservice training for crash programs are:

i. Gross underestimation of the time it takes to change the methods and attitudes of
average and below-average teachers wherever new objectives, as well as new techniques, become necessary, and

ii. A failure to realize the difficulty teachers have of converting theory into practice, and the continuing need there is, over a period of years, for helping them, wherever possible in their own classrooms. Without continuing support and encouragement, the average teacher has a remarkable capacity for reverting to old practices under a new name.

Lest we hasten to dismiss this advice as relating only to ‘crash’ programs in developing countries, we emphasise that this same fundamental conclusion is the essence of Fullan’s (1991) analysis of a wide range of research into educational change in mainly the North American context. In short, Beeby's advice here seems to have a validity that transcends settings: rather, it is an observation about human nature in general in the face of change, and specifically about the way teachers generally react to innovation.

**Educational Change**

Basic to Fullan’s theorising about educational change is that *educational change is a personal learning process* that requires support over time while teachers come to grips with the objective realities of the change.

The purpose of acknowledging the objective reality of change lies in the recognition that there are new policies and programs ‘out there’ and that they may be more or less specific in terms of what they imply for changes in materials, teaching practices and beliefs. The real crunch comes in the relationship between these new programs or policies and the thousands or subjective realities embedded in people’s individual and organizational contexts and their personal histories. How these subjective realities are addressed or ignored is crucial for whether potential changes become meaningful at the level of individual use and effectiveness. It is perhaps worth repeating that changes in actual practice along the three dimensions – in materials, teaching approaches and beliefs, in what people do and think – are essential if the intended outcome is to be achieved (Fullan 1991 p.43).

Some explanation of the notions of ‘objective reality’ and ‘subjective reality’ of a change is now needed.

The notion of ‘objective reality’ of an educational change is that each has certain identifying characteristics that can be categorised under one or more of three main categories: *materials, teaching practices and beliefs*. Simple changes, such as the introduction of a new text book (a new material) might not imply any changes in either teaching practices or beliefs about the educative process whereas a more complex change, such as the introduction of the NAPE in Bhutan, most clearly carries implications for all three. To the extent that we can agree upon these defining characteristics of the change, then its objective reality is established.

The notion of ‘subjective reality’ recognises that at the individual level each teacher will interpret the implications of the change’s materials, practices and underpinning beliefs for them in an idiosyncratic way, hence the reference to each person’s ‘organisational context’ and ‘personal history’. Accepting the individuality of teachers leads us directly to the conclusion that those responsible for introducing a change into the school system cannot assume that their personal understandings of that change will be shared by the vast majority of the teachers who are being asked to implement it. Rather, these
implementers will need to learn how to work out the meaning of the change as part of deciding how best to incorporate it into their teaching. This cannot be assumed to be a simple process, a point emphasised in the following extract.

No one can resolve the crisis of reintegration on behalf of another. Every attempt to pre-empt conflict, argument, protest by rational planning can only be abortive: however reasonable the proposed changes, the process of implementing them must still allow the impulse of rejection to play itself out. When those who have power to manipulate changes act as if they have only to explain, and when their explanations are not at once accepted, shrug off opposition as ignorance or prejudice, they express a profound contempt for the meaning of lives other than their own. For the reformers have already assimilated these changes to their purposes, and worked out a reformulation which makes sense to them, perhaps through months or years of analysis and debate. If they deny others the chance to do the same, they treat them as puppets dangling by the threads of their own conceptions (Marris, 1975 in Fullan 1991, p.31).

Fullan further suggests that while it is not at all clear about how best to assist implementers achieve the necessary reintegration of the change with their existing assumptions and practices, two principles can be identified. First, any assistance, such as inservice, should be provided on a continuous basis while teachers are striving to implement the change. The corollary to this proposition is that

One-shot workshops prior to and even during implementation are not very helpful (Fullan 1991, p.85).

It follows that an extended time frame is required over which such inservice should be conducted, as much as two or three years or more for specific innovations and more for system-wide changes (Fullan 1991, p.107).

Second, any new beliefs should be discussed only after some experience with implementation has been gained. Early implementation should focus upon the place and use of new materials in conjunction with any new classroom practices that the change implies. If this experience of the change is positive, then the teacher will begin to reconceptualise, that is, change practices and beliefs. In a related point to both of these principles, it is important to give teachers the confidence to take risks by trying new practices, thereby having experiences that may lead to them changing their beliefs.

**Pressure and Support**

The continuous basis for assistance is provided through a combination of both pressure and support. It is normal for people to resist change, especially teachers whose work-world is already busy and structured, so some pressure for change is needed. Typically this comes in the form of new policy directives or suggestions from central agencies such as the inspectorate or from superordinates such as Head Teachers, but Fullan (1991, p.91) warns that if such demands are placed on teachers without accompanying supports, then resistance and even alienation can result. On the other hand, if support is made available, for example through the provision of resources, without adequate direction, then waste and aimlessness can result.
Turning more specifically to the implementation of specific changes, some guidelines are available in relation to the characteristics of the change, the local characteristics that prevail and the effect of central influences.

(i) Characteristics of the Change

Where Beeby's discussion of the change process took mainly a macro or system-level view, Fullan’s analysis extends the focus downwards to also include a focus upon specific characteristics of a change that might either inhibit or encourage implementation. These characteristics might usefully be used as a check-list of issues to address by those designing changes and those conducting inservice programs in support of them.

(a) Need

If a proposed change is easily recognised by teachers as addressing an important need then it is more likely to be implemented (Fullan 1991, p.69). Of course, this raises the question of ‘who determines the needs?’ The point is that desirable changes from the point of view of Headquarters, for example, might not be desirable by teachers in the inservice workshop.

(b) Clarity

Even if agreement exists about the need for a change, it is also important that clarity exists about both the goals of the change and the means by which it is to be achieved (Fullan 1991, pp.70, 71). In terms of the objective reality of the change, and with the idea that beliefs are more likely to change in the wake of positive experiences with the change in practice, clarity about the nature of the new materials and practices of the change need to be established.

(c) Complexity

‘Complexity refers to the difficulty and extent of change required of the individuals responsible for implementation’ (Fullan 1991 pp.71, 72). In large measure this reflects the extent to which change is required in terms of materials, practices and beliefs. Perhaps the most obvious example of a complex change in the Bhutanese system in recent times is the adoption of the NAPE, where all three dimensions are in play. Clearly, the more complex a change is, the more challenging it will be to implement, and the more sustained the inservice support program will need to be. Off-setting the costs of this extended support, however, is the promise that more extensive change will be achieved.

When insufficient support is provided for the learning that is necessary, the risk is ‘false clarity’ in which teachers dismiss the change as something that they already are doing, that is, they think that they know but in fact have not really engaged the essence of the change. While such teachers might experience a sense of satisfaction in their state of false clarity, others experience the frustration, anxiety and sense of incompetence that accompanies ‘painful unclarity’ (Fullan 1991, pp.34-36).
(d) Practicality

This notion is definable at both the classroom level and the system level, both having implications for the management of change, including inservice education and training. At the classroom level, a change is practical if it meets a recognized need and can be implemented within the teacher’s current school situation, and is defined in terms of ‘concrete how-to-do-it’ advice. At the system level, Fullan (1991 p.72) draws attention to circumstances under which the decision to adopt and implement the change were made:

Inadequate quality and even the simple unavailability of materials and other resources can result when adoption decisions are made on grounds of political necessity, or even on grounds of perceived need without the follow-up or preparation time necessary to generate adequate materials. Ambitious projects are nearly always politically driven. As a result the time line between the initiation decision and start-up is typically too short to attend to matters of quality.

The persistent theme that permeates both these levels of consideration is that practicality of a change is closely determined by the extent to which implementers are supported, in concrete terms, while they explore and learn about the new materials and practices of that change. The implication for inservice programs is clear.

(ii) Local Characteristics

The factors listed here describe key elements of the context of the school within which teachers strive to make meaning of the changes they are asked, or directed, to implement. Consequently, these too, provide further insights into the complexity of the implementation process and possible avenues by which inservice programs can be made more effective.

(a) Teachers

In referring to teachers as factors within the local environment, we are not challenging the fundamental proposition that they are central to change: without teacher change there is no educational change. Rather, since change is such an individual process, interactions among teachers are a potentially powerful influence upon the success or failure of change. However, the realities of ‘classroom press’ mean that teachers have few routine opportunities to interact with each other, or with other adults (Fullan 1991, pp.33, 34). And when they do, their most effective source of assistance is other teachers, followed by administrators and then specialists (Fullan 1991, p.120).

These tendencies suggest that, where possible, inservice activities should make use of competent teachers as resource persons, at least this is the case in North America. Beyond that, it also suggests that inservice designs that maximize teacher interaction are preferable to those using other forms of delivery.

(b) The District and its Administrators

The more that teachers or others have had negative experiences with previous implementation attempts in the district or elsewhere, the more cynical or apathetic they will be about the next change presented regardless of the merit of the new idea or
program (Fullan 1991, p.74). The implication here is that teachers’ subjective realities are shaped in part by their previous experiences within the system to predispose them, one way or the other, towards current change attempts. For the managers of change, knowledge of this innovation history is useful in alerting them to the likely responses of teachers to current change proposals.

Where system-wide changes are being promoted, such as Integrated Science, it is also known that the behaviour of senior system personnel is monitored by teachers as a means of determining whether or not it is important to try to implement those changes. If tangible support is being provided by these personnel then teachers are likely to read that as a signal that the change in question is important and that they should strive to implement it. In short, it is desirable that the several agencies of pressure and support for change within a system be coordinated to reinforce each other to minimise the chances of ‘mixed messages’ about the importance of the change being conveyed to teachers. Without such coordination, it is possible that the effectiveness of inservice programs will be prejudiced before they have begun.

(c) The Head Teacher

Head Teachers are expected by their teachers to be active supporters of their change efforts, though not necessarily as instructional or change leaders, and failure to do so is likely to be read by teachers as a sign that the change is not important. On the other hand, if the Head Teacher learns enough about the change to be able to offer support and encouragement to teachers and backs that up with efforts to procure necessary resources, then teachers will most likely interpret that as a sign that the change is important. Fullan (1991, p.168) concluded that there were two ‘stand-out’ features of the behaviour of effective Head Teachers:

They showed an active interest by spending time talking with teachers, planning, helping teachers get together, and being knowledgeable about what was happening. And they all figured out ways of reducing the amount of time spent on routine administrative matters; they made sure that change had an equal priority.

Perhaps the most compelling implication of this insight for inservice programs is that Head Teachers themselves should be targeted as key people within the system whose learning about the nature of any educational changes that their schools are being asked to engage. In addition, it is clear that Head Teachers must see themselves firstly as educational leaders, in the broad sense rather than in the narrower, instructional sense, and secondly as administrators.

(iii) External Factors

Just as the local factors noted above affect the context in which teachers deal with change, so too do those more remote, central agencies. In centralised school systems it is the central administration in which budgets and educational policy decisions are determined, such as syllabus revisions, changes to the examination system and to the inspectorate. As Beeby’s framework illustrates, these three agencies are the key means by which curriculum policy and change is controlled. They are also the most remote from the daily lives of the teachers and as Fullan (1991, p.79) observes:
We have a classic case of two entirely different worlds – the policy-maker on the one hand and the local practitioner on the other hand. … To the extent that each side is ignorant of the subjective world of the other, reform will fail – and the extent is great.

He goes on to suggest that to date these two groups have not successfully worked out how to communicate effectively in the ongoing, “processual” manner that is needed if change is to be effectively implemented. By this is meant the appropriate integration of centrally provided stimulus and support with the local factors discussed above. Achieving a measure of such integration is the challenge for central administrators and the inservice support agencies that they provide. As Fullan (1991, p.92) concludes:

In summary, the broad implications of the implementation process have several interrelated components. The first is that the crux of change involves the development of meaning in relation to a new idea, program, reform or set of activities. But it is *individuals* who have to develop new meaning, and these individuals are insignificant parts of a gigantic, loosely organized, complex, messy social system that contains myriad different subjective worlds.

This is a sobering message, and it is an accompaniment to the powerful previously cited quote from Marris, for it emphasises that the management of educational change within a school system is not a simple matter that can be modelled by rules to be followed closely by automatons.

It follows then that the ideas encompassed by this framework should be selectively used as principles by which inservice education and training programs are devised and conducted. However, it is important that all such strategies be regarded as hypotheses to be tested and adjustments made in the light of what works best in Bhutan. If there is anything approaching a rule in any of this, it relates to the central place of teachers as the means by which change is achieved.
Context of INSET & Selected Literature

In this description of the contextual background to INSET, we provide historical notes and perceptions as well as a description of the present policies and reports that have an impact upon this INSET Report. Broadly the selected literature that follows fall into two categories; literature relating to Bhutan and research about inservice in Bhutan. First, the historical context of INSET provides an interesting backdrop to the findings of this Report and its recommendations.

Historical Background

It seems that the earliest NBIP-type workshops in 1984 were in agriculture, but the greatest infusion of effort into this kind of inservice was in support of NAPE from 1987. Reports from that period give a strong sense of the kind of ‘conferences’ that were conducted. Large numbers of teachers were involved for from 15-30 days with groups participating in activity-based learning and rotating every few days. Even from these early days the need for support for teachers once they were back in the schools was recognised, not only in the form of Dzongkhag Resource Teachers (DRTs) that were more available then but through staff meetings. Poor attendance at this first conference (N=193 representing 77% of those expected) was noted and the reasons given were ‘late appointment/transfer, interviews and invigilation, and personal difficulties’ (RGOB 1987, p.10ff). The 1989 conference included the feature of many teachers from the same school attending (N=153 over 15 days) and many Head Teachers were also there (N=19)

so they [could] give appropriate professional/academic supervision to all teachers in his/her staff but with emphasis upon the NAPE teachers by giving him/her an understanding of the role of resource teachers and the importance of him/her leading the team within a program of staff development for him/herself and the teachers in the school. (RGOB 1989, p.2).

The third conference was run on similar lines, again with resource person training for a week before hand (RGOB 1990). A feature of the NAPE series of conferences was their length (up to 30 days), their developmental nature and the strategic thinking that went into them. The Coordinator of NAPE at the time had this to say in a recent interview:

It was a new philosophy with new principles, new directions, and the inservice programs were in the conceptual framework for the whole development of the program. Since we had very well developed documents of how we envisaged the whole development of the NAPE program, we had worked out carefully as to where would the workshops fit in and the need or the purpose of the workshop. So, it was already there in our strategic planning, and that helped us to facilitate these workshops.

She went on to say, in relation to the NAPE initiatives and the inservice in support of those initiatives,

definitely it was a centrally governed change. In fact the first and the second workshops were more or less geared [to that] realizing what would be the basic needs of the
teachers in the system. But the later ones were more … need-based workshops when the teachers were able to give us information on areas of their needs and concerns.

Some NAPE teachers did do things differently. The quotation below bears this out and the importance of the support received and given needs to be noted.

When we came back that time we were quite fresh and I really took initiative in teaching classrooms. We had one VSA teacher also here and the two of us, I was not officially counterpart for her, but she said that I should be counterpart for her, whatever she was doing I was helping her and what I was doing she was helping me. We really did something. That time we were in old school down there. … Whatever we taught in the classroom it was quite effective. Our result was not poor because whatever was taught in the classroom, in the evaluation time our children were really doing something. You know, pass percentage was quite good (NAPE teacher).

The NAPE workshops were clearly important in the history of INSET in Bhutan. However, they were not always entirely successful, as one experienced educator pointed out.

We had a mixed group of participants ranging from immediate graduates from the training institutes and also teachers who had been in the field for a time. So, the skill-based training in those days was received almost, say, not very enthusiastically by most of the older teachers but very enthusiastically by the people who have recently graduated and then they were very interested. ... In the training camp teachers were made to sit down like children when we were practicing the skills especially. And I think that came across with some of the older ones who did not like it and I thought later on when we organized that type of training camp in Punakha we changed some of the ways. We had a small activity and then we held lots of discussion at that kind of thing later on. That seemed to be more beneficial for teachers and they tended to understand better.

A participant too was critical of the early NBIPs, though not of NAPE in this instance.

During early 90s I think the objective of the workshop whatever the organizers have framed could not be identified by the participants. Many participants gathered there and participants [identified] different issues and those issues were really discussed [amongst] ourselves.

Others indicated that practices could be improved. For example, as a result of talking to teachers and Head Teachers in nine Bhutanese schools, McBeath and Adhikari (McBeath and Adhikari 1990?) observed ‘teachers have a strong desire to be able to share experiences and meet together on a regular basis to exchange ideas’. Teachers thought that general refresher courses would also be useful. Subject teachers wanted contact with other teachers in their subjects and subject associations were mentioned (p.1). ‘A number of teachers suggested that they should be asked to provide their own topics for inservice’ (p.3) over workshops whose length varies from 5 to 23 days. Others suggested a series of short meetings would be best (p.4). ‘Principals and Heads need to have workshops on how to initiate, encourage, and conduct professional development’, they recommended (p.4). ‘At the national level there was too much lecturing and talking by one person. There were too many people and thus the groups were too large’, they found (p.6). Follow-up was suggested in a number of ways: a session, a visit by resource persons, correspondence and by acting as a resource person for others in the school (McBeath & Adhikari 1990, p.6).
McBeath, in a separate paper, points out that in implementation of NBIPs as distinct from workshop delivery, attention needs to be directed to preparing for follow-up during the inservice course, towards the end so that people are encouraged to begin the translation of ideas to their own setting. A commitment to act is sometimes important to elicit. Once back in the classroom follow-up is required by Head Teachers, DEOs and consultants. What is needed, according to McBeath, is what Joyce calls coaching at the classroom level. Perhaps newsletters and questionnaires could also be used, he suggests (McBeath 1990, p.10-11). Taking a similar line, the Combined Inspection Reports for 1996 (RGOB 1997b) provided this overview:

More focussed, need-based and systematically delivered refresher training to update teachers’ general teaching skills through properly developed INSET master-plan (NBIP/SBIP package) need to be given.

I’Anson (1996), a retiring DRT, reported but from the perspective of flexibility of teachers’ practices.

Teachers appear confident and competent in implementing the activities in the manuals for Class PP to VI [but need to be] encouraged to adopt, select and change the manuals’ activities to match the abilities of their students more closely.

These and other comments made by teachers from the McBeath and Adhikari research back in 1990 and others more recently foreshadow many of the findings of the present study. However, during this time the overall judgement of a number of senior educators and observers was that the NBIPs of those times were making a difference. They were indeed having an impact because changes could be seen in schools and classrooms.

Dzongkhag Based Inservice Programs (DBIP) did function during the middle of the 1990s alongside NBIPs and SBIPs for a short time. Regarding DBIPs, one key person had this to say

I don’t really know why they got locked out of the policy in kind of the overall structure. From my point of view they do several things; they get people together, people that know one another, supposedly work together [and] are able to be supportive if [they] have troubles and it makes a team out of the Dzongkhag. I do not know why the policy has gone against them. I think that it is a very useful level. … It is local resource people who can be of assistance to the younger and upcoming teachers in the Dzongkhag. … It is also a bit unmanageable at the national level but when you are dealing with a smaller number of schools at the Dzongkhag base level you can see that it might be doable.

Some insight into the DBIP issue was provided by another key person.

If Dzongkhag education offices have better capacity in terms of the staffing, transport (and) their professional ability to organise these, then I think that [DBIP] will work. But right now our Dzongkhag Education Office needs to improve in terms of the staffing because in many cases they are just one person in the Office and they cannot do anything. Until that capability is built we cannot talk about DBIPs.

DBIPs were not part of INSET during this study but SBIPs, on the other hand, were. SBIPs started earlier than the DBIPs. They were in their infancy at the time of the McBeath and Adhikari (1990, p.2) study. Their comments are interesting since they are very early views on SBIP.
School-based inservice was seen as advantageous but some [teachers] thought that some staffs were not ready and that there were not people to lead the process but Head Teachers might be trained for this. Staff development should be differentiated from staff meetings. Many teachers thought that the district level was appropriate for inservice so that teachers could meet for interaction, especially for small schools.

SBIPs were encouraged as a form of staff development at the school level.

It was introduced into Bhutan as part of a program for developing a sustainable school improvement system. … Most schools carried out SBIP as a mandate. However, many teachers found it difficult to accept that they could gain from sharing their ideas with each other from such a forum. Most of the teachers stuck to the traditional idea of a training being given by an outside expert. Some schools even found it difficult to start any form of SBIP. … Those schools which did carry out some form of SBIP, usually shared the ideas gained from NBIP/DBIP. Normally this was an end to it (Chhetri et al. 1995, p.7).

However, the 1996 Combined Inspection Report (RGOB 1997b, p.107) observed of the Central Region of Bhutan that the ‘SBIP is beginning to help teachers to improve their instructional skills [but] few schools have even thought of long-term development plans’. So SBIP was present in schools though the strategic planning of it into longer termed development was not evident.

Intervision was a specialised form of SBIP, the early ideas for which came from the PITT Phase II in July 1993 (RGOB 1997a p.3). Intervision is a cycle in the school where ‘in teams of 3-4, pre-planning, teaching and observation and discussion [are] meant to be built into SBIP as a way of trying out the input and subsequently discussing it at the school level’ (Chhetri et al 1995, p.7). There was some pressure here for teachers to try new ideas. They go on:

Professional input initiates SBIP. It presumes some need identified by the school initially or ideas from the previous SBIP round. Input can be by a teacher after an NBIP, a teacher who has an idea, a teacher who has read of an idea, input by DEO, NIE, TTC, etc, a teacher from another school with expertise (pp.8-9). Intervision, which is central to the SBIP cycle, is a technique of sharing and learning from each other in an atmosphere of mutual trust and friendship. It is a way of promoting personal and professional development of our teachers and enhancing learning in our schools (p.16).

Roles for the Head Teacher, the DRT, the DEO, the Inspector, and the curriculum officer are set out in this small but useful publication (Chhetri et al 1995). The review of Intervision (RGOB 1997d, p.6) noted:

After the final edition, the [SBIP] Handbook was printed and distributed to all schools and institutes in Bhutan for implementation and feedback. During 1996 and 1997 the school Inspectors followed up and supported the development and growth of SBIP in schools.

The four Intervision trial schools have been the subjects of a review (RGOB 1995c) and a more comprehensive study by Thinley (1999). Both of these studies make it clear that Intervision is possible, though difficult, to achieve.

Two final comments give an impression of the situation immediately prior to this INSET study.
One of the striking similarities that we observe in our schools both old and young is that whether they are in rural schools or in urban school, most follow the age-old teaching method “chalk and talk”. Teaching is still highly teacher centred all over the country. Classes are mostly always confined to the four walls of the classroom (RGOB 1997b, p.2).

This does not paint a strong picture of the impact of INSET, but Goldsmith (1997) puts another perspective. His retiring report as DRT in Pemagatsel Dzongkhag indicated that the most important work he did was to provide moral support to teachers and the recognition of their efforts. He makes the point that it is difficult to sustain developments when the staff turnover is high. DRT work had been taken up with a range of advice, for example, on how to manage large numbers of students, sometimes up to 80 in a class. He concludes:

There are many teachers who take their responsibilities to King, country and their students very seriously. … These teachers deserve respect, support and above all, some praise.

**Current Policies**

Over time, policies and practices regarding INSET have developed. One of the most often repeated ideas, such that it appears to have become policy, is that articulated in an interview. ‘Teachers who attend the NBIPs should carry ideas and experiences shared by other colleagues and then go back to their schools and share with their colleagues through SBIPs’. This is because  

each year everybody in the school cannot come therefore everybody that comes to a course should go back and do SBIP courses with their colleagues. With that knowledge another colleague is not waiting for two or three years until his or her turn comes.

The assumption is that ‘a senior colleague who has attended the course this year should be able to share the same with his or her other colleagues … so that development [and] that impact goes on to everybody in the school’ (key person). If this were an effective mechanism it would be relatively cheap.

Policy was usually transmitted to staff through the Educational Policy Guidelines and Instructions (EPGI). In the Fifteenth EPGI, certain guidelines and reasons regarding INSET were introduced in May 1995 in order to  

bring in the necessary fine-tuning … to make such training programs more cost effective and sustainable [by]: (1) Number of inservices are reduced to a bare minimum to include NBIP and SBIP; (2) a teacher can only attend one NBIP per year; (3) participation is by invitation or confirmation of acceptance; (4) a teacher must average one inservice program during two years and is required to undertake one every three years (RGOB 1995a).

NBIPs are held almost exclusively in the winter because this is the only period when large blocks of time are available to accommodate large numbers of NBIPs, some of which are quite long. As we have seen, each teacher is required to attend one inservice every three years, but the
policy of one NBIP in three years gets translated into a minimum in practice though because of the Headquarters demands for teacher/librarians, PE, counselling, reproductive health and scouting some teachers may attend sometimes more than one in any year (Key person).

This will be the case in small schools when the requirement is that every school send a participant. Inevitably there will be clashes.

In the Seventeenth EPGI a number of important and interesting positions were made clear to schools. The first appears to follow the decentralisation principle that is being introduced throughout all levels of governance in Bhutan but is also indicates a reality of the burgeoning number of schools and the priority of putting teachers in front of classes (rather than in support positions).

It is unrealistic to expect the Headquarters or the Dzongkhags to provide answers to all the issues. … It has become increasingly evident that the most effective and lasting solution to many of our problems lies with the teachers and the heads of schools RGOB 1997c, p.2

There was also a reminder to schools about the importance of SBIP and that it aims at professional development of teachers in the ‘most sustainable, convenient and cost-effective manner’ (p.9).

In the Eighteenth EPGI (March 1999), the following extracted points are important to a developing system of education, most noticeably the first point.

His Majesty raised the salary of teachers by 15% for PTC, 30% for Secondary and 45% for lecturers. There is a hope for more and better qualified candidates attracted into the teaching profession. It is also hoped that the existing teachers will “be motivated to work even harder in the field” (RGOB 1999b, p.1).

Informal discussions with two senior NIE and Sherubtse staff members in October 1999 in Thimphu for enrolment interviews indicated that, indeed, more and better qualified PGCE candidates had presented themselves for interviews. In the same Eighteenth EPGI, in relation to schools,

enrolment grew by 9.5% i.e., 6.7% primary, 25.6% junior high and 32.1% for high school! (p.2). The budget increase over 1997-8 financial year is 58.44% (p.3). His Majesty commanded that values education as a formal subject be introduced in all schools from the 1999 academic session (p.6). With the objective of streamlining selection for promotion and professional advancement, the Education Division will be introducing a Career Ladder for the Teaching Cadre. A committee has been formed to implement this’ (p.7). Capacity building at the Dzongkhag Educational level was mentioned (RGOB 1999b, Annex 1, p.3).

Following concerns at the 2nd Ed Conference, the purpose of the lengthened flexible mid term break was clarified. It is ‘to enable children to help their parents during the peak farming season and in case of children from urban schools to help them keep in touch with the rural background of the country’ (RGOB 1999b, p.8). So, the policy on summer vacation timing is that schools can vary them. This does make it difficult to plan NBIPs for this period but it could be possible for more localised inservice to take place.
We can see from the points immediately above that INSET has a number of pressures placed upon it by the Headquarters and also a number of potential support mechanisms that could be readily incorporated into strategic planning. Some pressure is also evident from CAPSS. In one of their Newsletters, perhaps in the form of promoting policy, (RGOB 1998) makes it clear what the expectations are.

The Education Division will, therefore, expect all our teachers to dedicate themselves fully to their profession, play a role model of all the values they are supposed to impart and put the interests of the students and the country above all else. … We will also continue to focus on the further development of our teacher’s capabilities.

In summary, NBIPs are the major form of INSET. Certainly this is where the INSET funding for inservice inside Bhutan largely goes. As a key person observed:

a lot of the teachers are young. I think that any form of support like inservice is crucial to the education system especially to very isolated teachers. I think again it is a social event where they realise that they are not the only ones in the ball game.

In what follows, some recent work provides a research base for understanding INSET a little better. Although not large, these research projects provide important information to the Education Division and for our INSET Report. We summarise those parts that are directly relevant.

Selected Literature

The first of the five documents that are discussed below sets out the Government’s vision of the growth and development in Bhutan in the next two decades.

(i) ‘Bhutan 2020’

The very recent publication Bhutan 2020 sets out parameters for the development of broad sectors of Bhutanese life over the next 20 years. In so doing it establishes what are described as Bhutan’s development assets as a series of statements:

We have built unity out of diversity; … We take quiet pride in our independence; … Unity and development would have been impossible without the continuity and vision that have been bestowed upon our nation by the institution of a hereditary monarchy; … Our approach to development has been shaped by the beliefs and values of the faith we have held for more than 1,000 years. Firmly rooted in our rich tradition of Mahayana Buddhism, the approach stresses, not material rewards, but individual development, sanctity of life, compassion for others, respect for nature, social harmony, and the importance of compromise. … Our development has been able to draw upon our strong tradition of self-reliance, self-sufficiency and self-organization. … We are a strong-willed, disciplined and law abiding people with a respect for authority and honest leadership. … The development of our society has traditionally been and “inclusive” process. … We are not only a hard-working but also an enterprising people. … The enterprise and skills of our people have been matched by the soundness and the wisdom of the policies we have pursued. … Our approach to development has led us to emphasize the importance of institutions that are able to guide and manage the process of development as well as foster participation. … The values underlying our approach to development have meant that we, unlike many of other developing countries, stand on the threshold of a new century with our natural environment largely intact. … We
have been assisted by others in our efforts to modernize and transform our nation (RGOB 1999a, p.20-24).

Such assets will be needed when, as testimony to Bhutan’s development, the Planning Commission (RGOB 1999a, p.85) notes that the dependence upon aid ‘will change dramatically when new large hydro-power schemes come on stream in 2006 and thereafter’. INSET will thus be directly affected since it is largely funded via donors if, of course, this target is met.

Of three conclusions based upon the review of progress since modernisation began, one is particularly relevant for consideration in any discussion of inservice of teachers, namely,

from our traditional perspective, poverty and underdevelopment should not be defined only in terms of the absence of wealth but also in terms of the persistence of ignorance and prejudice (RGOB 1999a, p.25).

Consistent with this conclusion is the human development objective ‘to maximise the happiness of all Bhutanese and to enable them to achieve their full and innate potential as human beings’ (RGOB 1999a, p.47). Teachers will have a fundamental role here. However this objective is brought into strong relief with the Planning Commission’s own projections.

Bhutan’s demographic transition will mean that the growth in the demand for jobs will far exceed the rate of population growth. In the next five years alone, around 50,000 young people will leave school and enter the labour force and five years from now more than 100,000 children will be enrolled in primary school, with around 60,000 young people in secondary education (RGOB 1999a, p.29).

This compares strikingly with the current primary and secondary combined population of 100,000. It means that approximately 1500 additional teachers will be required (currently there are approximately 2500) if the present average class size of around 40 is maintained. Coupled with the larger school populations is the projected urban migration and the inevitable problems that such migration brings to the nation (RGOB 1999a, p.29-310) and to its teachers. Despite these concerns, the Planning Commission urges:

universal enrolment in primary and junior high schools (Class 8) is now within our reach. Although universal enrolment at high schools will take longer, it is a target that must be pursued with the greatest urgency.

In fact a milestone for the Education Division is the achievement of full enrolment at junior high school by 2007. It is thus very likely that the education system will continue to expand dramatically. To the already difficult resource problems, social problems are likely to be added to the difficulties that teachers face. INSET planning should be mindful of these projections.

The Planning Commission (RGOB 1999a, p.52-4) then goes on to identify a series of priorities that provide the background to teachers’ work in the next five to seven years and beyond. (1) Basic education will be extended to cover all young people, ‘with appropriate incentives to work in remote areas’. (2) Efforts will be made to improve the quality of basic education. ‘Education must be guided by a holistic concept based upon
the total development of the child ... [which] must be progressively applied throughout the nation’. There is a need to break the ‘association that appears to exist in the minds of many young people that manual work and skilled trades are the reserve of the illiterate and a sign of “backwardness”’. Regular data are needed via monitoring and review so that the curriculum can change responsively. (3) ‘The attainment of the above will be dependent upon our capacity to train teachers who are not only highly professional in their approach to education but also motivated and dedicated to the profession they have chosen’. (4) Educational innovation can be enhanced by information technology changes sweeping Bhutan, for example, in distance education. As noted in (3) above, INSET will take a major role if these strategies are to be successful and a theme running through them is the development of a professionalism of teachers which includes a commitment to life-long learning and teaching as a service to the community.

A further issue that is relevant to inservice in Bhutan is the long standing development initiated and supported over a considerable time by the Druk Gyalpo. Decentralisation of governance is most likely to have an impact upon education as district and regional personnel develop skills and power within the communities. Consistent with the trend to decentralisation, Dzongkhags are likely to gain block grants (although no time-line projections are offered) so that Dzongkhags ‘will have the authority to decide on how such grants should be used’ (RGOB 1999a, p.82).

(ii) The Hughes Report

The production of Bhutan 2020 was timely for this Report and there are also two reviews contemporaneous with this INSET study. They are the Review of Class VI and Class VIII Examinations (Hughes 1998) and the review of the curriculum that is chaired by the Director of CAPSS. The latter is nearing completion. A third review, of continuous assessment, has yet to be completed. Data from the first two reviews, relevant to the present study, are set out below.

The Hughes et al ‘impact analysis’ was based upon interviews of teachers and Head Teachers from ten schools in the west of Bhutan and from 28 possible schools who returned a questionnaire from the east of Bhutan. Interviews were also undertaken at TTC, Paro, BBE, CAPSS, and EMSS. Data was analysed by determining themes. They advised on the future of roles of the Class VI and Class VIII examinations. In relation to INSET, they found that ‘Only in rare instances is there any evidence of Continuous Assessment being linked to the on-going monitoring of learning for the purpose of helping the student learn better’ (Hughes et al. 1998, p.40), yet there have been inservice courses on continuous assessment. We take this to be a serious misunderstanding of the nature of continuous assessment by teachers in schools.

External examination results can be used for diagnostic purposes. We agree with Hughes et al (1998, p.53) that analyses of the external examination results at the school level would enable ‘schools to identify the strengths and weaknesses of students’ performance in each of the examined subjects and thereby establish priorities for both curriculum development and inservice’. We note too their observation that ‘the influence of the external examination also can be seen in its important role in directing teachers’ attention to important elements of the curriculum and to its motivating power
for both teachers and students’ (Hughes et al. 1998, p.41-2). On its own this observation is potentially important, but when taken in concert with an analysis of examination results at the national level (Hughes et al. 1998, p.53), the use of examinations to assist in the direction of teacher development can be extremely powerful. At the least, ‘the results of such an analysis [at the national level] can clearly be of value to CAPSS and the EMSS in directing the sort of assistance that can be provided to schools and teachers’. Such assistance could be via NBIPs. Thus the development of external examination items is a potential ally for INSET and is a reason why coordination of effort is essential at the headquarters level (Hughes et al. 1998, p.59). As Hughes et al (1998, p.67ff) point out, INSET will be required for teachers and staff at headquarters to develop an understanding of the formative purposes of analyses of results and how to undertake them, but this effort would be a good investment.

(iii) The Curriculum Review

The Curriculum Review (Dorji 1999) though still not quite complete at the time of writing, provides considerable insight into the nature of a range of aspects associated with INSET. Based upon an item analysis from a questionnaire responded to by over 200 randomly selected teachers and head teachers, 58.7% indicated that they had attended INSET in recent years but from these data it is evident that greater than 40% had not! Nearly 90% agreed or strongly agreed that ‘inservice courses have improved my skills in teaching’. In response to the item ‘there are opportunities in the school to update my subject knowledge’, 70% agreed or strongly agreed, but how they could do this under present circumstances is unknown and may be a good example of a response set in these data. An analysis of a broad factor, Teacher Education based on nine items containing pre- and inservice items as well as those concerning professionalism, indicated that females viewed Teacher Education more highly than males, Bhutanese viewed it more highly than non-Bhutanese, and primary teachers were more positive than their secondary colleagues.

Dorji’s recommendations in the Curriculum Review are wide ranging. The ones that follow have direct relevance to INSET.

1. Rather than spending more resources for one-shot inservice programs to orient teachers in winter, graded and regular inservice programs for teachers may be considered.

2. Acquisition of certificates of the inservice courses could become a requirement for the teachers to get their promotion.

4. Reading materials for teachers may help to improve their knowledge. Now that the Druknet will be expanding in most parts of the Kingdom, our high schools, resource centres, and junior high schools can be given this facility. Meanwhile provision for procuring library books for teachers in the resource centres should be explored.

5. Inservice training programs need to be systematised for teachers to attend. To sustain the programs in the long run, it may also be considered that teachers need to value them. If inservice programs are organised based on the need of the teachers, they may place value on it.
There is a strong feeling that distance education programs should be enhanced in order to provide professional development of the teachers. Use of information technology in providing distance education to our teachers will need to be considered.

Support in terms of materials required for teaching learning purposes need to be provided without fail, if the teachers are to improve their performance.

Regular monitoring and visiting by the staff from the Headquarters, especially from CAPSS, is a must particularly during the initial stage of implementing a new syllabus or program.’

Teachers should be given more support to improve their teaching. Instead of massive national-based inservice programs, some alternatives need to be explored, such as limiting the national-based inservice programs to selected teachers and strengthen the Intervision cycle in the schools through school-based inservice programs.’

Increasing capacity at the Dzongkhag education sector needs to be given top priority for proper monitoring of any program.

Improvement is also urgently needed in the supply of teachers as well as teaching learning materials and furniture.

While the criteria currently used for selecting head teachers need to be reviewed, regular training of head teachers in management and leadership would be a good investment.

It is interesting to note that Dorji’s (1999) findings on the formal curriculum include amongst others: its relevance, but vastness of syllabuses, and difficulties with Maths and English. Poor English abilities of teachers will impede their understanding/interpretation of ‘curriculum instructions and other materials’, he argued. The recommendations are an interesting perspective upon a number of issues that we address in this report.

(iv) The Thinley Research

The Hughes Report and the Curriculum Review are the two very recent sources of data, independent from the present study, which address INSET issues. Another study completed recently by Thinley (1999) developed four case studies of schools undertaking Intervision, with varying degrees of success. It is helpful to think of Intervision as a process fitting under the SBIP umbrella. Thinley made a series of recommendations concerning Intervision itself but his work provided the impetus for more broad observations about change in Bhutan. He states:

An important implication of the findings of this research is that a change initiative such as the Intervision program cannot be implemented in all schools in Bhutan through an official pronouncement and the little support that the Education Monitoring and Supervision Section of the Education Division [provides] once in three years. A deliberate implementation program has to be drawn up and followed systematically if the schools are to draw maximum benefits (Thinley 1999, p.236).
In a follow-up to this, he makes the following recommendation: ‘The results of this study show that the schools need much more outside pressure and support in the process of implementing such an initiative than was planned and delivered in the case of the four schools’ (p.236). As well, the ‘range of interests and abilities in the staff of each of the schools seemed to be too limited, to have a variety of stimulating ideas coming out from teachers themselves’ (p.239). The schools required ideas for change but ideas did not come out of NBIPs (e.g., p.196). Thinley observed that there was a need to think through how the main curriculum concerns of each of the schools and the ideas that are discussed in the national workshops could be discussed at the whole school level and be drawn up as long term … school development plans (p.239).

Thinley (1999) also found that although the number of schools in this study was small, principals with a better understanding of, and commitment to, the change initiative together with the leadership that they provided distinguished those schools who ‘practiced Intervision consistently, and with greater vigour and direction from those that did not’ (p.242). He also observed that

in the Bhutanese cultural context, the principals seem to be respected as the persons in authority and nothing seemed to happen without their approval, initiative and leadership. This cultural understanding can be used to good effect to promote change in the direction required (Thinley 1999, p.242).

Further, Thinley concluded that to achieve what is required, Head Teachers needed specific inservice which addressed context specific constraints (Thinley 1999, 242-3).

The final document to be reviewed is an excellent publication prepared for those who are directly involved with INSET and so it is very relevant. It is also widely available in Bhutan.

(v) ‘Handbook for Teacher Inservice Presenters’

In this UNESCO-supported production mainly developed by (RGOB 1995b) four main areas are developed: factors affecting inservice (adult learning), basic principles, and workshop planning, and implementation. In this summary we shall concentrate upon the first two. The underlying idea of the Handbook appears to be that adults learn in different ways than children do. It is ‘aimed at providing a guide to any personnel requiring to deliver inservice teacher trainings at various levels.’ (p.6). From this, it is clear that the focus is upon the planning and delivery of workshops and so does not include the follow-up after these that is so very vital. Still, it is useful.

The Handbook begins with a rationale for teachers’ work. ‘The mission … is to bring about the desirable changes in the children for the benefit of the community and the country at large’ (p.5). It goes on to define staff development.

Teachers from the first day in the service till they retire undergo numerous changes in their Understandings, values and behaviour to cope with such demands. Such changes when deliberately and purposely organised constitute … staff development or inservice programs [INSET] (RGOB, 1999b, p.5).

Implications are drawn for presenters from the physiological, psychological (especially self-concept) and emotional characteristics of adult learners (teachers). These include
(pp.7-8) that presenters should deliberately lower anxiety in the early sessions; ensure physical comfort; encourage a non-threatening learning environment; and ‘employ multiple channels for processing of information’. In addition, past experiences of the learners will vary. These are the basis for learning but are also a potential obstacle. Obstacles can often be dealt with by providing alternatives and allowing time for the new idea to take shape for the learner (pp.8-9). Adults demand that time is spent on current problems giving immediate benefit, and that time is not wasted. Adults also need to be motivated to learn, especially as the learning process necessarily involves some form of anxiety as new practices are learned and the use of new materials is added to their repertoire (p.9). Just as children have different ways of learning, so do adults. This means that different ways have to be used for adults to learn and opportunities for them to learn in their own way should be provided. Professionals pass through different stages in their career and this too needs to be taken into account (p.10).

The consideration of the above needs of adult learners is the basis for the identification of the following ‘basic principles of adult learning’, or, ‘how adults learn’ (p.11). There are eight principles. Each has a number of implications which are drawn out in the Handbook itself. (1) ‘Adults learn better when the inservice program is based upon the needs of the [learners] and the program is designed and planned in collaboration with [them]’ (p.11). (2) Learning activities have to be designed that suit the desired change including being consistent with what the learners have to cope with back in schools. (3) ‘Adults have vast experiences and they learn more productively when the material being learnt, or processes being used, [have a clear] relationship to the past experiences, or when past experience can be applied directly to the new situation’ (p.11). This means that sharing of past experiences can be extremely useful. (4) ‘All learners learn better when the environment is conducive to learning. It is more so with adults. They learn more when they are physically comfortable and mentally not intimidated’ (p.12). (5) ‘Learning is [maximised] when the [learners] are involved in learning processes’ (p.12). This means keep lectures to a minimum and provide different activities. (6) ‘Adults do not feel comfortable when [the] program is facilitated by young, in-experienced people’ (p.12). (7) ‘Adult learning is motivated when appropriate rewards and skills are provided’ (p.13). Clarify objectives. Acknowledge achievements. (8) ‘Learners learn better when learning activities are well structured and presented systematically’ (p.13).

The two subsequent chapters deal with the planning of workshops, including ways to develop a needs analysis, and their delivery. All of these depend upon the ideas presented in the previous two paragraphs and so shall not be summarised here. The Handbook itself is an excellent guide.

Conclusion

What we know as NBIPs in Bhutan began strongly with NAPE initiatives, support mechanisms and planning ten to fifteen years ago. Since that time other forms have developed, notably SBIPs and its specialised form, Intervision. These then, provide the main structures for INSET at the present time, supported by a range of policies, practices and materials. We have, however, seen some research indicating that INSET is not meeting some challenges and that there is already some thinking about the need for change. Such changes will have to take into account the long term national plans
which have largely been set out in *Bhutan 2020*. The present study addresses the need for change in INSET, or otherwise, by adopting a methodology that is briefly described next.

### Methodology & Data Sample

This section very briefly describes the methodology of the study and the resultant sample from the questionnaire.

#### Methodology

Data for this study were provided by approximately one hundred interviews that were taped and transcribed. People interviewed included teachers, Head Teachers, EMSS officers, key persons, course coordinators and resource persons. Additional data was supplied by almost six hundred teachers and Head Teachers from a structured random sample via a questionnaire, and from 15 DEOs. Additional material was provided from over 60 documents. These data were analysed carefully and the results prepared based upon these data. Greater details of the actual design, methods and procedures etc can be found in Appendix 1 (see p.123).

#### Data sample

The resultant sample from the questionnaires is presented as Table 2 as a spreadsheet of school type against location in comparison with the actual numbers of schools in the Kingdom. The distribution based upon school type shows that the random selection within type produced a good distribution by school location. This is important in a country where geography plays such an important role in the provision of educational resources.

**Table 2: Population & Sample School Type by School Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Semi-urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Remote</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The unit of analysis for this quantitative part of the study was the teacher and the sample of teachers who responded in terms of school is shown in Table 3. Table 3 shows actual teacher numbers, numbers anticipated via sampling procedure and the respondents, by school type. The Table 3 respondent data indicate that community schools are over-represented, high schools considerably under-represented. (The relatively high proportion of community school representatives was due to the forced sampling of a higher ratio that in the other schools. Taking into account the extra form sent to each school in the sample, the response rate was very high (79%).

Table 3: Population, Sample & Actual Respondent Comparison By School Type (N, %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of schools</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popln (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes five missing data on school type

The question of representativeness of the sample was further investigated with reference to gender (Table 4) and nationality (Table 5). These data indicate that the study data are representative of the population using these characteristics as criteria.

Table 4: Population & Sample of Teachers by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Population (%)</th>
<th>Sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>70.0*</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(RGOB 1997a)
Overall the data is representative, though some care needs to be taken in analyses involving school type (community and high schools).

Table 5: Population & Sample of Teachers by Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population (%)</th>
<th>Sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhutanese</td>
<td>90.0*</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bhutanese</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(RGOB 1997a)
Results

This section of the Report records the sample obtained and presents the results of both the questionnaire and interview data, inter-woven in a way that presents the most coherent and succinct overview of the data. The data are presented according to the research questions (Appendix 2: Research Matrix, p.129) that is, Current Practices, Impact and Improvement. However, prior to the presentation of these data, descriptive data about the sample are set out in addition to those that were presented in the discussion of the representativeness of the sample.

Location is a crucial issue in geographically demanding Bhutan. Table 6 indicates the location of teachers in the Kingdom. Almost half of the teachers are found in urban schools while the remaining teachers are almost evenly distributed across the three other categories.

Table 6: Teachers by Location (N=586)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-urban</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can note from Table 7 that the teaching cadre in Bhutan is young, almost 57% being less than 31 years of age.

Table 7: Teachers by Age (N=582)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 25 years</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic qualifications of teachers in Bhutan are generally low (Table 8). Only approximately 30% of teachers have a Class XII pass or above.
Table 8: Teachers by Academic Qualifications (N=584)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Qualifications</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class IX &amp; below</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class X pass</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class XII pass</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree or above</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 9 we note that about seven out of ten teachers have either Dzongkha or Primary teacher qualifications. There are more teachers (14.1%) with minimal qualifications than there are with postgraduate professional qualifications (4.4%).

Table 9: Teachers by Professional Qualifications (N=560)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Qualifications</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZTC/PTC</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, eg, induction course, untrained</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teaching cadre in Bhutan does not have large experience (Table 10). Two thirds of teachers have less than ten years’ experience.

Table 10: Teachers by Teaching Experience (N=565)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 5 years</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 6 and 10 years</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a range of categories of teachers in Bhutan as shown in Table 11.
Table 11: Teachers by Teacher Type (N=586)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Teacher/Principal</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Teacher</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzongkha Teacher</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multigrade teacher</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, eg, apprentice, temporary</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class sizes in Bhutan are high (see Table 12), for example, five out of six class are larger than 30. Given that classroom size in Bhutan is small to average in size, teachers are teaching and students are learning in over crowded situations. In contrast, very few classes in government schools in Australia would be larger than 30, and generally the rooms themselves are larger than in Bhutan.

Table 12: Class Size Taught (N=472)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turning now to the data in the remainder of the questionnaire, that is, beyond the biographical data just described, it was evident that there was a strong tendency towards a uniformly perceived positive and/or supportive responses. This was particularly so for the items in Section B, Teachers’ Problems and Concerns, and Section D, Improvements. This kind of ‘response set’ is much more than we would have expected given our experience in Australia and might have, in part, a cultural explanation. The effect of the response set is to be careful in analysis and interpretation.

The data that follow are presented following the major questions set out in the Research Matrix, that is, first Current Practices, then Impact of INSET followed by Improving INSET.

**Current INSET Practices**

I think that when I look back ten years I am very impressed with the increase in the level of professionalism of teachers in Bhutan, and the amount of professional
development that has gone on, the textbook writing. A lot of that has lead to the need for many, many inservice courses because everything has moved quite quickly [but] we shouldn’t say what has gone on is leading us to what needs to go on in the future. I don’t think that it is a harm that it has been developed in an ad hoc kind of way. I think that it has served its purpose well. The people who have brought on the education system should be quite proud of how quickly it has evolved and how far reaching it has been and gone out to all areas of the country. It is time to make it a bit more systematic (Key person interview).

Introduction

In this section we sketch out, from the analysis of the data, the range of practices which together constitute how INSET happens in Bhutan. These practices range from the generation of the original idea for an NBIP to the planning that occurs through the delivery of the workshops, their follow-up and evaluation. Consideration is given to the in-school pressure and support that can assist teachers in their endeavours to improve their school and classroom practices after an NBIP. We also consider the administrative procedures that are a necessary part of a nation-wide INSET program such as NBIP, and related matters. Current practices in relation to SBIP are also presented; their planning, implementation and evaluation. We also consider the current relationship between NBIP and SBIP. First however, we provide an analysis of NBIP budgets for the four years 1995/6 to 1998/9. It proceeds to a discussion of NBIP and related practices and then SBIP and related practices.

Budget Overview

Funding for NBIPs is arranged with funding agencies and the Royal Government of Bhutan following budget proposals presented by various subject committees and others desirous of funding. Some of that funding is allocated from the Five Year Plan. For example, in the Eighth Five-Year Plan, teachers’ inservice budget was Nu11.318 million. This represents about Nu2.659 million each year. This fund comes from different bodies such as, RGOB, BTF (Env. Ed.), UNFPA, UNICEF (Primary teacher) and Canada for 1998/9 and appears to be supplemented in various ways (cf Table 13).

A large part of the budget is invested in paying teachers ‘TA’ (travel allowance), for travel between home and NBIP venue and ‘DA’ (daily allowance, when at the NBIP and for the period of travel). Resource persons and course coordinators (not Headquarters staff) also receive DA and TA as well as net pay (70% of daily pay since 30% is taken as accommodation). This is standard for Civil Service (RCSC). From data for budgeted figures for NBIPs over the period 1995/6 to 1998/9, 56.5% (over Nu11 million) of total funds were budgeted for TA and DA. This appears an expensive incentive scheme, especially given recent salary increases (see p.28). The NBIPs were categorised and the data aggregated in order to see where the INSET budget is allocated. The categories can be seen in the left hand column of Table 13. From the ‘Total’ column, approximately twenty million Ngultrum have been budgeted for NBIPs over the last four years. However, to enable comparisons to be made across years the data need to be adjusted for inflation from figures provided in Selected Economic Indicators (RGOB 1999c) using the data (Table 13) for 1995/6 as the baseline.
Figure 2 shows the changes in annual budgeting for NBIPs over the four year period, that is, it represents the bottom line of Table 13, adjusted for inflation. Broadly there is a trend to increasing funding from 1995/6 to 1998/9.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEOs and above</td>
<td>382,250</td>
<td>293,600</td>
<td>713,010</td>
<td>283,360</td>
<td>1,672,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Head Teacher</td>
<td>422,600</td>
<td>552,100</td>
<td>397,560</td>
<td>1,786,240</td>
<td>3,158,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>165,840</td>
<td>259,500</td>
<td>197,400</td>
<td>695,280</td>
<td>1,318,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-Class 3</td>
<td>336,800</td>
<td>444,600</td>
<td>761,600</td>
<td>410,600</td>
<td>1,953,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Subject Areas</td>
<td>1,505,540</td>
<td>1,116,980</td>
<td>1,109,800</td>
<td>1,161,520</td>
<td>4,893,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grades 4 - 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Services (Health,</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113,500</td>
<td>1,049,780</td>
<td>1,163,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling, Careers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Orientation</td>
<td>89,920</td>
<td>743,100</td>
<td>682,920</td>
<td>741,380</td>
<td>2,257,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>177,600</td>
<td>506,940</td>
<td>564,160</td>
<td>667,820</td>
<td>1,916,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Curricular</td>
<td>401,620</td>
<td>1,084,320</td>
<td>674,528</td>
<td>399,820</td>
<td>2,560,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,482,170</td>
<td>5,001,140</td>
<td>5,214,478</td>
<td>7,195,800</td>
<td>20,893,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3 represents the right hand column of Table 13. This pie graph shows the proportions spent on different categories of NBIPs over the four years. These data are interesting because they can be considered to represent the overall priorities of budget allocation over the four year period.

The question of whether this is an appropriate relative proportion of NBIP categories, is one to which we will return (see below p.107). There too we shall raise the issue of funding for other forms of INSET as we see here that SBIPs are not supported by funding.
The data in Figure 3, however, mask the annual changes within budget categories. These data are presented in Figure 4. They are also interesting because there is a great variation between and within some categories suggestive of a somewhat ad hoc development of the various workshops categories over time. On the other hand there is a consistent relatively high allocation to class teacher development although this has diminished over time. Head Teachers had a major budgetary commitment in 1998/9. Teacher orientation and distance education each had a solid budget allocation over the
last three annual periods. Ancillary services are a recent category of NBIPs taking up a solid proportion of the budget in 1998/9. The question needs to be asked about the appropriateness of these relative movements of budget. Again, we shall address this issue in the Framework at the end of the report.

From the above data, we conclude that there is a considerable amount of money spent upon in-country INSET. At present the vast majority of the budget is provided by donors and 56% is spent upon incentives to attend, in the form of daily and travel allowances. There appears to be considerable variation within and between categories of the budget across the last four years.

**Teachers’ Current Concerns**

The ways that NBIPs run in Bhutan depend upon a variety of factors including their history, and the funding that is available. Section B of the questionnaire, ‘Teaching Problems and Concerns’ (Appendix 3, p.131 and Appendix 4, p.139 for the Dzongkha version), gives a window into teachers’ thinking (N=500 approx.) about their every day realities. From experience we would presume that NBIPs would at least in part address teachers’ problems and concerns since these represent current needs.
Some caution is necessary in the interpretation of Section B data since they show a strong ‘response set’, that is, the tendency for respondents to consistently favour one area of the scale. It has forced us to focus on items that show any deviation from this response set in an effort to detect opinion that might lead us to insights about where improvement might be made.

In effect, the responses to these items show that teachers do not report themselves as having many concerns about teaching. The only item for which more than 50% of respondents reported ‘some’ or ‘great’ concern was the ‘lack of teaching/learning materials’ (B7). Furthermore, 14 of the 46 citations in the qualitative data refer to lack of materials, also. For example: ‘We did not receive the Dzongkha textbooks for classes 4-6, and this was a problem’, ‘I teach PP with 83 students. We have very few textbooks; and this creates a lot of problems’, ‘We have the problem of not having the teacher’s manual along with the textbooks’, ‘Textbooks and stationery to reach in time’, ‘Lack of science equipment and textbooks’, ‘No manuals available for ISC & SCSE’ and ‘Little accessibility to authentic reference materials’ are quite typical. There were only two other items for which more than 40% of respondents reported a concern. These were ‘class size’ (B24) and ‘lack of access to professional development’ (B25). Both of these are significant in an INSET context.

The three items identified above are worthy of further reflection. Taken together, B7 (there are not enough teaching/learning materials) and B24 (class sizes are too large) reflect a concern about resources. B25 (lack of access to professional development) adds to this theme. In any developing educational system this almost always is a major constraining issue that implies the need to prioritise carefully while at the same time keeping visible the ideals to be striven for.

Changing our attention to what respondents are unconcerned about, some interesting observations can be made. For example, about 80% of respondents believe that their ‘awareness of teacher’s manuals is adequate’ (B21), the implication being that they do not need much further inservice with such a focus. Similarly, in excess of 80% of respondents report that they have ‘no concerns with planning learning activities’ (B8) and almost 90% believe that that they have ‘few concerns with subject matter’ (B18). This is a surprise since 70% of teachers only have a Class X pass. This contrast is illustrative of the response set bias. The implications of these data, if they are valid, are clear for the focus of inservice programs. Of course, it remains possible that teachers’ perceptions of their own abilities and skills in these areas are optimistic: this is a judgement that system administrators need to make when deciding on INSET priorities and program emphases.

In looking more closely at the open ended responses regarding teacher concerns, it is evident from five comments of the 94 Dzongkha teachers that ‘If we get opportunities for getting trained abroad, we will be able to learn new methods of teaching’ and ‘For Dzongkha teachers there are very limited opportunities for training either abroad or within the country’. The point here may well be that Dzongkha teachers may need special consideration so that they can experience alternate models of teaching. This may have implications for ZTC training. Other teachers’ comments included lack of training, for example in multigrade teaching, Dzongkha EVS, lack of staff and classrooms, student motivation and teacher health problems affecting teaching.
In relation to teachers’ concerns, there are variations amongst different group in the ways that they perceive problems and concerns. Using the single scale of ‘Concerns’ as the dependent variable in a general linear model univariate analysis with personal characteristics of age, gender and nationality as independent variables, there were no interactions and only nationality produced a significant main effect ($F=5.868$, $df=1$, sig. <0.05). Figure 5 shows that Bhutanese had significantly lower levels of concern than did non-Bhutanese since high negative numbers indicate greater levels of problems and concern. Speculation about why this should be so include non-nationals’ wider experience, or Bhutanese peoples’ greater tolerance of what exists.

![Figure 5: Concerns by Nationality](image)

Exploring variation in teachers’ perceptions of concern, the differences between professional characteristics (academic and professional qualifications, and teaching experience) on Concern were investigated. There was a significant first order interaction for both academic and professional qualifications ($F=3.205$, $df=2$, sig.<0.05) and academic qualifications and teaching experience ($F=2.688$, $df=3$, sig.<0.05). (An interaction implies that the two characteristics vary differently in relation to one another.) These effects are illustrated in Figure 6 and Figure 7. The data from Figure 6 indicate that there is a general trend for teachers with higher academic qualifications (above Class X) to be more concerned, and specifically for those with higher professional qualifications than ZTC or PTC, for example BEd or PGCE, are significantly less concerned than all other groups.
In Figure 7, those with two to five years’ experience who are more academically qualified are significantly more concerned than their less qualified counterparts.
Turning now to the variation in teachers’ perceptions of problems and concerns in relation to context (independent variables: location, school type and class size), there is a significant interaction between school type and location (Figure 8). Urban community schools have teachers significantly less concerned than others. There was no main effect for class size.

![Figure 8: Concerns by School Type and Location](image)

**Current NBIPs**

This section attempts to shed light on the existing practices of NBIP in Bhutan in terms of the reasons for having NBIPs and their design, implementation and evaluation. How NBIPs are administered is also addressed. One third of teachers have attended at least one NBIP over the last three years see (p.64).

**(i) Reasons for NBIP**

According to informants, 23 out of 34 of whom were resource persons, the major reasons given for conducting NBIPs were (1) central curriculum initiatives (12 citations, that is, 12 different people made essentially the same point) and (2) the needs of teachers (15 citations). Respondents claimed that teachers’ needs were sometimes determined by survey, talking to selected local teachers, or feedback. Other reasons given were the need for a curriculum review, follow-up workshops from the previous year, and resource development.
It might be expected that the planning for NBIPs most often involves a serious consideration of the needs of the teachers. Despite the claims above that the teachers’ needs were given as reasons for conducting NBIP, from the data concerning descriptions of organisers’ plans, the systematic analysis of teachers’ needs is largely non-existent. Rather, the NBIP planning reflects central curriculum needs (curriculum initiatives), that is, syllabus or text or manual rewriting precipitated the NBIP. To support this claim, 29 citations by resource persons indicate centrally felt, or rather, perceptions of teacher needs. To illustrate this point, this is what one of the resource persons says: ‘I think it was from the CAPSS Maths Unit. May be they felt the need based on the feedback they got from the teachers’. On the other hand, only two citations of resource persons indicate that the EMSS reports and concerned CAPSS officers’ school visits were used as a form of teachers’ needs analysis.

**(ii) NBIP Design**

As far as NBIP design is concerned, there was a range of issues to address. These include planning and its relationship to teachers’ needs, workshop topics and the delivery of the workshop, and other related issues such as venue and length of the workshop.

* (a) Planning

The first issue to consider concerns quality of planning. Seven of the 26 resource persons interviewed indicated there had been consistent problems in getting people to plan for workshops. Resource persons either do not turn up or those trained for a particular workshop went to another workshop. Together these are indicative of a lack of planning or commitment.

Also a systematic way of having a properly planned course, many times as we were saying earlier, it is ad hoc. Normally they decide [in August]… that this course needs to be put together, [to be] delivered in the coming winter … so probably they would be deciding a few courses and normally they would be sending letters to those people they want as resource persons … the people who put the courses together are normally full time workers, already busy people, and there is no personnel who are available to work purely for the inservice program. And we will have to be freed during the winter vacation and normally the planning is ad hoc, there is no long term thinking in that way (Resource person).

At the workshop itself, two resource persons indicated that they were under great pressure, worked sometimes till late hours meeting with other resource persons to report on the day and to plan for the next day. For example:

It is normally long hours starting from 7.00 in the evening because we have to coordinate and plan every day. The course lasts 10-15 days and then every day after the contact hours sometimes there are needs to meet and discuss issues amongst the resource people.

WT: Are you also working to produce more materials?

More materials for the next day, something like that. So it is a very hectic time, in comparison to the normal pre-service program which is not that hectic because we have longer time.
Less important comments on the planning issues include, resource people needing to search for materials and lack of people to do technical work during planning.

Six citations of course directors/resource persons and Head Teachers indicated that there had been overlap of workshops and poor attendance in workshops. Many teachers rush for BBE evaluation camp because of the extra monetary benefit.

Moving away from concerns about quality, we now discuss overall planning. The Human Resource Development (HRD) Unit is entrusted to coordinate the development of workshop proposals in cooperation with the course coordinators. It ‘finds’ the budget and submits these to the Teacher Education Board (TEB) in which the types of workshops, their objectives, venue, and target groups are finalised. After this the DEOs and others are informed. The TEU/HRD finally collates the nominations from the Dzongkhags.

From seven citations in this area, the role of course coordinator usually starts from the framing of the objectives and listing of areas for the workshops through the subject committee meeting after the TEB approval. Then coordinated planning sessions are held with the resource persons. Two citations indicated that the roles of the course coordinators included preparing workshop schedules and arranging the required resources for the workshops. One course coordinator reasoned that generally the number of participants be limited to 30 to facilitate better interaction and in making the time more useful.

The majority of the 15 citations of the resource persons express that their planning roles are usually to help plan the delivery of courses and development of materials, and to assist course coordinators to take decisions on logistics and modalities of workshops.

Depending on the type of workshops, the number of planning days appears to range from two to ten days. This was generally done immediately before the actual workshop. This is one of the resource person’s views.

Yes, so we meet together sometimes as the course is intensive and a lot of materials have to be developed. We meet a week in advance. Other times two to three days in advance depending upon the nature of the course. Then we sit down together.

According to nine citations, session planning and development of materials are usually done either in groups, or through discussions.

From data available from records, general trends for aspects of NBIP planning over the period 1990/1 to 1997/8 can be seen in Table 14. Firstly, the number of courses has increased in recent years but the average number of participants has decreased (but remains high). The ratio of participants to resource persons is about 10:1. Average course length has remained about ten to twelve days.

\[(b) \text{ Delivery of NBIP Workshops}\]

According to 21 NBIP reports, workshops are delivered through group work and discussion, demonstration, lecturing, brain storming and practising of skills. A small number of the respondents found discussion to be a useful tool in understanding what is happening in the schools. There were a small number of incidents where the resource
persons were not clear about the workshop objectives and were not prepared for the session. Such problems are bound to affect the delivery of the workshops.

Table 14: Planned Annual NBIPs, 1990/1-1997/8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of courses</th>
<th>Planned Number of participants</th>
<th>Total planned Number of facilitators</th>
<th>Average Number of participants per course</th>
<th>Average course length (days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997/8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/5</td>
<td>11(3)*</td>
<td>973(765)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>88.4(255)</td>
<td>13(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/4</td>
<td>9(2)</td>
<td>547(480)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>60.8(240)</td>
<td>11.8(N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991/2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates separate funding from agencies

Broadly, the day’s sessions start with conceptual input and/or brainstorming on the topic in the morning when the participants are fresh and then involve participants in activities with a plenary session at the end. In a day there are usually four sessions of two hours each and participants generally have hectic days. Below is a description of one very experienced course director’s workshop day.

Well if it is a training course, what we normally follow, or what I normally follow, is in the morning when they are fresh and eager, we normally put in the concept part of it in the presentation, the theory part of it, the concept part of it. Then slowly we move towards the end of the day when they are normally drowsy we normally break them up into groups and we give them work, some assignments to discuss, some issues.

If we are talking about adult teaching then the concept paper and then we break them up into different groups and let them discuss on their own concept what they understood and what they would like in that. And then there is a presentation to each other in the group, they present to each other.

If it is a workshop for materials development then I have a different approach and we normally try to see the kinds of people who are normally interested in the different kinds of topics. Then we group them in that since if they are more interested in that then the more they are alert and they contribute more. So we do that but we try also to facilitate by seeing what is the need of the field rather than what is the need of only those present there in the workshop.

We note the strong links with adult education principles (see p.34). According to 15 citations of NBIP reports, generally workshops are one-shot. Some had a follow-up strategy in place (three citations) to be executed by CAPSS.
Thirteen respondents, the majority of whom were resource persons say that the workshop dealt with school subject matter. Another type of NBIP conducted was the school management workshop (seven Head Teachers). Almost all the Head Teachers commented about the usefulness of this topic in guiding them to run the schools smoothly.

Then in the management course I think learnt mainly [about] the human resources, even the materials. How to make the human resources and the materials useful in the school, how to use them properly ... I tried to use locally available materials. Then after coming back from the management course, ... I think in the school in the beginning of this year 1998, I have introduced about two or three new ideas in the school and I think they worked quite well.

Ten out of 15 citations from teachers indicated that Multigrade workshops dealt with the teaching skills and managing the class. According to a small number of citations, other workshops dealt with the teaching skills, continuous assessment, identifying problems, keeping record and preparing routine for different ability groups. Two citations, one by a resource person and the other by Head Teacher said that NBIP generally covered a broad topic. Two citations indicate NBIP topics are very vast against the short duration of the workshop.

Out of the eleven citations recorded, six citations indicate that teachers at least attend minimum of two workshops in a year while five citations reveal that teachers attended one to three workshops within this three-year period. One teacher cites he/she attempts to attend at least one NBIP each year. Our questionnaire data indicate that two out of three teachers have not attended an NBIP.

According to 19 citations, the length of most NBIPs range from 10 – 18 days, while a few NBIPs’ duration is from 7 – 9 days (see Table 14). However, according to four, because the NBIP duration is short, participants do not get an opportunity to discuss issues at length. One teacher said:

When we were doing these review activities we found it short because since there were many teachers and we did not find enough time to discuss with all the teachers. Actually, they said that all the groups will do the revision for all the classes [but] because of the shortage of time we did it group-wise and we completed the revision.

The most preferred venue (two teachers, two resource persons, one experienced coordinator and one NBIP report) was at the Training Institutes at Samtse and Paro, although quite a good number of workshops are conducted at the Youth Centre and high schools. One of the Head Teachers provided this rationale.

I found the most appropriate venues [were] the training institutions and the Youth Centre, because there we can get all the good facilities and also we can get lot of references especially to deal with the workshop courses. Usually when we do these NBIP workshops in the training institutes, there we can contact even the lecturers and also some of our well-experienced colleagues from different schools and that way we can make our NBIP more comprehensive and successful.

Interestingly, according to one of the experienced course coordinators, NBIPs are conducted in different places so that both the participants and the community benefit from the workshop. More importantly, the community comes to know more about the program.
(iii) Implementation

Here we discuss the aspects of how the ideas gained by the teachers from the NBIPs are being put into practice in their schools. This, however, depends greatly on the type of (1) follow-up; (2) the magnitude of support, pressure and materials supply; and (3) the time the teachers have to practice and reflect upon their actions.

In so far as the NBIP implementation is concerned, out of 16 relevant citations, six citations indicate that generally plans for follow-up were drawn up to make people write back to the concerned NBIP course coordinators. But it could not be confirmed whether they did so. Other methods were to distribute the related materials to the participant teachers, resource persons delegated to follow-up with the participants (two citations), and Head Teacher constantly monitoring the teachers (one citation). On the basis of two citations, it appears that a cluster workshop after the workshop was useful. This can be seen in the comment of one of the experienced course coordinators.

In the NBIPs, we basically talk on broad issues or talk on broad concepts and theories. On the cluster based programs our teachers who have attended have already experimented in their own schools and they actually come back with field-based problems and experience. From that point of view, I think the NBIP is further enriched by adding day to day wisdom into the overall program. Secondly, cluster based workshops are considered important because we have tremendous teacher shortage problems and to call them from the distance of three to four days travelling, it means a tremendous wastage of time for our teachers. So we save time by going to their doorsteps. Thirdly, in the cluster based workshop they can share similar local based problems and they can have integrated programs jointly prepared during cluster workshops whereby they can have further follow-up and if they are interested they even visit each other.

In contrast, other course coordinators and resource persons said they were generally preoccupied with the daily routine tasks (four citations) suggesting that to large extent NBIP follow-up by them is poor. This is what one of the course coordinators said:

Follow-up has definitely to improve … we couldn’t follow-up because we had a shortage of manpower. We always had in our mind that we had to go to schools if need be to conduct school based inservice programs ourselves, and help these people, find out how they are doing. If there were any problems we could help them and so on, but we haven’t been able to do. But a follow-up I think, more than to conduct the workshop you need to have the skills.

The last sentence is interesting. In spite of the new ideas and insights to some of the issues the teachers have gained from the NBIPs, some do not have confidence or the interest to implement them in their schools. There is tendency for them to remain unchanged in their practices. Note this observation of an experienced resource person.

Well for instance, as I was telling you in the earlier stages, when we started, people came to attend the workshop. [They] attended the workshop, and fell back into their old ways of doing things and there still isn’t a mechanism of follow-up from this, from what is done in the workshop. Many things do not get implemented because there is no follow-up mechanism.

At times (four citations) the teachers were not given the subject for which they have attended the workshop. Further, according to one of the resource persons, ‘we feel that
it is generally taken for granted that the DEOs and other concerned authorities will put pressure on the teachers to implement the NBIP ideas’.

According to the pilot study (Strawbridge 1997), teachers generally felt that they were handicapped by a lack of materials and guidance to implement the NBIP ideas. Citations of inspectors and teachers indicate a lack of resources, small size of classrooms together with a high pupil-teacher ratio also affected the use of ideas in the reality of school situations. Precisely these issues were high on the list of teachers’ problems and concerns reported above on p.46. One of the inspectors reported:

> Sometimes whatever things are discussed during the NBIPs may not be possible in the school situations. … Sometimes there are resource constraints and sometimes teacher shortages; and the implementation of the curriculum depends a lot on the availability of resources, on the adequacy of the teaching staff.

However one of the NBIP reports indicates that the required materials are being sent to the schools to support that workshop.

According to three citations (an inspector, a teacher and an NBIP report) it seems teachers generally don’t have time to plan and use the NBIP ideas in the class because teachers have a heavy teaching workload as well as extra curricular activities they have to shoulder. One inspector reports implementation is difficult ‘since they lack time and since they have other areas to attend to, since they are over loaded. They do actually want to practice, … but then they resort to the traditional method of teaching/learning in some of the schools’.

The current practices of implementation following NBIP as indicated by these data are not well developed, and there are considerable constraints.

(iv) Evaluation

NBIP courses are generally evaluated by using an evaluation questionnaire (19 citations). According to six NBIP reports, the Strawbridge pilot study and five resource persons, NBIPs were conducted well and usually well received by the participants. However, one of the course directors alleged that teachers fill in the evaluation questionnaire just for the sake of completing it. If this is more generally the case, confidence in these data could be questioned. One resource person indicated that the recommendations of the evaluation would be used as indicators to improve a future workshop.

Further, it is also interesting to note there may be growing critical commentary among the participants. For example, ‘while the process of the sessions were well received, people were generally more critical of the workshop content than is usual’ and another NBIP report added ‘course evaluations on the whole were very positive despite quite trenchant criticisms of the resource base’.

(v) Administration

In this section we discuss the issues of NBIP attendance, budgeting, incentives and selection of participants.
(a) Attendance

There were problems associated with attendance of participants at the NBIPs. Attendance does not always approximate the planned numbers. At times people not nominated come to attend the workshops. This results in a wastage of human resources and funds. The report on NBIPs to the TEC succinctly illustrates this problem

Points raised from the NBIP reports included: 95 extra people turned up for the DEVS workshop; only 27/45 attended the Nutrition Training (said to be too long and used too many lectures). Class IX to XII maths attendance was low; … 49/51 apprentice teachers attended the Induction Program at TTC, and 25/26 new Head Teachers had attended the Management Training conducted by RIM.

Selection for NBIP is contentious. Comments from interviews are revealing.

I think sir mostly when we talk about NBIP, sometimes one teacher is nominated for one program, and again at the same time that particular teacher is nominated for other program. So, that it really creates some problem with us for the proper nomination of the teachers (Teacher).

What becomes bad about it is if the same person has to go to three workshops all in one winter break and then you get sort of fatigue. I think that there has to be some sort of rationalisation of who goes and how the information that that person collects should be passed on (Key person).

Already then even the participants were not enough because some small schools have to send teachers for so many courses and they have to forego some of the courses and some courses there is a shortage of participants.

The latter comment reveals an administrative imperative (see p. 110). Thus, issues associated with attendance are closely related to those concerning selection/nomination for NBIPs.

(b) Selection

The 75 citations contained in this section provide insights into the current practice of selecting the participants for the NBIPs. In doing so, we look closely through the selection criteria, procedure and related issues.

Selection of participants is based on certain principles which are framed by the TEB and modified by the respective course coordinators to suit their participants’ selection. These principles generally concern the needs of the course, the school, the interests of the teacher and the relevancy of the NBIP to the teacher participants’ work (see p. 110).

Though nomination is often based upon school needs, selection is often controlled by the DEO. For instance, eight citations of Head Teachers make similar comments of this:

It could be because of the felt need of the school, the situation of the school, the situation has been forced. Because of that I may have been selected by the Education Department as well as by our immediate boss, the DEO.

Another Head Teacher of a community school attributes his nomination to the ‘DEO because at that time I was in community school. I was the only teacher there. For the community school, multigrade teaching is very important so the DEO nominated me’.
On the whole 17 citations shared common attributes of their selection to school needing subject teacher development and for the implementation of new curriculum initiatives, although there appeared to be few cases whereby the teachers were selected because other teachers were already preoccupied with other workshops.

The selection is also based on performance, experience of teachers and the type of responsibilities they hold in the schools like health and sports in-charge (14 citations). Three comments illustrate this and the fact that the nominator varies.

So that is totally based on the performance report of the concerned teacher by the Head Teacher and the subject you teach, that has to match with the content of the workshop. [So, the Head Teacher really must nominate] Yes the Head Teacher really must work carefully in nominating the participant for the NBIP.

To be frank I think actually I was nominated by the Dzongkhag. Might be the Dzongkhag DRT. She thought that I am the right person to attend it.

And another teacher says.

I was teaching at Chukha High School then, and I was in charge of the mess arrangements. I had to stay for the workshop, and I was told that I could also join the program if I was interested. So, I joined it although the Division did not nominate me.

The DEOs, in particular, use the abilities of teachers to conduct SBIP or to share the NBIP ideas to their colleagues when they come back to schools as selection criteria. This is what one of the DEOs says:

Based on the interest of the individual teachers as well as their level of commitment to the work output after attending NBIPs; who can conduct SBIPs thereby leading to the implementation of the shared ideas in the actual classroom.

The selection of participants is also determined by the interest of the participants as illustrated by nine citations of DEOs, Head Teachers and participants. One Head Teacher says: ‘for the evaluation one I wrote myself expressing my interest in it, and for the others, I was nominated by the Dzongkhag’. However, one of the DEOs said: ‘based on their willingness, subject combination, and keeping in view of his/her capabilities to share and multiply amongst other teachers within and other schools of the Dzongkhag’. This illustrates that the reality of the selection is often determined by a number of factors combined, as the quotations above indicate.

(c) Procedure

In general, 11 citations of DEOs, Head Teachers and teachers, agree that ‘actually, from the headquarter, we are asked to nominate the candidates from the Dzongkhag. So, likewise the Dzongkhag asks the Head Teachers to nominate accordingly. We nominate the right person’ using a prescribed form. One DEO comments from his perspective:

The nominations of the teachers for NBIP are invited from the heads of the schools. They nominate the best teacher for the NBIP. Further selection is done at the Dzongkhag level depending upon the number of slots allotted for the Dzongkhag. Selections are made by Dzongkhags following a predetermined number given in the proposal.
A key person concerned with the INSET says that.

Apart from the BBE NBIP, 120 participants is usually the largest. Nominations from
the Dzongkhag are collated and discussion takes place between [the HRD] section and
the section proposing to confirm acceptance or denial of nomination.

(d) Constraints

Ten citations of resource persons, Head Teachers and teachers express problems about
the selection of participants. One of the experienced resource persons shares this
concern.

So there we have talking as course directors on how to tackle that problem of not having
one or two teachers only attending the same line of thing. But how do we identify
different teachers to participate in different workshops because I think that is very
difficult, you know. Normally they are doing a lot of activities in the schools so he or
she could attend one or two but all of us as course directors would like to have that
person to come and attend the workshop. So that is slightly a problem. Then of course
in my point of view ... is the qualification of the level of participants that we have.
Some are trained, some are just Class 8 pass trained, you know.

Another resource person expresses this concern that

getting the right people to attend the NBIP is a problem because the respective
Dzongkhag Education Officers have the tendency to nominate their close friends both
for the NBIP and SBIP. Therefore, persons who are important in the field or subject
relevant persons attending the inservice programs are less.

This is a concern and is an issue that is addressed by many comments regarding equity
in the Improvements part of the Report (see p.80). Other perceived problems according
to two citations (NBIP report and resource person), include the nomination of the wrong
participants and two citations of teachers indicate that they were forced to attend
unrelated workshops in place of their unwilling friends.

(vi) Summary

Current practice of NBIPs indicate a litany of difficulties. Design indicates a lack of
commitment and time of resource persons and delivery that does not always accord with
adult education ideas, implementation indicates a broad lack of coordinated follow-up
and evaluation is scant. Administration difficulties appear particularly severe at the
point of selection/nomination. We shall now turn to the current situation with SBIPs.

Current SBIP

It is generally felt that SBIPs are used to disseminate the NBIP ideas among the teachers
while in a few schools, they form an important forum of sorting out teachers’ problems.
Here we discuss the current SBIP practices in terms of its design, and implementation.
There were no comments about SBIP evaluation. Broadly, we know that two-thirds of
teachers say that they have experienced at least one SBIP in the last three years (see
p.72).
(i) Design

We focus on how schools plan the SBIPs, how they are delivered, their length and the number of SBIPs schools conduct in a year, and generally how they select topics. Teachers’ interviews and EMSS reports on schools show the presence of varying models of SBIP in the schools.

(a) Planning

From 47 EMSS school reports, it appears that schools usually maintain two types of plans to guide the school development and delivering the curriculum. They are (1) the annual school calendar which reflects action plans to assist the curriculum delivery of the teaching/learning process and the co-curricular activities, and (2) the long term development plans which stress the gradual general development of the schools. However, 36 EMSS reports (one high school, three junior high schools, 11 primary schools and 21 community schools) indicate that schools do not have long term development plans although they maintain and follow annual plans, presumably school calendars. Only two schools have an annual plan as well as long term development plans. The point here is that SBIPs could logically be indicated on either or both of these planning documents.

From the EMSS school reports, four schools (two PS and two CS) do consider SBIP as an annual feature in enhancing the teacher effectiveness and proceedings are generally recorded for reporting and future reference. Some schools usually conduct SBIPs as a follow-up of the NBIP, indicating that SBIP is dictated by NBIP attendance.

This SBIP followed the Dzongkha EVS NBIP on teaching practices and planning. Active participation, sharing and team building are described. Temporary teachers present and benefited. The next SBIP [is to be] based on points collected from Intervision.

In some schools, staff development is taken as an informal process as can be seen in this EMSS report of one junior high school.

While regular interactions among the staff take place on an informal basis at individual levels, the school has not had any organised professional development programs for its staff during the year.

One of the EMSS reports on a high school indicated that staff development on curriculum delivery and management is carried out through various subject committees as can be observed in this citation.

The school has organised various subject committees to look into the problems and difficulties of teaching-learning the subjects. The committees come up with recommendations and plans of action for implementation by the school to improve the standard and quality of teaching-learning of the subjects.

One of the reasons reported by the EMSS for schools not conducting SBIPs was that, ‘the academic calendar does not reflect the SBIP for 1998. On inquiry it was reported that the school didn’t organise this program in 1997 also’.
Moving on to the different aspects of the SBIP that need to be planned as opposed to the overall planning, length of workshop is an issue. Of the 14 citations, eight teachers maintain that they conducted SBIP for two days or a half a day on the weekend and rarely in the afternoons on school days. One of the Head Teachers gave the reasons for this as:

In our school we usually conduct SBIP on the non-working days, like on Saturdays we do not have class in the afternoon and so we run for a half day; and sometimes on public holidays we used to conduct the SBIP without hampering the class teachings.

Responses regarding length indicate that SBIPs are essentially thought of as workshops.

Frequency of the SBIP is another planning issue. According to two Head Teacher citations this depended largely on the needs and the problems the school faces. On the whole, (13 citations) the number of SBIPs conducted range from two to five in a year. However, one citation explained there was no need for SBIP because they were contented with the informal discussions they generally have.

Out of 20, ten citation showed schools selected topics which were based on their needs and to solve problems. This included sharing ideas when teachers faced difficulties with the content, enhancing the students’ interests to read, improving knowledge of their subject matter, and solving their general school problems such as toilet problems. On the other hand, three citations say that NBIP topics are used as the SBIP topic so that the teachers who attended the NBIP can multiply the ideas in the schools.

EMSS officers reported two instances of an interesting innovation in one junior and another high school in that teachers from the same subject departments in the same school were getting together to conduct SBIPs.

(b) Delivery of SBIP workshop

When SBIPs are based upon felt needs and a person is selected to go to an NBIP, the SBIP initiates with a staff meeting, often dividing the teachers on the teaching subject basis. This is what one of the head said:

This depends on the stream sir. So, different stream has different staff. So, even whenever we conduct the SBIP, firstly, during the opening we just brief in general. Later we just break into our own stream like Dzongkha group they go in the Dzongkha section; likewise followed by other subject, and that way we conduct the SBIP.

Another teacher said:

When there was policy from education department saying that SBIP should be done in the school, since then we have started to conduct SBIP when we were in Wangdichoeling primary school. Yearly we used to conduct at least once. In the SBIP we used to select the topic and then those topics we used to give to the teachers and then we asked the teachers to tick the appropriate topic which can be relevant in our day to day teaching life in the classroom. The topics having the maximum ticks they are selected and we used do the SBIP workshop [on those]. At that time Intervision was not there. Just the workshop and what ever they have learnt the other teachers were learnt in the workshop they were asked by the resource [person] to implement the same thing in the same classroom. Later on we went round the classroom whether they were implementing what they have learnt in the SBIP. Of course in big group of teachers,
some were really implementing and some of them little drew back [and this] will be always there.

However, as reported by EMSS, three primary and one community school preferred to conduct SBIPs only once in a year. This sometimes was as short as the general staff meeting and minutes recorded. It is inferred from the teachers’ interviews that generally SBIPs were delivered through lectures although the SBIPs conducted to share the NBIP ideas usually resemble a mini NBIP (one citation) where there was distribution of NBIP materials and group activities.

(ii) Implementation

In the absence of adequate number of data not much can be discussed about implementation current practices. Nonetheless, out of nine, four citations (two reports and two teachers’ interview) illustrate that teachers get encouragement and support from the DEOs and Head Teachers. In one citation, a teacher was supported with the materials made available in the school to conduct SBIP.

It appears that at times there is pressure from the Dzongkhag authority to conduct SBIP in the school: ‘actually we conduct this SBIP in our school by ourselves because whenever we need this ... we have problem in the school to solve that we conduct SBIP. So there is encouragement from the Dzongkhag to do that’. Along with the DEO pressure, teachers maintain that they receive support from their Head Teacher. This, however contradicts with what teachers express in the questionnaire open-ended responses and a small number of the teachers’ interviews in which teachers generally allege that they could not do SBIP due to lack of resources and time. So there are variations in the ways that teachers are getting support for SBIP.

This citation, however illustrates a typical case of how the SBIP is being implemented.

It is like this. For the particular day, we select resource teachers from among ourselves, they work very hard because they have to teach their friends. I mean that workshop goes very nicely, but later on what happens, that those teachers who learn it they don’t utilise it. So this is the problem.

One reason for lack of support locally could be that

The management is over loaded with curricular and office clerical work. As such, monitoring and additional support procedure has not been devised in the school in Bhutan for implementation and feedback.

This is one of the pertinent factors affecting the SBIP implementation. But others could be lack of clarity of (1) the concept and (2) the process of SBIP which were evidenced during the teachers’ interviews. Teachers generally hold the notion that SBIP is to disseminate the NBIP ideas and to solve the problems they face through one-shot SBIP workshops.

(iii) Cluster SBIPs

Cluster SBIPs are important for small and/or remote schools. In the Combined Inspection Reports covering 1996, six schools visited carried out SBIPs in clusters, for
example, an EMSS officer noted: ‘The school is concerned with the staff development programs. This year the first program was organised in cluster in X CS for the whole day and the next one scheduled in August is going to be conducted in Y PS’. A further three cluster groups were identified through their SBIP reports.

(iv) Intervision

Following the pilot of Intervision in central Bhutan in the middle 1990s, Intervision was found as being practised in seven schools, for example, from the Combined Inspection Reports for 1996,

Though the lack of time does not permit an organised supervision of instruction to take place more regularly, the school has put into place the ‘Intervision’ concept of staff development. Conscious efforts for the professional development of the teachers are being made by the school resulting in leading to better performance by the students.

Intervision was recommended by EMSS officers to be carried out in five other schools as a result of their visit.

(v) SBIP then NBIP

From interviews, 33 of the 64 citations in this category simply reiterated the rhetoric that SBIPs follow NBIPs, or contain a simple description that this is what happened. For instance,

SJ: What would you say is the relationship between NBIP and SBIP in our schools?

EMSS Officer: Um, in many cases the SBIPs are an outcome of the NBIPs. SBIPs occur because NBIPs have occurred, and the topics dealt in the NBIP are directly brought to the SBIP, and then the teachers who participated in the NBIP are the resource persons.

A Head Teacher in response to the same question said:

I think they are very closely linked because somebody attending the NBIP workshop and coming back and the idea is spread through SBIP. So other teachers are able to learn whatever he has learnt in the workshop, so the students are benefited.

And a teacher said: ‘Sometimes we have SBIP as a follow-up of the NBIP, we have someone who attended an NBIP facilitate the SBIP’. However, other teachers (24 citations) were more explicit and mentioned that sharing the ideas was essential though sometimes this sharing may have been more a ritual than attempting to change practice according to one Head Teacher.

After the NBIP workshop when we reach to school we conduct [a] staff meeting and I share with my colleagues these are some of the new ideas and we can try them and even if you are not able to implement they are just for your information.

While there might be a concern that SBIPs are a ritual, for many SBIPs following NBIPs can be productive as illustrated by the following comments:

I think both the courses are very closely linked. What ever we learn in the NBIP we bring back to the school SBIP. So this year we had a SBIP like those who went to attend course in winter when they come in March they have to talk [about] what they
learnt and experienced. So those who have gone out share the ideas what he had learnt, whether it was useful, whether related to the school.

It was to share the ideas that I have gained from the workshops and to compare my ideas with what my colleagues’ think through discussion. Different pamphlets given to us during the NBIP were shown to the teachers to choose the better one to help the students to the maximum.

The latter comment points out the utility of materials provided by the NBIP (see p.20) and indicates the potential of informal sharing. In the following comment the interviewer summarises one Head Teacher’s approach to SBIP after NBIP.

INT: Okay, let me take you back and say in the case of the national-based Integrated Science would have been held in the winter vacation. So, in April you would have an SBIP that would share information from that workshop, and then in October you would have another workshop to follow-up any problems that the teachers had. Does this mean that you would do the same thing for each of the different national based workshops that are held each year that your staff attended? You could have one in science, you could have another one in English. Is that the case?

HT: Yes sir. So, depends on the different needs and the streams that we conduct. Most are conducted based on the newly come up workshops. So, we deal with all types of subject matters.

Other points made about SBIP following NBIP included that the results of the SBIPs could be collated to inform NBIPs, that there wasn’t sufficient time to conduct SBIPs, and that sometimes the NBIP stops with the individual.

(vi) Summary

Broadly the data on SBIP are indicative that SBIP is patchy in both its planning and implementation dimensions. Some schools have incorporated it into planning documents. Some schools support their teachers. The conception of SBIP is that it consists of one-shot workshops following NBIPs. Evaluation of SBIPs was not evident. Clusters and Intervision are interesting developments.

Dzongkhag Based Inservice Programs

Although DBIPs were not supported during the period of the study, there were several in the Zhemgang Dzongkhag apparently associated with Canadian initiatives. Although not a DBIP, the following quote indicates the potential of a DBIP-type of inservice in some situations.

INT: I take it that your NBIP is in the winter. When do you do and where do you do your cluster-based workshops?

Reply: Last year on guidance and counselling, we had our first cluster workshop in Kanglung College and … we invited all the Head Teachers and counsellors from close by Dzongkhags, like Pemagatshel, Samdrup Jongkhar, Trashigang itself, Mongar and even Jakar. And of course Kanglung lecturers participated. For this side for Western region we conducted at Paro. We had two cluster workshops last year but … our consensus is that we should have at least three or four so that we really go very close to them. So next year we would like to have even central level cluster workshops.
Conclusion

The current INSET practice data show that many NBIPs have been conducted within this three years 1995/6 – 1998/9 and schools initiate SBIPs predominantly to disseminate the NBIP ideas, and to a lesser extent to solve their content related and teaching/learning problems. Our data show that the two areas of concern for teachers were lack of resources, such as science equipment, teaching material, classroom size etc., and lack of access to professional development. However, there is an absence of a system of assessing teachers’ actual needs and NBIPs generally are more focused on the central curriculum needs.

About one-third of teachers have attended at least one NBIP in the three years. It appears that it is a usual trend that the HRD section, in consultation with the respective course coordinators, prepare the ground work of allocating the funds, getting approval, identifying the objectives, areas and the number of participants. Nomination and selection of participants rest on the Head Teachers and their DEOs. Selections are generally based on the school needs, and the interest and ability of teachers to resource SBIPs. However data on problems associated with the NBIPs include: many workshops at a time, biases in selection, duration not compatible with the topics, uncomfortable venue and more seriously, for not having proper follow-up of the NBIPs.

Most often SBIPs are organised to disseminate the NBIP ideas and a few were organised to solve teachers’ problems. Other schools report using Intervision. Therefore there are variations in the models of SBIPs in the schools. The innovation of clusters is supporting the SBIP in some, often remote, schools. However, data on current practices indicate some early concern about SBIPs following NBIPs. A small number of SBIP resource persons say teachers do not practice what they have learnt and Head Teachers cannot monitor because of their administrative workload. A few schools treat SBIPs simply as a staff meeting. However, on the whole, data strongly show there is a system of staff development in place. That system is largely devoted to the idea of INSET as a one-shot workshop.

The Impact of INSET

In this section the impact of the various forms of INSET will be discussed. Positive and negative impacts are identified together with the constraints and factors which facilitated impact. In each case, the discussion will be structured around the main structural forms of INSET, that is, the National Based Inservice Program (NBIP) and the School Based Inservice Program (SBIP) together with minor forms, Cluster SBIPs and Intervision. Broadly, the analysis of the data indicate that there have been considerable gains to the education sector through INSET during the period 1996-8, though there are some serious reservations and hence implications for improvements.

National Based Inservice Program (NBIP)

Only 36.5% of all teachers (N=216) reported in the questionnaire that they had experienced NBIPs in the last three years. This is in stark contrast to the policy which
states that all teachers should experience an inservice program (presumably an NBIP) once every three years (see p.27). The proportions of teacher types who have been to NBIPs are approximately what might be expected, however, here are some variations in what might be expected. The proportions of Bhutanese and males are slightly higher than anticipated compared to the overall sample.

(i) Positive Impact

Section B of the questionnaire concerned teachers reactions (N=216) to NBIPs that they had attended over the last three years. As mentioned in the Methodology in Appendix 1 (p.123) the items in Section B were factor analysed to get a more parsimonious view of these data. The second order factors were interpreted as ‘Improved classroom management for student learning but lack of support’ (ImpManLg for short), ‘Focus on classroom concerns’ (Classroom Concerns) and ‘Lecture delivery okay’ (Lecture). These factors explained 39% of the variance (the fourth factor explaining 27% of the variance was not interpretable). The first mentioned factor is interesting since it indicates a positive reaction by teachers to NBIPs, despite lack of support. What are the differences between groups of teachers amongst these factors (including the fourth factor)?

In terms of the personal characteristics of the teachers and these groups’ reactions to NBIPs, there was a significant three-way interaction among gender, nationality and age, when the general linear model multivariate analysis was performed. (As stated above, an interaction means that the factor does not vary uniformly as the characteristics vary). Subsequent analysis of the interaction revealed that factor Improved Learning was the one of interest. The best way to see the effect of a three-way interaction is to graph it. These data are presented in Figure 9. Comparing the placement of the patterns on the two sets of axes indicates that Bhutanese have more positive views about the ways
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that NBIPs impact on improving management and learning (despite lack of support) than do non-Bhutanese. Comparing patterns in the two graphs, we can see that Bhutanese views are different from non-Bhutanese. Now focussing upon the graph on
the left hand side for non-Bhutanese, we can see that females of age 31-40 have higher perceptions of improved management and learning despite lack of support than do males. In the other graph (right hand side) males perceive the impact less favourably as they get older, whereas there is an opposite trend for females. Significant differences exist, certainly between males and females over 40 years of age.

If we now turn our attention to teachers’ qualifications and differences between these groups and the impact of NBIPs, the multivariate analysis revealed a two way interaction between professional qualifications and teaching experience on the factor Improved Learning ($F=3.151$, sig.<0.015). Again these can be more easily interpreted by graph. These data are presented in Figure 10. These data indicate complicated pattern. Clearly there is a significant difference between the ways that teachers with MEd and ‘Other’ qualifications perceive the impact of NBIPs in terms of the improvement and management of learning despite the lack of support, Those with more experience are less positive. There was a main effect for academic qualifications but this was on the uninterpretable factor.
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The third multivariate analysis investigated the relationships between school systemic characteristics, teacher category, school location and school type. There were no statistically significant results for these factors. This was a surprising result.

We shall now turn to the complementary qualitative data set. The qualitative data set here consists of all interview data plus data from relevant open-ended items in the questionnaire. Positive impact (contained in 133 citations, 1755 text units in NUD*IST) will be considered first. The negative impact (13 citations, 105 text units) will then be considered, followed by constraints and facilitating factors, before moving on to SBIP. The higher relative number of citations and volume of text units for the positive impact is an indication that generally impact is perceived far more positively
than negatively, though there are possibilities of a cultural factor producing these data differences.

The positive impacts made upon teachers were categorised into beliefs, materials, practices and sharing between teachers (collegiality).

(a) Beliefs

There was no evidence of the development of beliefs in the Fullan use of the term (see p.19). There was minor indication of the development of beliefs and amongst these, eight teachers reported an easily overlooked outcome of development of self confidence as a result of NBIPs.

(b) Materials

This small number of citations concerning beliefs is not surprising but an important finding was that there were less than ten teachers who reported that the materials from NBIPs were useful. A typical comment about the usefulness of materials to teachers in INSET situations was made by one of the resource persons.

The teachers were quite happy about it because the way they have been running their multigrade classes with the existing ... manuals that are used for normal schools they find it very difficult to use. So, the idea of a handbook with sample of lesson plans and different subjects, they were quite I think excited about it and they were quite eager to know when the handbook will be out and can use it.

A similar comment was expressed by a teacher.

After that just like previously we used to go like teachers centred, just go on describing without using any aids etc. But after this inservice course ... we can make some new teaching aids etc., so that they understand and ... our teaching will be more effective.

This could be understood because of teachers’ apparent preference for identifying practices that had developed as a result of NBIP and materials may well have been overlooked. However, it is inescapable that little mention of materials was made and the conclusion must be drawn that materials were perceived to have not been as useful as they might. This is all the more important since materials were a key feature of teachers’ concerns (see p.46) and an important thrust of many of the NBIPs in the period.

(c) Teacher Practices

Development of teacher practices was the most highly recognised form of impact by teachers and others as a result of NBIPs. Practices included all curriculum and co-curricular areas from the NBIP program (40 citations in all). A typical example is the following comment from a teacher in a Zhemgang primary school: ‘The topics selected for the NBIPs are relevant to our school because Maths was really [a] problem to our school’. However, more commonly teachers mentioned the development of general teaching practices rather than those that were specifically associated with particular school subjects (60 citations). This was despite the fact that there were no specific NBIPs on classroom skills development. Broadly, the practices mentioned were concerned with classroom implementation and little mention was made in relation to
planning for, and assessment in, the classroom indicating a possible lack of balance in the workshops, or, teachers’ propensity to focus upon practice. Particular mention was made of the use that NBIPs were for remote and older teachers. For example, a Head Teacher said:

Having attended this workshop, I found it very useful because prior to attending this workshop though there wasn’t problem in teaching, I was teaching in old ways. After attending this workshop when what ever things are to be taught are taught through songs, games and fun making students were able to understand better. So it is of great help.

An experienced resource person had this to say about the impact upon teachers’ practices:

On the practice side I would think that in regard to the impact of NBIPs I would think that it is now better, I think that people are trying much better because when they come back from different courses you can see that people can talk about issues, a lot of maturity has come into them.

INT: So they have developed the language.

Not only the language but also they are talking real issues. In the initial years when we had NBIP many of the ideas that were talked about were not [grounded in reality]. Now there are much more realistic issues that are coming up, realistic discussions, some of the solutions that they come up with in discussion are more practical.

Furthermore, students were specifically mentioned 20 times by teachers as having improved directly as a result of NBIPs.

(d) Sharing

Sharing is an interesting outcome of INSET since it represents the informal learning that may occur. A number of the interviews make it clear that NBIPs are an important social occasion but from these data it would be hasty to write off the informal interaction that takes place at NBIPs since so many teachers mention it as an outcome. ‘My friend, he was my batch. He did not have [an] idea about to run the multigrade class. We sat together and talked and then after sometime he [did]’ is one of the quotations from the 32 citations. A DEO indicated that the sharing begins and goes beyond the NBIP:

In the NBIP, teachers share their knowledge, ideas and experiences with their fellow participants and the resource persons. These shared ideas are further discussed and shared with their fellow teachers in the schools. This way the ideas are multiplied from the National level courses to the school level courses which benefits the entire teacher population of the country.

To continue this informal theme, a further eleven citations from teachers indicated that they agree, they share ideas with their colleagues when they get back to their school (as opposed to conducting SBIPs). According to one of the teachers, after an NBIP, ‘we can guide these temporary teachers because they don’t have knowledge of teaching. So we guide as well we make them how to make the lesson plan and do the assessment through this’.
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(ii) Negative Impact

Despite the teachers’ quite positive views about the impact, they are not shared by everyone. Of the small number of 13 negative citations, three are from very senior Education Division officials. The following is the strongest opinion when the impact of NBIP was raised:

It has been very minimal. It was noticed that in many cases the teachers did not use the skills acquired during the training (but) definitely the NBIP did benefit (some) teachers a lot. Despite that, the desired outcome is not satisfactory.

INT: How do you know that?

I know that because whenever we visit some schools we make a point of seeing into their classrooms to see what they do and there are lots of evidences, such as in the classrooms once you enter you can very well make out what is happening in that class, the way that the teachers are teaching. So we can very well relate, you know, whether those skills are being used or not. Even the simple things like making learning materials and using them in the classroom. Some classrooms are just barren. Nothing being done. The teachers just walk in, they just lecture, and go out. … By now every teacher will have attended some courses so we do not expect that the classes will be in such bad shape. So looking at these indicators I feel that teachers are not making use of inservice.

There is thus quite a difference in views between some senior Education Division administrators and most of the teachers, the resource persons and DEOs. Given the high proportion of teachers in Bhutan who have been to NBIPs from 1996 to 1998, the small number of positive comments gives cause for concern. However, alongside this must be put the mainly positive data from the quantitative data analysis despite the response set. There are also a small number of negative comments from teachers and others, and the suggestions for improvement of NBIP contain inherent in them many quite trenchant criticisms of the NBIPs (see p.80).

(iii) Facilitating Factors of NBIP

Facilitating factors were conceptualised as design, implementation and evaluation effects. There were no evaluation citations, just as there had been none in the NBIP Current Practices.

(a) Design

There were 30 citations concerning NBIP design evenly spread amongst venue, quality of resource persons, topic, language, teacher selection for NBIPs and such matters. According to 23 citations of Head Teachers and teachers, language used in the NBIPs are generally adequate. However, here is an interesting comment made by one of the Lopen Head Teachers.

INT: During any of the workshops that you have had attended, did you find the medium of instruction as a problem?

I have attended workshops of both Dzongkha and English instruction. Though my schooling was in Dzongkha, so far I did not face the medium of instruction as a major problem because my level of understanding was quite adequate for myself.
In terms of materials required for the NBIPs, one teacher said ‘I think we did not really have very serious problems. It was well funded so we had enough materials support’ though we know from the resource persons that there were sometimes difficulties in providing them (see p.51).

There is mixed opinions about the resource persons’ abilities. A few argued that

They particularly do well. I have attended many workshops but I found all the resource persons they are resourceful, much helpful and the ideas they gave us we have implemented in the school and we found that it has improved a lot.

Some comments from the resource persons themselves indicate that psychological comfort also has a vital role in the delivery of the workshops.

Yes. But again when we say Head Teachers we had a range of Head Teachers like community Head Teachers, primary, junior high schools and principals of high schools and we also had inspectors. This was, I think we had more professional discussions and I think we treated them like responsible persons and I think that is why this time when I had the feedback of the workshop ... actually two weeks ... three weeks ... two weeks of training course, almost everybody had said they benefited a lot.

(b) Implementation

There were about half the number of citations concerning implementation compared to design. (Note the distinction we made here between delivery of the NBIP workshop and implementation of what was delivered back in the school.) One of the inspectors comments: ‘there has been many NBIPs and when we visit the schools we find that they try their best’. He goes on to say that

The schools are trying to make their own resources or teaching aids; and the teachers who have attended the science NBIPs are able to make teaching aids using the locally available materials. And I think many primary schools do this and this has been possible only because of the NBIPs.

It has also been identified that one of the important roles delegated to the officers of EMSS is ‘to provide the necessary professional support to the DEOs/DRTs and schools on a regular basis through forums such as the Dzongkhag Based Inservice Programs and the School Based Inservice Programs’. In some cases, to assist participants to implement the ideas in their schools, teachers are asked to plan implementation programs at the workshop as is evident in one of the NBIP reports ‘materials and an action plan level-wise were produced’.

The citations indicated that for certain NBIP workshops, design and implementation factors were well received by a small number of people.

There were no indications that evaluations played a facilitating part in the impact of NBIPs.

(iv) Constraints on NBIP Impact

There were about the same number of constraint citations as there were facilitating factors in the previous sub section. Note, however, that this number in both categories
is masked by the practice of including a citation as an improvement where the constraint also specified a suggestion for improvement. Thus the number of constraints are understated here. What were these constraints? Again these are divided into NBIP design and implementation categories.

(a) Design

In terms of design, participant selection is the most common constraint on impact (19 citations). It seems that at times, too many of the wrong people get nominated to NBIPs or too few turn up, as illustrated by the comments of this course director.

As far as my experiences go one thing that always disappointed me was the participants. We either get participants we did not expect or we get too few. When we had workshops for the lower classes, our turn out was more than expected. We had to send some back even because it involved money and other logistic problems.

Analysis of NBIP reports substantiates this point. Other constraints included trouble with the venues, lack of materials and difficulty with resource people, and even some mention of a lack of professionalism in lack of preparation and in conduct of NBIPs. An example of the latter is the following: ‘From my point of view when I go to inservice training, the participants are often treated like children, you know. There are bells for everything. It is just like going back to school’. This is not the way to treat fellow professionals whose work is very difficult and important. Language, either Dzongkha or English, was also a constraint for some.

(b) Implementation

Impact was constrained as far as implementation back in the classroom was concerned by resource issues such as large classes and lack of materials as well as lack of support in the school. For instance one of the NBIP reports alleges that the Head Teacher can be a block to successful implementation in the school. ‘The positive or negative attitude and the active or inactive roles of the Head of the institution in general is attributed to the presence or absence’ of effective implementation.

Nine citations of inspectors and teachers express that teachers cannot implement the ideas because, for example

When it comes to implementation of the science curriculum, we have seen that in many primary schools the resources are not there. Accompanying the new curriculum there are supposed to be some resources, but in some schools because of the inadequacy of the funds, the Division is not able to send the [resources].

Often there were some trenchant comments that teachers could not use the new practices because of resource constraints, implying that the resource persons should have anticipated these problems.

However these practices in some of the schools are very much affected by manpower shortage teacher constraint, too many sections for less number of teachers or too many large class strength and the teacher pupil ratio is quite high .. wherever the teacher pupil ratio is quite high then some of the professional [short pause] skills that the teachers acquire through the NBIPs are unable to be practiced by the teachers.
Apart from the resourcing problems perhaps not being addressed in the NBIPs, follow-up was missing; firstly by people who resourced the NBIP visiting schools owing to their daily commitment. For example, one of the resource persons said, ‘Ah, there was one guy, two people who contacted us actually so but it just happened that we were so busy and we couldn’t make it out to the school’. Secondly, the follow-up requirement that teachers themselves actually do try out what they had learned is often lacking. For instance one interesting comment was made by one of the experienced resource persons that puts these two follow-up ideas together.

Each course required follow-up activities ideally and support to teachers in schools. But what happens in many courses these activities are not planned and even if it was planned for some courses it was not done as scheduled.

INT: By the follow-up do you mean that the teachers were asked to do something or that the resource people and course director were going to do something or do you mean both?

Both. Actually what I mean is okay we run a course and we expect the teachers to learn some skills. Based on that they make use of those skills in the classroom. That follow-up from our people who conducted the course should have made sure that some of those skills are made use of. That type of monitoring was not done, or not possible to be done within the available time. So, I would say in such cases it was just a one shot affair. Courses, once they were finished, it was over.

There were complaints that some teachers went to NBIPs but tried nothing new afterwards once back at their school. An example of this is found from a resource person’s comment: ‘I mean, you train people for multigrade, and you find half of them are not in multigrade situation, but you don’t even find out if that teacher is using the multi-ability skills in the school or in his classroom’. A small number of teachers claimed that resource people did not have any idea about whether what they had presented actually worked or not. Sometimes impact was nullified by a teacher being transferred (eg., ‘Deployment has caused a problem, especially in secondary, leading to wastage’).

(v) Conclusion

The impact of NBIP was variable within the one third of the teaching cadre who had participated in NBIPs over the last three years. Generally there was a more positive reaction than negative, the main impact being in teaching practices and the main facilitating factors being design features. Constraints were mostly to do with selection of NBIP participants, lack of follow-up and the realities imposed by high class size and lack of resources.

School Based Inservice Program (SBIP)

On average two out of three teachers had experienced an SBIP at least once in the last three years. However, only 51% of community school teachers reported in the questionnaire that they had experienced SBIPs in the last three years. This compares with two thirds from Primary, almost three quarters from Junior High and 87% from High Schools. There are 88 positive citations concerning the impact of SBIP against eight negative. This relative proportion is quite an achievement since SBIP is quite
new and an understanding of what to do and how to do it has not had time to develop. However, A possible difficulty in interpretation here is teachers’ lack of understanding of the concept of SBIP which means that staff meetings, something akin to a workshop, might have been classed as SBIP. The quantitative data, which follow, provide a general picture of the ways in which teachers see that SBIP has impacted on them.

(i) Positive Impact

The two factors derived from the second order factor analysis of 23 of 25 SBIP items responded to by 402 teachers were readily interpreted as ‘Improved learning with Headquarters materials and practical ideas and collegiality but not relating to everyday life’ (Improved Learning for short) and ‘Poor content and input’ (Poor Content). The first factor explained approximately 39% of the variance, the second approximately 16%. The first factor indicates a concentration upon items about practical ideas associated with teachers’ classroom needs. There is also an element of support, especially that from colleagues and from authorities through the use of the materials that they produce. In the second factor the concentration is upon other than classroom realities, that is, too many ideas with too much explanation and focus upon manuals and out of touch with classroom realities. Were there differences between groups on these two factors?

There were no differences between groups based upon teacher characteristics (age, gender and nationality) or by qualifications (academic and professional) and teaching experience on either of these two factors. There were significant differences, as main effects, for teacher type (Improved Learning) and for school type (Improved Learning). As can be seen from Figures 11 and 12, Primary school teachers have a less positive view about the impact of SBIPs upon improved learning in the classroom with Headquarters support and collegiality than Junior High (sig.<0.05) and High School teachers (sig. < 0.05). High school teachers view SBIP significantly more positively than do Community School teachers (sig.<0.05) (and primary school teachers) but not Junior High School teachers. Overall, this is an interesting result given that primary schools proportionately use SBIP considerably less than the other categories of school, especially Junior High and High Schools (Figure 11).

In Figure 12, Dzongkha teachers are significantly different from all other groups of teachers in that they consider SBIPs improve learning with the support of Headquarters materials and they provide practical ideas and collegiality. What is interesting to note here is that Dzongkha teachers are very often on their own or in small numbers in schools and they also say that they desire more opportunities for SBIP-type interaction, certainly more NBIP opportunities. Their position as represented in these quantitative data might well be interpreted as a naive position.
Figure 11: Improved Learning School Type main effect.
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Figure 12: Improved Learning Teacher category main effect.
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We shall now turn to the qualitative data and the positive and negative impact of SBIP, followed by facilitating factors for, then the constraints on, SBIP will be addressed.

Impact by SBIP on teachers was conceptualised once more using the Fullan basic framework of beliefs, materials and practices.

(a) Teacher Practices

Three quarters of the positive impact citations concerned teacher practices and one third of these (20) were teachers’ views that students had benefited, presumably as a result of
these practices. Teachers perceive SBIP helps them come to terms with their real work situation. For example, one Head Teacher said ‘in the SBIP we discuss since it is the academic session (and) we try whatever we discussed and (the) decision taken, finalized, (and then) we try to see whether this is working or not practically on students’. However, not everything can be readily worked out. ‘Although we are able to resolve some of our difficulties during SBIPs, many still remain unresolved’. More than one EMSS Officer pointed out that the follow-up by teachers from the SBIP meetings was often poor. One of the inspectors reports, ‘teachers tended to be dissatisfied with the quality of professional input in the SBIP because its focus tended to be classroom only. They wanted more outside help’.

(b) Beliefs

Gaining confidence was a main outcome of SBIP for some teachers as revealed by the two of their citations.

Both in teachers and students learning SBIP is very useful we gain lots of ideas, we have clarified our doubts what we have ... the doubts we have hidden in our minds whatever we have hidden we can clarify it.

From that SBIPs I could find myself little bit confident, even I have to look after the library I can do it.

And one of the DEOs comments,

In my opinion SBIPs have proved more useful than NBIPs as it immediately addresses the specific problems faced in the schools, may it be administrative academic and any other important issues needing SBIPs attention. Such programs do act as a useful forum to thrash out the problems at the grass root level using the local resources both human and materials.

(c) Materials

The use of aids and materials were positive outcomes in a minor number of citations. One comment illustrates that teachers learn ‘from each other and making use of the teaching learning materials available within the school’ and another ‘we basically look at the materials that the schools have in line with the said workshop that they have conducted’. Alternatively, a few comments such as the one that follows indicates that the materials do not always get used:

when I observe their classes they don’t go along with the teaching aids, they use lecture methods. So I advise or help them to prepare teaching aid. Without teaching aid we can’t go to the class.

(d) Sharing

Just as in the context of NBIPs, sharing was an important element of SBIPs according to the teachers of all types and also according to ten of 13 DEOs who responded to the short open-ended questionnaire. One of the latter said

The teachers take active part in sharing their ideas, knowledge and experiences with their friends. Thus the teachers are made aware of the policy, change of curriculum and
the directives at the national to the lowest levels. Therefore, SBIPs have positive impact to contributing to professional development in the schools.

Problem solving and collegiality were seen as main benefits within this category. The following are indicative.

SBIP is gaining momentum and is a forum for the teachers to share their ideas and experiences and solve methodological as well as pedagogical problems encountered by different subject teachers.

Through SBIP we can have good cooperation among staff, we can deal [with] the problems those teachers are facing plus [those of] the students.

However, sometimes it is interesting to note that sometimes the sharing is one way. For example one officiating Head Teachers is of the opinion, ‘they [SBIPs] are very useful because I can share my ideas to the teachers and they can take note and implement them on the students. Sharing of ideas refreshes teachers’ knowledge’.

(ii) Negative Impact

There were very few comments in this category and a lack of understanding of the SBIP process was most evident in them. Two comments illustrate that SBIPs can go wrong.

The observation and discussion of each other’s teaching as a part of SBIP seem to have been misunderstood in many cases and leads to an atmosphere not very conducive to learning.

SBIPs and Intervision should not be used simply for criticizing and pointing out each other’s mistakes.

An EMSS officer observed that SBIP ‘is an area that schools have to work on because barring a few schools, what happens is SBIPs are conducted and a round of applause at the end and that is the end, that’s the end’.

(iii) Factors facilitating

There were roughly fifty per cent more facilitating factor citations (37) for SBIP as compared to the constraints. Design and implementation issues will be considered.

(a) Design

In terms of design, input on relevant topics was seen to be useful in the SBIP situation. As one teacher succinctly put it ‘if the subject / topics are relevant to the issues it would be very effective’. Teachers’ felt needs were addressed according to a DEO (see p.75). Making use of school plans was also useful for a small number of schools as an EMSS officer observed.

Some... not some, few schools they have. [short pause] They are planned to organise and they have reflected in the calendar. Also they have planned to organise thrice in a year and most schools only twice in a year. As I have already said the newly opened community schools with less number or only with staff and the community schools which are isolated they, in their plan, the SBIP program is not reflected.
(b) Implementation

As for implementation, support for teachers by EMSS (six citations), DEO/DRT (four) and particularly by Head Teachers (only six) was an important facilitating factor. For example, ‘Most important has been the provision of moral support to teachers and the recognition of their efforts’ as was the availability of materials like the SBIP Handbook. Pressure was not mentioned.

(iv) Constraints

Teachers at small schools made the point that they found it difficult to undertake SBIP and explains to some extent at least their negativity towards SBIP (see p.73). Others indicated they did not have the opportunity and materials were a problem. For others the very real problem of input by teachers returning from NBIPs was mentioned: ‘NBIPs go on for weeks and their SBIP versions are mostly just one day. What do you think in terms of how much can be done in such a short time?’ This point certainly challenges the wisdom of trying to follow NBIP with a single SBIP!

(v) SBIP Following NBIP

Despite the logic of the last comment, it is apparent from a small 14 citations that some teachers believe that SBIP following NBIP can be very effective, for example,

Head Teacher: The value education that was attended by the Head Teachers all across the country irrespective of the size of the school, that was very, very educative, especially that one. I even I shared with my friends after having come back from Punakha. That was something very, very educative.

INT: How did it have impact on your staff?

Head Teacher: They really learnt and they really appreciated and they are implementing the same.

Both constraints and facilitating factors refer to the quality of the NBIP and the ‘attentiveness of the participant teacher’ as being crucial factors. However, the reality is that given the participation of teachers at NBIPs in the period 1996-8 (planned numbers were well over 3000, see p.52) the number of responses in this category is very small indeed. This must call into question the present practice of SBIP following NBIP since the practice does not appear to follow it very often and, likely as not, it is very difficult to do.

Upon reflection, there are a number of reasons which, separately or together can make SBIPs following NBIPs less than successful. These include: (1) the person selected wasn’t appropriate; (2) the person was so uncomfortable that not much was learned; (3) the returning person was not able to run an SBIP (not trained in adult education principles); (4) there was a lack of materials (either not supplied from the NBIP or not available at the school); (5) only a half to two days was available for SBIP following an NBIP of from ten to twelve days; (6) lack of credibility of the person (either because the ideas have not been tried out yet in that school, or they are inexperienced); (7) SBIPs are seen as a workshop rather than a series of workshop-type events followed up by
practice in classrooms and support and pressure, and (8) transfer of teachers after the workshop.

(vi) Cluster SBIPs

DEOs, EMSS Officers and teachers all reported that remote schools were joining in clusters of two or three to undertake SBIP. The benefits of such clustering and sharing can be quite considerable.

for example in my school now we have now three general teachers and before we had only two general teachers. So whatever doubts I had if I could ask my friend, sometimes he can clarify, sometimes he can’t. Sometimes whatever doubts he had and if he asks me I can not clarify because I am also in doubts. So these doubts we hide and continue our teaching. If we have a cluster, we note it down whatever the doubts we have, from classroom teaching to disciplinary action and anything. Then we talk in the cluster. “We have certain doubts. What do you do in your school?” So then they will say “We did like this and it works well”. Then we can copy, yes then we come back and follow their system, it works well. For me SBIP working in cluster system is very useful.

However, it is apparent that the number involved is quite small.

(vii) Intervision

Intervision is even newer than SBIP and is on trial in Bhutan. As Thinley’s thesis (Thinley 1999) has shown, conducting it successfully is not easy. However in more than one school, Intervision is having a positive impact as evidenced by this quotation from one teacher.

After conducting SBIP we made groups, either a mixed group or social group or subject groups. Every time we change like that not same groups all the time. Then we go [and] observe our friends teaching … then at the last we all sit together and again conduct a meeting. It is like sharing of ideas among all the teachers and headmasters. We discuss and then we go to our respective classes and implement the same thing what ever we did in the workshop.

An observation element in such a process is likely to be threatening and may challenge even the most confident of teachers. Clearly a firm base of collegiality is important (Thinley 1999).

(viii) Conclusion

The analysis of the data indicate that, on the whole, the impact of the NBIPs leaves much to be desired. Much reliance has been placed upon these centralised mechanisms for development but there are considerable constraints to their success. Despite the constraints many teachers, resource persons, DEOs, and to a lesser extent some key persons, indicated that NBIP had impacted upon the quality of teaching practice in Bhutan. Two teachers’ comments looking back upon the impact of NBIPs sum this position up well. First, a junior high school teacher said:

I could carry out the activities in the classroom very efficiently. I became more confident, I could even guide the teacher trainees while making their lesson plans and all. National based workshops are very useful.
And a Dzongkha teacher commented:

but having attended this workshop where the resource persons familiarized me with the use of manual step by step, I have gained much experience and I have become more confident now.

Building teachers’ confidence is essential. SBIPs are common across the Kingdom, however, the data on SBIP impact is very variable. It is indicative that SBIP is taking place and in some quite effectively. The impact of SBIPs following NBIPs appears to variable but, on the whole, minor. This latter finding is a cause for some considerable concern.

Improving INSET

Data from the ‘Improvements’ section of the questionnaire and interviews are brought together to address the research sub-questions on improvement. Those are:

(a) In what ways might the system-wide inservice program model be changed to make it more useful to teachers and others?

(b) What content needs to be improved in inservice courses to make them more useful for participants?

(c) What course delivery needs to be improved in inservice courses to make them more useful for participants?

One of the outstanding aspects of the statistical data on the Improvement items in the questionnaire that sought opinions about some alternatives to improve the INSET program, is the ratio of valid responses received. About 95% of respondents in the sample provided answers to these items, even though only about one third of these respondents had first hand experience of NBIP (p.49), and two thirds SBIP, in the last three years. High levels of support for the vast majority of the various options were recorded. It appears that teachers want greater participation in a full range of inservice activities.

A closer analysis of those data pays dividends (see Appendix 5, p.147). The last seven items all address, in one way or another, the classroom practices of the teacher. The implication is that INSET should provide support for the work of teachers because they address teachers’ concerns and professional needs. This finding has implications for both NBIP and SBIP. There is also a somewhat lower level of agreement, compared with other items in this set, with the provision of inservice that is based upon the use of the teacher’s manual (ranked 19th out of 23) and textbooks (ranked 23rd). As we have seen in Current Practices (see above, p.80), perhaps NBIP and SBIP have focussed too much upon these topics in the past, relatively speaking. It might be that teachers are looking for increased emphasis upon their professional concerns and needs (ranked 4th), classroom or school planning and practices (ranked 7th, 6th and 13th respectively).
The structure of the section again follows the structural forms of INSET, that is, National Based Inservice Program (NBIP) and School Based Inservice Program (SBIP), NBIP followed by SBIP, together with minor forms, Cluster SBIPs and Intervision. Two additional sections are added in this section. These concern the management of INSET and the idea of inservice activities based on clusters of one kind or another. We will refer to this latter idea as ‘Cluster Based Inservice’.

**National Based Inservice Program (NBIP)**

We begin with NBIP where the greatest number of suggestions for improvement was made (422 citations covering 5709 text units). From the outset it should be noted that these endorse the continuation of NBIP, both from the interview and the questionnaire. In what follows, improvements in NBIP are considered from the point of view of their design, their implementation and their evaluation, remembering that implementation refers to after the NBIP in schools rather than the delivery of the NBIP itself. More than three times the number of suggestions were made concerning design than implementation improvements.

**(i) Design**

Design refers to the set of decisions that are taken about the plans and overall structure of the NBIP. Specific issues for comment include selection of topic, timing and length, venue, resource persons, delivery, and upgrading of qualifications.

**(a) Selection of Topic**

At the beginning of this section we saw that respondents to the questionnaire expressed a relatively stronger desire for addressing their needs as compared to the use of manuals and text books. More than one third of the qualitative data citations in NBIP design improvement concerned who should choose the topics for the sessions of the NBIP which is a directly related issue. Improvement suggestions concerning selection of topic were between teachers’ choice of topic and the Headquarters choice.

There is a general recognition and acceptance that curriculum change will be initiated by CAPSS, as indicated by such comments as

> There should be inservice programs on how to use the new manuals or handbooks introduced in schools.

However, 36 of the 60 were citations concerning alternative topics on what the teachers would rather have. The following quotation regarding teacher choice from an open-ended response in the questionnaire puts this view rather well.

> It will be helpful if arrangements can be made so that we can take part in inservice programs where our need is most or the ones that are relevant to problems we face.

A slightly different perspective is given in the next comment, again from a teacher:

> NBIP should be planned as per practical classroom situation problems and how to overcome it.
Resource persons did not comment at all openly on this issue of school choice, but there was an indication that either there was no need to take teachers’ needs into account or the process to determine teachers’ needs was not understood. Several suggestions were made, however, by teachers, for improvement on how to determine teachers’ needs. These included surveys, analysis of SBIP reports, and more direct contact with Headquarters staff. *The overwhelming impression from these data is that teachers’ needs have not been addressed adequately in NBIPs and teachers thought that they should be.*

(b) Timing and Length

As well as the nature of the choice of topic, timing and length of the NBIP are two related and important issues in NBIP design. There were 85 citations each for these two issues. Broadly there was a tendency for teachers to want NBIPs to be lengthened or at least cover the same time period as at present in the qualitative data. The desire for greater length can be understood in terms of the content and processes of the workshops. This is illustrated by comments from one of three teachers below:

Duration, it was ten days, but very packed.

In some cases the workshops are too lengthy, many things are being crammed into one day not giving that much freedom to the participants. They are really pressurized. In place of that, depending upon the type of the workshop, the time has to be spread over; the sessions should be spread, and the number of days should also vary according to the content of the workshop. Rather than having a few days or a number of weeks.

I just think it should be based on the nature and the content of the workshop; in such a way that the sessions are not cramped in one day and people should have time to go for relaxation after the sessions. In many cases they are coming from different places. Let them also have the opportunity to see the environment.

However in the quantitative data, support for ‘workshops longer than 15 days’ (D8) is noticeably weaker (and especially from teachers in urban locations, High School teachers and those with higher qualifications). Opinion was more diverse on this item than any other in the set (standard deviation is 1.28). Of course the longer NBIPs really demand that they be conducted in the winter but one third of citations (12) on this issue indicate that their preference was for another time, especially mentioning the mid-term break. Six of the 27 citations in favour of the winter asked that they not be held in mid winter while 14 observed that timing and length depend upon a variety of factors, such as topic, participants, length and so on.

(c) Venue

The issue of venue is related to length and timing. The most common issue in this regard was participant comfort (44 citations), especially in relation to the cold.

Regarding venue only I think during winter vacation it happens and when it is conducted in the cold places many of the participants are not participating fully because of the climatic condition. When conducted in TTC we will find that there is a bhukhari and everybody tries to sit near by the bhukhari, not much of interaction.
Cold people cannot work well. Such is also the case if their food and lodging is not adequate, as was indicated by several teachers. Another perspective on venue is the observation that it would be cheaper for resource people to travel, the implication being that there could be more and shorter courses, so that more people could attend since they would have shorter distances to travel. Yet another perspective was that the venue for similar courses should change from year to year, again to increase the opportunities for attendance.

(d) Resource Persons

The following comment from a Head Teacher identifies a persistent concern among teachers.

In NBIPs, or it can be DBIPs or SBIPs, the coordinator should be ... a really good coordinator, really very good facilitator. ... With dedication he or she has a habit of exploration in-depth in that NBIP topic matter. He should have the sense (to) really make show that what I am going to implement and he should have character who keeps on exploring.

Resource person quality is the issue here. Several respondents suggested that knowledge of adult education processes were required, but as we have seen from the section on Current Practices, too often the resource people are forced to attend or simply do not arrive. Further, teachers notice a poorly planned and delivered NBIP (8 citations on this issue). Where planning by resource persons and course directors is undertaken at the last minute, often demanding working late into the evening the night before, then the quality of the NBIP is likely to suffer. These problems are exacerbated as the course lengthens.

(e) Delivery

The delivery of courses was commented on by 40 respondents, the common theme being the pedagogical approach taken by the resource persons. The suggestions made were consistent with adult education principles and included not too much lecturing, increased group participation, addressing of the problems of those present, and variation in methods and aids. There were also comments on teachers’ need to be respected.

Do not treat teachers like children; teachers should have some freedom to express their feelings and share their experiences

and

He/she should be very friendly with everybody and present the plan casually with limited rules and regulations rather than making strict rule and disciplines as all are teachers and very responsible persons. If the NBIP is conducted in this manner I’m sure there will be greater impact on every individual.

(f) Upgrading and Certification

The final issue to come from the data is the broad content of the NBIPs and their purpose. Slightly more than twice as many teachers thought that NBIP should be about professional upgrading, including the possibility of earning qualifications through participation in the NBIP program (see below), as those who thought NBIP should be
about academic upgrading. Dzongkha teachers (14 citations) in particular took the opportunity in the open-ended items of the questionnaire to point out that their opportunities for upgrading were limited. As one respondent put it:

You [could] have specialist certificates in English or in maths and that you usually do them over three winters and you get level 1, 2 and 3. I’d be a big supporter of that idea. I think that it is time for that idea that at a professional level that they will become specialised and that they will be a resource person for the Dzongkhag in English, or in maths, or in library management, or whatever. I think that if we can develop some sort of specialist certificate and if they are then related to some pay scale they would be very attractive. … If you have something where you go to a workshop that you particularly interested in and that if you get level 3 you are going to get paid more for being a professional in that area you will see a whole new era in people’s interest in the workshops.

If NBIPs were to develop so that a monitoring mechanism was developed to ensure actual development had taken place then this might be the time to take up the idea of certification or awarding credit points for NBIPs. This is essentially the point made during an interview with a senior educator, talking about teachers who want better qualifications.

I think that they would very much like to get that professional qualification. If some how that special certificate that you are getting in inservice could be linked to degree credit at NIE [or TTC] and that you would then get at the end after you have done so many credits on top of your teaching certificate. I think that you would have a popular product there, and I think that it would go hand in hand with the distance education.

A similar idea was put forward for packages to be developed and presented at NBIPs (see below p.86).

(g) Summary of Design Improvements

There are a number of ways in which NBIPs may be improved in terms of their design, and these need to be taken as a package.

1. NBIPs will need to be more focussed in terms of the resource persons’ objectives for workshops in order to accommodate a shorter length.

2. NBIP workshops have to include strategies that take into account the needs of teachers, and in particular, of those present at the workshop. Strategies to find out the needs of teachers in general as well as those who actually attend NBIPs will need to be developed as will the responsiveness of resource persons.

3. Resource persons need to be trained in the use of adult education principles and encouraged to adopt a more professional approach to their work as well as a more collegial approach to their teacher colleagues. In the first instance, this means that course directors are properly trained so that they can begin the process of dissemination to their resource person collaborators.
(ii) Implementation

Whereas there were 330 citations concerning ‘design’ there were less than one hundred citations concerning implementation of NBIP back in the schools. There were also clear trends regarding opinions about follow-up and support in the quantitative data.

(a) Follow-up

Over 80% of respondents in the questionnaire agreed that follow-up was desirable, seemingly regardless of the particular form (see p.147). Thus follow-up via SBIP (D11), Head Teachers/DEOs (D14) or other resource persons (D15) were equally supported. A similar preference for follow-up through various people was evident in the qualitative data with a special emphasis upon putting into practice what had been learned at the NBIP (21 citations). One teacher said: ‘Some simply attend the programs and do not implement it. This I think is a great loss’. A Head Teacher observed that

some teachers attend a workshop, come back, they share it in the SBIP and that is the end of it. They themselves don’t put it into the implementation.

In this same vein, almost 87% of respondents thought that NBIP should be compulsorily followed-up in the form of classroom activities (D16). This might be interpreted as meaning that respondents believe that the connection between the NBIP and the classroom is not yet as strong as it can and should be, thereby legitimating some form of external pressure to enforce such connection-making. Some even wanted a formal report to be written based upon experiences. There were also calls for follow-up by resource people from the NBIPs and from Education Division (CAPSS and EMSS), even questionnaires to provide data back to the Headquarters.

(b) Support

While ‘follow-up’ received the most citations, the comments regarding lack of support for those returning from NBIPs were very telling. Teachers saw the need for support but, interestingly, few gave this role to the Head Teacher whereas more senior educators could see the instructional leadership role of the Head Teacher providing the necessary support. Alternatively, one senior educator had a different perspective.

Somebody who is involved in the NBIP and who knows exactly what went in as input and who knows the ins and outs, should be somehow based at the DEOs’ level to go and support teachers when they get back from the NBIP and start working in schools. … Just getting a shot of ten days or fifteen days and then going back to the school and facing the realities and the difficulties, sometimes people are lost. And if there is someone to give them follow-up guidance, and help them overcome the problems then this would improve things.

Another senior educator pointed to the present difficulties in monitoring (including support) which give a clear indication of areas for improvement.

This is something that we need to think harder, because when we talk about efficient monitoring, we might ask who is the right person to do that. Now, at present again I still feel the lack of the right persons to do the right job is still a big question mark for me. Let’s take the main people who are responsible for support in our system. We have the inspectorate in the education department. I still wonder about the type of support that they provide in our schools. Then let’s take the DEOs in the Dzongkhags- the type of
people we have and their academic competency. Are they the right people who a teacher can look up to and say, wow, I can get some help from this person? How often a DEO visits schools for academic purposes is another question I would like to ask. Then come to the most basic level of the head teachers who are supposed to be the main academic support and supervisor in the school. Again looking at his academic competency, experience … as well as his load with administration, whether he justifies it. So, at present I think there is this three layers of support laid out in documents, but how well do they do is my question.

These last comments lead to at least two important questions regarding support. How important is it, and do the people know how to do it?

(c) Pressure

In contrast to the support just mentioned people from all levels pointed out the necessity for pressure. Pressure is a form of monitoring with some power base behind it.

There were almost as many citations for pressure as there were support, and almost as many ways of applying pressure, including report writing, questionnaires, frequent communications between participants and resource persons, monitoring by EMSS staff, monitoring by the Head Teacher.

(iii) Evaluation

It is clear from the NBIP reports submitted after the completion of the NBIP by course directors that evaluations of NBIPs have been generally undertaken. But these, not surprisingly were limited to the evaluation of the NBIP sessions, in the main.

(iv) Other Improvements associated with NBIPs

Other improvements identified by respondents included improved coordination of the support services, increased reliance upon research data, the design of workshops in a graded sequence, formal certification of workshop achievements, and the development of skills packages. Each is considered briefly below.

(a) Coordination of Education Division Services

As one senior educator said:

All of us in the Education Division, we talk about the importance of wholesome education and therefore all of us are responsible for providing teacher education in terms of inservice programs. I think it is important for us to sit together and see how and where our contribution compliments each other.

Already there has been mention of the way in which analyses of the BBE examination results could assist INSET and the way that an analysis of the EMSS reports could assist. The support function of parts of the Division also needs to be addressed.

(b) Development of a Research Orientation

Broadly this has to do with the need for the Division to have access to data. It has already been mentioned in the form of follow-up and evaluation of NBIPs. Data is
needed on the impact of INSET (and other) effects as one senior CAPSS officer pointed out. Already there is a beginning of action research in Bhutan through the Multigrade Attachment Program but there is potential elsewhere for it to be developed and to have an impact in a small education system such as Bhutan’s as the following speculation indicates.

Maybe what we can do is I work with twenty teachers and I make these teachers my coresearchers. They become research associates and I do the research. So we work together as a team and we come together and we discuss as a team and my colleagues has another twenty teachers so she does the same thing and other teachers. In this way teachers will feel involved in some important work, they can be inspired to contribute and through that they build up their capacity to do research themselves. I mean this action research is something that individual teachers can carry out. I have this dream about building up this action research capacity in every teacher. So if we have twenty teacher educators working with twenty teachers each we already have about 400 teachers. [That’s one sixth of all teachers in Bhutan.] 400 teachers involved and they can inspire other teachers. So this is how I see it.

And it could be possible.

(c) Levels of NBIP

Levels or stages of NBIPs could greatly assist in the focussing of NBIPs and so assist in ease of nomination. Were this to be adopted, then potential participants could be channelled or channel themselves toward the most appropriate course. NBIPs of this kind could be subject oriented, perhaps developed by NIE and/or TTC, or even Sherubtse leading to teacher specialists (see p.83). Others could be essentially professional in orientation and could be the products of collaboration between teachers on professional matters such as classroom skill development in continuous assessment. To some extent staging of NBIPs looks after the one shot issue since the stages of NBIPs could be developmental in nature. Again, the potential is there.

(d) Certification of NBIPs

As we have seen, the impact of NBIPs is very variable so the question of awarding certificates for successful completion of an NBIP would be extremely problematic at the moment. But, if the NBIPs were to develop so that a monitoring mechanism was developed to ensure actual development had taken place then this might be the time to take up the idea of certification or awarding credit points for NBIPs (see p.83). Such mechanisms will be necessary as Bhutan’s presently young teachers get older. Presently three quarters of Bhutan’s teachers are 30 or less.

(e) NBIP Skills Packages

These are another mechanism, but rather more formalised that the idea immediately above, that can address teacher development in the future, again, especially as the teaching cadre ages in Bhutan. The idea is for packages to be developed and presented at NBIP or even Dzongkhag level. Resource persons could be trained to deliver these packages and handle the follow-up. A senior educator described these packages thus:

It is important to have an inservice package developed which is staged, for example, modules 1, 2 and 3 where 2 builds in 1 etc. We need refresher courses for teachers on
teaching skills, say, every five years, so that teachers can update. Also an understanding is needed of the particular historical/cultural/social forces that have shaped the teaching service. Perhaps a minimum of a two month training package, all told, with credit to NIE. This needs to be built in to upgrade qualifications.

These kinds of packages are currently credited for university awards in Australia and elsewhere. In these cases the university usually judges the merits of each package and awards credit accordingly.

(v) Summary of NBIP Improvements

All three essential aspects of the NBIP workshops were seen as needing improvement. Following an adequate needs analysis, sessions need more focus, and the delivery of sessions requires persons who are trained and professional in their approach. Implementation of NBIPs would be improved by greater attention to follow-up in the form of different levels of pressure and support.

School Based Inservice Program (SBIP)

SBIP attracted 321 citations (3021 text units) that focussed upon its improvement suggestions. These are also considered from the point of view of their design and their implementation. Approximately twice the number of suggestions were made concerning design than implementation. In addition there were a limited number of suggestions about SBIP policy matters.

(i) SBIP Policy

Three citations made the point that the SBIP reports that had been written should receive some feedback from CAPSS. Another suggestion from six citations was that SBIP should be supported by funding. Two teachers wanted SBIP to be compulsory for every school and compulsory for all to attend.

(ii) Design

Comments on the design of SBIP programs were made concerning resource persons, topics, time related issues (frequency, timing and length) and the need for clearer guidelines about the process of SBIP. Each is elaborated in turn.

(a) Resource Persons

The quality of the resource person leading an SBIP drew comment from 10 respondents. The following comment emphasises the importance of this matter.

There is no need for SBIPs. SBIPs to be successful requires a highly motivated organizer and participants, and good cooperation among teachers. These things are hard to come by and we end up wasting a lot of time.

The question of where that quality of resource person should come from was one that many commented on. If the resource persons were from the school’s own teaching cadre (34 citations), concern for the impact of their leadership was expressed.
It is because if the same school teacher conduct SBIP in the school, other teacher do not
give much importance to the course

and

a colleague resourcing or observing does not become so effective.

Furthermore, there were suggestions included in 48 citations that the resource person be
drawn from NIE, TTC, a Headquarters pool, or Dzongkhag and this view is confirmed
in the quantitative data. Teachers tend to agree or strongly agree that they ‘would like to
take part in SBIP with Intervision resourced by others ...’.

These data are interesting for two reasons. Firstly, they further highlight the problems
of implementing the SBIP following NBIP policy since these personnel are scarcely
available. Secondly, they may also point to teachers’ awareness that they need expertise
that does not exist in their own school.

Suggestions were made for how resourcing from outside the school might happen. For
example, it was thought that NIE and TTC personnel might do so during teaching
practice rounds, while NBIP resource persons could do so during follow-up to schools,
and for Headquarters personnel by appointment.

On the other hand, some teachers are at the point where they can readily accept
colleagues as resource persons, as the following shorthand quotation from the
questionnaire shows.

Better ideas from the friends can accept. –Available, initiation and creativity

These data suggest clearly that the issue of resourcing of SBIP is a critical one.

(b) SBIP Topics

Just as the issue of resource persons created an interesting series of considerations, so
too did the issue of the topic of the SBIP. Just over half of the 83 citations indicate that
teachers understand that SBIPs should address the needs of the teachers in that
particular school. This is consistent with the general finding identified at the beginning
of this section that teachers’ needs relative to use of manuals and texts should be the
basis of INSET. The need to focus upon teachers’ needs is illustrated by the comment
by a teacher from a community school.

Especially we conduct the SBIP when we think there is a need, when we think teachers
have some problems in teaching certain subjects. If we have problems I feel it is always
good to get together to share the ideas and knowledge or experiences among the
teachers. I mean when ever they have problem, when ever their need arises it is always
wise to conduct SBIP.

A further comment raises another issue.

The teachers who attend the NBIP should not only share the knowledge and skills
she/he learnt from the NBIP but should also conduct research on the problems in the
particular schools jointly with other colleagues.
The implication here is that if the teacher is to return to conduct an SBIP, then the teacher needs to be sent to an NBIP that covers the needs of the school.

(c) Time related Issues

An implication of the previous discussion is that SBIPs should be conducted as and when required, based upon teachers’ needs. We have already noted the policy suggestion that SBIP be compulsory. However, there were a considerable number of improvement suggestions (over 30 citations) regarding timing and duration that assume a model of SBIPs similar to NBIPs. In this model SBIP workshops covering several days, if not 10-20 as one person suggested, would be held at the beginning of the academic year, or during the mid term break.

Suggestions concerning frequency were more in tune with SBIPs as responsive to the variety and extent of teachers’ needs. There were over 50 citations ranging from once per week to three to four times per year. Such suggestions are in line with the idea that teachers can try out new ideas in their own way in their own classroom and get support from colleagues and the Head Teacher as they try to do so. Attempting new practices inevitably produces failures initially, that is why SBIPs can be designed to be ready for this eventuality. One teacher suggested that ‘SBIP should be planned as series of work’ and the series would contain alternate workshops and practices and support between the workshops, all of which should be thought of as SBIP not just the workshops on their own.

It is interesting to note from the questionnaire data there that less than 50% agreed or strongly agreed with the proposition that ‘In future I would like to take part in single SBIP activities’. In contrast, more than 85% agreed or strongly agreed that ‘In future I would like to take part in SBIP as a planned series of activities’. What is addressed here is a model of SBIP that is different from the SBIP based upon the NBIP model, certainly as it is presently practiced.

(d) SBIP Guidelines

An implication of the above is that there is some lack of understanding about the concept of SBIP and the processes to follow. For instance one teacher comments:

The school should also have a SBIP Handbook with certain professional directions on how to conduct it. Right now many teachers of this school happened not to know what is SBIP and it must be same everywhere.

Another adds

however, there are so many different ways and directives given. We will find it more useful if we are given one that is clear

and another comment asks for assistance with the process.

SBIP] can be improved if officials from the Division could conduct such programs to every school during their visit because most teachers have attended the NBIP but they cannot organise SBIP in the school; they are not confident. Otherwise Division could organise a workshop on SBIP and call a teacher each from each school.
The concerns regarding process are reinforced by most of nine citations indicating that better planning of SBIP is required.

(e) **Summary of Design Improvements**

There are a number of improvements to SBIP coming from the data that can be summarised:

1. Headquarters should respond to the written reports concerning SBIP.

2. Experienced resource persons should be found where necessary. Sources of these experienced resource persons include schools themselves, Headquarters, NIE and TTC as part of their normal travelling to the schools and especially resource persons who follow-up from the NBIPs that they have resourced.

3. Topic for SBIPs should be determined by school needs. This is particularly the case where teachers are nominated for NBIPs and they are expected to return and conduct a series of SBIPs.

(iii) **Implementation**

The data that addressed the issue of implementation of SBIPs included four main themes: concerns about follow-up, the need for support for the process, the need for pressure to ensure implementation and the ideal of SBIP as a collaborative process.

(a) **Follow-up**

Eleven of 13 citations on follow-up came from teachers themselves. The citations recognise that follow-up is necessary, firstly by the teachers themselves as they try to do what was suggested in the NBIP workshop. The following two quotes give the sense of the responses here: ‘Practice follow-up by the individuals teaching and follow-up by the head and education authorities and ‘SBIP is done after a certain interval, not once done and forget forever’. The workshop presenter also needs to follow-up as part of the presentation responsibility.

(b) **Support**

There were 36 citations for suggestions about where support could be obtained by teachers, with approximately equal suggestions of support being for Headquarters, the DEO and the Head Teacher, and small support for NBIP resource persons to support.

Comments about the Head’s support include:

- Heads of schools should create good team and working spirit among the teachers
- the Head of the school should take an interest in SBIP and should firmly fixed times for conducting different topic areas
- Participation by head of schools may formal or informal

and
Head Teacher’s presence everywhere (in all the SBIP classes) is a must.

The DEO, or representative, is one step removed from the school situation but the suggestion was that support could still come from this quarter, especially by timely visits. Even further removed is the Headquarters, it was the interest in the timely visits by officers such as from EMMSS and others that was most evident in the citations. Even better, in five people’s opinion, if the visitors to the SBIP were from resource persons who conducted NBIPs.

The other main kind of support suggested by teachers to help them in their SBIP work was for time to be made available, for a budget in order to provide materials, refreshments and so on. With respect to the materials, they are needed to run the workshops and for use in the classrooms following the workshops.

Other forms of support that teachers affirmed through the questionnaire were broadcasts (ranked 7th out of 23) and Newsletters (2nd out of 23, see p.147).

(c) Pressure

As with NBIP, some teachers recognised the need for pressure for SBIP to be effective. Teachers, and only teachers, made 28 suggestions of ways that pressure could be applied to improve the implementation process, for example, ‘It will be effective if the Division and the Dzongkhag jointly monitored it’ and ‘It will be more effective if we can have lecturers or capable and experienced teachers as resource persons for SBIP. The Head Teacher should also monitor the activities after the SBIP’. In addition to five general suggestions concerning the need for pressure, just less than half of these were for Headquarters personnel to visit or that reports should be written by schools on their SBIPs. Four other suggestions were for the DEO to visit while seven more were for the Head Teacher to be the source of pressure. These suggestions are consistent with the comments about ‘follow-up’ and ‘support’ noted above, particularly in their emphasis upon the desirability of the sources of pressure being external to the school.

(d) Sharing in SBIP

One clear trend in the quantitative data is the support for proposals that promise collaborative participation by teachers in their inservice learning. For example, more than 95% of respondents endorsed the idea of ‘group participation in developing teaching plans’, despite the fact that this was not identified as a concern in Section B. Similarly, most items including SBIP received strong endorsement, the exception being the proposal for ‘single SBIP activities’.

Teachers, and again it was only teachers, mentioned ideas that would assist in the development of SBIPs. These centre on the idea of sharing, but are under-pinned by a notion of professionalism in which colleagues can learn from one another. There were 38 citations and the quotations provide the range of advice that the teachers suggest for more effective SBIPs.

Free exchange of ideas/views/thoughts/methods on a particular issue (the subject of SBIP) with individual active participation during the session add on (when all are summarized) and enriches our teaching capabilities/effective dealing procedures.
Creative criticism is appreciated.

SBIP should be a group work sharing each other’s new in making teaching/learning more meaningful and relevant to the need of our children.

There were some comments in this category, and in others in SBIP, which indicated that some teachers consider SBIP as Intervision. There is, thus, some confusion about the concept of SBIP and the relationship between the two.

(iv) Intervision

Nine of 13 citations favoured the use of Intervision as a form of SBIP. There was also strong support for those proposals that centred on the Intervision strategy in the questionnaire data. Although not the same as Intervision, the idea of collaborative classroom research is based upon observing what is happening in classrooms (p.86).

(v) SBIP Following NBIP

The impact from SBIPs following NBIPs was minimal and we have seen above how the experience and qualifications of the resource teacher, preferably from outside the school, are important considerations in the improvement of SBIPs that follow NBIPs. It is for these reasons that the following quotations are taken as expressions of faith rather than appreciations of the effective relationship between NBIP and SBIP.

SBIP is the most effective of decentralizing NBIPs or in other words SBIP is a bridge between NBIPs and schools.

Teachers who attend NBIPs should find time to disseminate the knowledge and experiences gained by him to his friends in the schools through SBIP. He/she could become a focal/resource person (subject wise) and share the ideas during SBIPs to the other teachers of different schools in the Dzongkhag.

If SBIP is successful that NBIP impact would be unquestionable!!

Rather, a set of prior conditions appears to be necessary for SBIPs following NBIPs to be successful and these are identified in the next sub-section.

(vi) Cluster SBIPs

The data indicated that a number of community schools have been coming together to share in SBIP. Suggestions for improvement were from teachers from community schools (20% of questionnaire respondents) and primary schools (15%) with virtually none from junior and high schools. By and large the suggestions took the form of schools needing to cluster mostly because of their small size. As the quotations show, each contains particular assumptions about this special kind of SBIP.

It will result in a more effective impact if about 3-4 schools come together once a year to discuss solutions to problems as discussions are better in a larger group than in small groups.

It is most useful when we discuss problems we face. It will be useful to have such programs with teachers from nearby schools or of the same Dzongkhag. For this some budget may have to be allotted.
However the important ingredient for successful SBIPs still applies, that is, it should address the needs that the cluster schools have in common. This is the idea expressed by the following teacher.

Topic for the SBIP I feel it should be selected. … From each school the teachers will select (their) problems ... and once then they can sit together on one of the days and then they can decide what are the major problems they have (and work towards a solution).

An alternative form of cluster is identified in the metaphor of the parent school.

SBIP can be improved if the parent school invite their community teacher where less than 2 members. According to my experience it is very difficult to have SBIP where the teacher is less in numbers, for example, with single general plus one Dzongkha teacher.

The last sentence of this quotation identifies yet another group of potential clusters, the cluster of specialist teachers. Perhaps the best example of these is the cadre of Dzongkha teachers. We noted in the improving NBIP section above that 14 of them thought that their opportunities for development were limited.

There is one group of schools for whom clustering remains unlikely, as this comment shows:

Our school is very small and far away from other schools. There should be alternative worked out for such schools.

What these data collectively demonstrate is that there is no single form of SBIP that can, or should, be promulgated. The data also indicated that there is a belief by some that DBIPs also have a place. These ideas about inservice activities being organised through different forms of clusters of teachers are now considered. We will refer to these as ‘Cluster Based Inservice Programs’.

Other INSET Improvements

When a large number of concerned people are asked for their views on how something like INSET can be improved, inevitably there is a wide range of suggestions made. This section deals with three main themes, that of the development of the ‘cluster’ idea introduced above, educational leadership at the Dzongkhag level, and the management of INSET.

(i) Cluster Based Inservice Activities

In addition to the emerging practice by some schools of setting up clusters of convenience to themselves, for the purposes of their school-level inservice education, the data also contained support for the re-introduction of DBIPs or forms of inservice that follow teachers’ needs and interests but at the Dzongkhag level. There were 42 citations on this matter, with supporters ranging from classroom teachers to Head Teachers and senior education officials. DBIPs were the focus of these suggestions for improvement. There was a variety of reasons given, including their cost effectiveness. For example one Head teacher indicated
I found it very expensive for Division because NBIP is usually one they have to call teachers from all the parts and DBIP means within Dzongkhag level so it will be cheap for the Division and it is implementing the same ideas.

Another benefit was thought to lie in the capacity of schools to send two participants.

Where ever is the zone center for Zhemgang, the resource person can travel to that place and we can send at least two teachers and not one from each school. The reason (is) if there are two participants and if one participant is not competent to share the ideas that they received at that workshop, the other teacher might be. Also they can work together and thus would have greater impact. [And also in teacher transfer cases]. Yes, when one teacher is transferred at least there will be other teacher to implement the ideas. This is what I feel.

Others argued that DBIP-type inservice would provide more opportunities for teachers, for example

it is hard to get opportunities to attend inservice programs. It may be three or four years before we get a chance. If we have Dzongkhag Based Inservice Programs it will allow all of us to participate.

Furthermore, one teacher pointed out that

in NBIPs we hardly get together once in a year. Therefore SBIPs should be frequently held in the Dzongkhag i.e. two to three times a year provided if the government approves the fund. It helps a lot for the teachers who are in great need in their daily teaching life.

INSET, according to a range of people, would be improved by its coordination at this level. For example one teacher said in a comment in the questionnaire that

it would have been better if we had quarterly or monthly Dzongkhag Based Inservice Programs so that we could share experiences/plan the blocks or Year Calendar together in order to have same program/timing of exams, breaks going on etc. within the Dzongkhag.

DBIP-type inservice could complement SBIPs according to a senior educator.

I would say that Dzongkhag based inservice programs should also [be implemented]. Once we used to have but now it dies down but I see the relative importance of [it]

TWM: How do you see them in the big picture?

These could complement both SBIP and NBIP. It falls in between to have effective inservice programs DBIP would be useful.

Others advised that where appropriate, SBIPs could follow DBIPs.

The fact that some schools and some sections of the Division (YGCS and NFE) are voluntarily experimenting with clusters as suitable fora in which to conduct inservice activities, combined with the observations that the earlier DBIPs were seen to have certain advantages, suggests that the idea of some form of cluster based inservice, in addition to the existing SBIPs and NBIPs, should be explored further. All of these cluster activities within the Dzongkhag would provide a focus for support and pressure from the Dzongkhag. What is also evident from this discussion of improvements is the
importance of educational leadership at this level and we turn to this in the following sub-section.

(ii) Dzongkhag Educational Leadership

The need for coordination of these forms of clusters, including the DBIP-type activities, is a good reason for educational leadership at the Dzongkhag level. The benefits of coordination are well illustrated by the following experience reported in Zhemgang.

The experience that we have had with integrating the inservice training for primary teachers through overseas training in Canada and then people coming back to Zhemgang Dzongkhag, we are only in the first year of it but already it seems to have had a fairly dramatic impact and we have called all the teachers of the Dzongkhag to come and I guess it was selected teachers from each school to attend courses on both reading and mathematics which in their trips to Canada they had gained some expertise in.

Teachers have different needs and interests across the Dzongkhags. This example illustrates one way in which multigrade teachers’ inservice needs are being met. More generally, Dzongkhag level coordination of inservice was mentioned in other important ways. For example, Dzongkhag level inservice could be based upon data that the Dzongkhag itself has analysed (see p. 31). Coordination would entail leadership in planning for INSET within the Dzongkhag as well as assisting networking, supporting and encouraging the various forms of clusters that have already begun to develop. Such planning has been evident in the early work of NAPE.

There was a time-frame, like we would start off at the end of the workshop; after three months the DRTs would give us a report on what was happening; this would be followed by the mobile visits to the schools; and there would be another DRT report and then towards the end of the year, about October, we would send the questionnaires to individual teachers.

Two further important reasons are the need of support for and pressure on teachers to make changes in what they do. Support (40 citations) and pressure (11) at the Dzongkhag level were seen to be missing by all types of our respondents and interviewees. For example, this is a comment out of the Combined Inspection Report of 1996 on one of the three regions but it could equally apply to the other two.

While many DEOs still visit schools, the focus of their visit is generally to see over some administrative issues, or the collection of data. It is a rare DEO who enters the classroom and makes observations through the professional view. Schools receive very little by way of guidance and support for the improvement of instruction or the implementation of guidelines.

A teacher put it this way:

at least once a year the DEO or his/her representative should attend the SBIP as this boost the interest of Headmaster and teachers

and another,
the support or a recognition from the Dzongkhag … is very much important in order to encourage our teachers about what they are doing in the school. More initiative should be taken.

Two additional comments were, firstly from a teacher:

I think there should be proper monitoring on the implementation at the school level. Presently there is no cross-checking of whether the ones who have participated had actually tried them out,

and from a resource person:

teachers are instructed to implement the NBIP in their respective Dzongkhags but due to the lack of supervision the NBIP is not going well.

There was also some commentary about the role of Dzongkhag Resource Teachers (DRTs) who previously had taken a major role in support of teachers. Generally teachers were supportive of the work of DRTs. However, the model under which the previous DRTs worked may have been flawed, as can be seen from the observations of a senior education official.

The criticism about the DRTs is that they came and worked and they provided support for the teachers as long as they were there and when they were around things worked well, but once that DRT went away the vacuum was felt since there was no counterpart and we had hoped that the counterparts would be developed, national counterparts, so that when the DRT went away then in each school there was a person who was responsible for that. I don’t think that that has happened.

We note that the number of DRTs was declining at about the same time as NAPE was adopted nationally. Thus, a considerable burden was placed upon the system to sustain the changes that had previously received considerable materials and other forms of support such as those previously provided by DRTs and for fewer teachers in the pilot schools.

If the Dzongkhag is to take a greater role in INSET, then, as the same official noted,

Until that capability is built we cannot talk about DBIPs. Because they have to rely on people here and there and (this) costs money.

A number of others pointed out the difficulty of providing resource persons for DBIPs, although it was evident that the assumptions used in support of this was the long, largely winter-based workshops. Despite the cost, teachers and others have pointed to the need for support and pressure to assist them make changes to their classroom practices. Apart from the all-important support and pressure, other leadership roles identified in the data include assisting in NBIP selection, finding resource persons and liaising between schools and resourcing and having knowledge of other programs such as future NBIPs. The range of roles that are identified here are consistent with the consensus recommendation of the First Educational Conference that the ‘Dzongkhag Education Office be identified as the focal point at the Dzongkhag level for both academic and technical matters.’ (RGOB 1997c, p.14) and would require a high calibre educator for the role.
(iii) INSET Management

On this issue there were 157 citations and these have been grouped into Management structure (five citations) and Administration (147 citations). There were seven citations in which the need for an overall plan for INSET was considered necessary. The reasons given for this were the overlap of NBIPs causing problems with attendance, the potential for vertical sequencing of NBIPs, and the benefits that could accrue from doing so. This latter issue has already been addressed above in the NBIP Improvements section (see p.82)

(a) Management Structure

Although there were few citations, the points made in this category were from senior educators and were usually strongly put. The thrust of the comments was that INSET should have specific leadership and management in the hands of an experienced educator. One of the reasons for that view was by way of criticism of the present structure.

I think that (in) professional support the TEU don’t actually participate. They just support. They just look for money and when we ask them they just give us the money.

Finding the funding is an important role but what appears to be implied here is a lack of coordinative leadership of the NBIP.

Another senior educator had clearly given this issue considerable thought. His comments are quoted extensively below. His point that ‘a separate body’ to look after the whole master plan for INSET was echoed by three other experienced educators.

Teacher inservice program needs to be treated as a separate entity. … It should have a separate body to look after the whole master plan, run the courses and plan everything from whatever to whatever. … Well inservice is for all those teachers who need inservice. Pre-service is taken care of with teacher training colleges whereas inservice at the moment is not a professional body that is looking after it. … A small group of people who could really look at all the inservice programs, planning and looking at all those details even looking at teachers’ resumes and see which teachers are for what courses and even have a very nice picture of different groups of people for inservice. … CAPSS, EMSS, BBE we can provide expertise but we cannot run courses.

And a Bhutanese academic made the following observation:

I think if we can improve on the communication and coordination between CAPSS, Teacher Education Institutes, and the teachers in the field, it will help make our inservice programs very effective.

To some extent, then, INSET in Bhutan has been characterised as ad hoc and in need of improved leadership and management. One of the consequences of improved management could be the careful consideration of the balance in budget lines for INSET. One senior official had already given this serious consideration, and, based upon his experience and vision, estimated that the overall budget of INSET should move to 25% allocated to NBIP, 25% to regional initiatives and, 50% to SBIP in the medium term.
(b) Administration

Several times the observation was made that following NBIPs teachers were re-allocated teaching duties within the same school thus rendering the NBIP largely ineffective, resulting in wastage. Sometimes too, teachers were moved from their school (10 citations), sometimes to teach in different subjects. Even if the qualifier ‘usually’ in the following quotation is overstating the situation, there does seem to be a problem here.

It would also be beneficial if the teachers who are taking (e.g. social studies) should be sent for social studies workshop and can continue teaching the same subject after the workshop. Usually what happens is we go for workshop for a different subject and end up teaching different subjects back in school.

and

After the (NBIP) training the teacher should remain in that school at least for two-three years so that the school will be benefited.

Probably the most contentious issue in the INSET impact study from the teachers’ point of view was teacher nomination and selection for NBIPs. As we have seen in the constraints to the impact of NBIP, the wrong people can be chosen and sometimes too few turn up.

Twenty five per cent of both males and females from the questionnaire identified this as an issue. Elements of these concerns included the claim that for some remote schools, the nomination forms arrive too late so they are disadvantaged. Sixteen indicated that they had not had the opportunity to participate, and with respect to selection, there were 24 citations claiming that the process was unfair, for example:

Inservice program as they are right now does not seem to be fair. There are some of us who are interested but do not get the opportunity and there are others who just get nominated again and again but [do] not do anything much in the school.

Teachers were forthcoming in their suggestions for improvement. There were 45 suggestions that selection be based upon equal opportunity and a further 39 that it be based upon interest and relevance to the individuals. A further eight indicated that the basis should be the school’s choice since they know the teachers best.

Other comments (33 citations) provided a range of other criteria that might be used in selecting teachers for NBIPs and illustrate just how hard it is to make the right choice. Such criteria included more than one person from each school, qualifications, experience, potential resource persons, only after 2-3 years in the service, if not attended before, once every three years, preference to remote schools, and, one from each department. These and the points of improvement suggested by teachers (in the main) point to the need to review policies and practices as far as teacher nomination to NBIPs are concerned.

(iv) ‘Best-Practice’ Schools

The idea for ‘best-practice’ schools is derived from comments like the following.
I would like to observe and study exemplary teachers around the country in order to improve.

I feel there should be one pilot multigrade school where the teachers from different schools do come and observe. … I feel that the teachers from the different corners of the country can come and observe and gain experience.

To the comments of these two teachers we can add those of a senior administrator.

Maybe a teacher in another school has a brilliant idea. Maybe (the teacher) has already overcome the problems that another teacher faces, so our job is to bring them together and one teacher learns from the other. This is one way. If there is a skill that they lack that they are most interested in developing, that then it is our responsibility to find the resource, some body who can best do it for the teachers and then we are most happy to do that.

Best practice schools could be visited by teachers who are interested or by teachers from schools that have this need articulated in the development plan. These teachers would then be able to observe, first hand, what good practice in a particular area is about.

Conclusion

On the basis of the data analysed as part of the INSET Project, the following improvements have been suggested in relation to the three questions that were identified at the beginning of the section.

(i) In what ways might the system-wide inservice program model be changed to make it more useful to teachers and others?

Course Directors need to think of the NBIP as being inclusive of teachers and Head Teachers trying out the ideas back in the reality of their school. The block of workshops is just the beginning. Thus, NBIP budgets have to reflect this new emphasis on implementation (follow-up, support and pressure). NBIP workshops should be retained but be shorter in length and offered either at different venues across the country within the same year, or from year to year. Schools need to be able to nominate more than one teacher to attend an NBIP. Courses that are run in winter should be early or late in winter, that is, at the beginning or end of the long break. Some courses should be run during the mid-term break on a trial basis in the first instance. Levels of NBIPs can be worked up so that a sense of development can be introduced. These and other NBIPs as well as stand-alone skills packages, might be potential sources of credit to awards, including those of tertiary institutions.

SBIP should be thought of, and planned, as a series containing alternate workshops and practice periods and support between the workshops. SBIPs should be encouraged and supported by a budget line. Experienced resource persons should be found where necessary. Sources of these experienced resource persons include Headquarters, NIE and TTC as part of their normal travelling to the schools and especially resource persons who follow-up from the NBIPs that they have resourced as well as from the schools. The teacher returning from the NBIP to be a resource person has to be experienced and qualified, otherwise it may be non-productive to require an SBIP.
sequence. The SBIP reports to Headquarters can be thought of as one form of evaluation but Headquarters needs to respond to each.

Schools might cluster on a variety of criteria, for example, Dzongkha teachers, school librarians. A budget would need to be raised to support clusters.

Greater budget support has to be applied at the Dzongkhag level, especially as INSET at this level is cost effective and promotes the break down of one shot INSET. If there are to be DRT-type educators then they have to work under a different model than the previous DRTs.

‘Best-practice’ schools might be identified.

(ii) **What content needs to be improved in inservice courses to make them more useful for participants?**

NBIPs will need to be more focussed in terms of the resource persons’ objectives for the workshops in order to take into account this shorter length but also to allow for workshops to include strategies that take into account the needs of those present at the workshop. Strategies to find out the needs of teachers who attend NBIPs will need to be developed as will the responsiveness of resource persons. NBIP resource persons should consider analysis of such data bases as that provided by BBE examinations and EMSS reports, as well as reports on schools’ SBIPs. These might be complementary, or in addition, to CAPSS curriculum initiatives. Thus some professional development (generic skills development in classroom planning, implementation and assessment) might be the basis of some NBIPs.

Topics for SBIPs should be determined by school needs. This is particularly the case where teachers are nominated for NBIPs and they are expected to return and conduct a series of SBIPs. All the requirements for effective SBIPs have to be in place, especially the idea of a series of workshops in order to seriously address the content from the usually much longer NBIP. SBIP following NBIPs might need to wait until the returning teacher has had opportunities to try out the new ideas.

Ideally, clustered schools sharing an SBIP need to have similar needs to share the workshop stage but they would have to work independently as far as the development of practices and support between workshops were concerned.

(iii) **What course delivery needs to be improved in inservice courses to make them more useful for participants?**

NBIP resource persons need to be trained in the use of adult education principles and encouraged to adopt a more professional approach to their work as well as a more collegial approach to their teacher colleagues. In the first instance, this means that Course Directors need to be trained so that they can begin the process of dissemination to their resource person collaborators. Head Teachers, as the instructional leaders in the school, need to be assisted in developing their follow-up, pressure and support roles (for both NBIP and SBIP) and in finding ways to juggle these with other duties. A complementary person to the administrative duties of the DEO would be an excellent support mechanism for NBIP implementation and SBIP implementation support.
SBIPs should be scheduled on the school’s academic and/or development plan.

**(iv) Other issues not directly covered by (i) to (iii)**

Coordination of support services and development of a research orientation are two issues that would assist in the overall improvement of INSET. INSET needs to be coordinated and managed by a person or persons who have direct oversight of the vision and day to day practice of INSET in all its forms. Teachers who have been to NBIPs should not be deployed and should be chosen so that the NBIP work can be implemented in the school. A task force should be established to review the mechanism for teacher nomination to NBIPs and the criteria for nomination.
Principles of the INSET Framework

The principles that are set out below are in response to data from the study that have been interpreted against both the theoretical framework and other relevant literature. We have been impressed, and encouraged, by the extent to which the data gathered through this study have uncovered opinions and suggestions from teachers that are highly consistent with the theoretical framework that we have used. This is especially so since that framework draws heavily upon research into educational change in the western world. In thinking about this, we have concluded that the framework is less about a specific geographical or social context than it is about the nature of human beings and how they cope with change.

Rationale for INSET

The paramount focus for any INSET program must be upon support and pressure aimed at assisting teachers to more effectively implement curriculum policies in their classrooms (see above, p. 18). This amounts to teachers learning to behave differently in some way, for example, learning how to use a new concrete aid to better teach a concept, or perhaps something more complex, such as a new strategy for the teaching of reading. No matter how large or small the change in behaviour is, it constitutes teachers having to learn something that modifies their practice.

In essence, this focus upon the teacher implies recognition that teachers are individuals, with their idiosyncratic or ‘subjective’ realities that must be assumed to differ from that of their fellows and, significantly, from that of their INSET resource persons. Indeed, one way of understanding the challenge facing the INSET program is to see it as attempting to modify the thousands of subjective realities ‘out there’ in the minds of the teachers in Bhutan's schools (see above, p. 17). As Fullan’s theory implies, and Beeby's hypothesis explicitly emphasises, these subjective realities can be expected to vary considerably, from person to person, with respect to any particular issue (see above, p. 14).

The immediate implication is that course designers cannot expect to make maximum impact upon teachers’ subjective realities unless they make a valid assessment of what concerns the teachers have about the topic in question. To do otherwise might leave the course designer feeling satisfied that a good job has been done, but runs the risk of leaving the teachers no better off, or worse still, alienated.

A second fundamental element of the rationale that we propose for the INSET program is that when a topic is being chosen for a course, the characteristics of need, clarity, complexity and practicality should be carefully addressed. If the topic does not meet most of these criteria, then the wisdom of presenting it should be questioned (see above, p. 19).

A third fundamental element of the rationale that we propose for the INSET program is that the personal learning associated with teachers modifying their classroom practices takes time: it is a process, not an event. Consequently, design of inservice programs,
whether they be NBIP, SBIP or any other form, should provide teachers with on-going support – ‘one-shot’ workshops are, in most cases, a waste of resources (see above, p.18). Further to this point, it is now understood that while changes in behaviour can be thought of as comprising changes in the materials used, the practices or techniques needed and the underlying beliefs related to the change (which collectively define its objective reality), the most effective starting point is with materials and practices. If improvement is experienced as a result of using these, then changes in beliefs will follow (see above, p.18).

These three main assumptions form the core of the theoretical framework that we suggest for the re-development of the INSET program in Bhutan. These are elaborated in the Theoretical Framework (see p.11) above and we would commend a careful consideration of that to all readers.

In the discussion that follows, we consider selected elements of the data and offer interpretations of their implications, with our theoretical assumptions clearly in mind, for any revised INSET framework.

Reconceptualisation of INSET

The conclusions to both the ‘Theoretical Framework’, the results above, the literature and experience that we bring to bear all draw attention to the fact that INSET in Bhutan needs to be reconceptualised in two important ways. Firstly, the focus of all concerned must be kept sharply upon teachers because it is upon them that the pressure and support for change must be applied. Classroom teachers must be the central focus of INSET and the work of all other agencies and personnel must be coordinated to that end. This focus is represented by Figure 13.

Secondly INSET needs to be thought of as more than a workshop or even as a series of workshops. Rather it is a process in which the workshop is just the beginning point. The implementation of the input ideas in the classroom or school is what really matters.

This reconceptualisation of INSET is thus more complex than is the current model and has a number of implications; for the ways that INSET is conducted, for its leadership and for its coordination.
(i) Conducting INSET Activities

There is a range of considerations pertinent to the conduct of INSET. In particular these include the content of the INSET, the processes that are appropriate, the modes or forms of INSET and the conditions under which INSET activities take place.

(a) Establishing Priorities

The first and main responsibility is the determination of what the inservice priorities should be for the immediate future and then to see how these relate to past and possible future priorities. In so doing, there is an inevitable tension between what can be afforded and what initiatives are most in need of support. It is in the discharge of this latter responsibility that a new equilibrium between the Centre’s needs and school/teacher needs must be established. Achieving this will require that the interests of CAPSS, BBE and EMSS, as well as others, are reconciled in deciding priorities.

Where major policy revision is taking place, for example, the introduction of revised syllabuses, changes to the examination system or changing responsibilities for system monitoring, then those changes will be possibilities for inservice programs and the relevant agency should make its case. On the other hand, the discharge of the responsibility for establishing priorities in a rational manner will also require deliberate and careful data collection and analysis about the array of concerns that teachers are experiencing in the course of implementing curriculum policy. Those data should drive the choice of inservice courses that address teachers’ needs in association with the implementation of curriculum policy. At present the data indicate a serious imbalance.

The overwhelmingly clear message from the data is that while teachers acknowledge the need for INSET to address topics of concern to the Division, such as manuals, textbooks and syllabuses, they also want their concerns to be taken into account. This is equally true for NBIPs (see p.80) as it is for SBIPs (see p.88). Their focus is upon classroom problems associated with implementation and, in the case of SBIP, upon collaborative problem-solving. While the identification of the problems to be solved within schools is not so much a matter for course designers, the data in respect to NBIP included sensible suggestions about how teachers’ needs might be assessed.

These data should be interpreted as a call for recognition, by teachers, that their subjective realities be acknowledged in the form of their being consulted about the topics that will be offered in the INSET program. While this practice has not been a feature of INSET in the past, it is clear that it should be in the future.

Recommendation 1:

The INSET program should reflect a balance between courses that focus upon the Centre’s concerns and those that focus upon teachers’ expressed concerns about classroom practices.

The importance of the above recommendation is underscored by the observation that senior educators are very busy and it is unlikely that they will have the opportunity to be intimately acquainted with real classrooms and the real teachers in them. We have already noted that this is a world-wide reality and it should be taken seriously (see
Thus, there is a dilemma here because INSET’s course developers are generally centre-based rather than school-based personnel. In our view this dilemma can only be resolved by recourse to data. Our argument is that even workshops on curriculum changes initiated through syllabus, text or manual updating/renewal can best be made when data is available on such practical questions as, for example, ‘are the manuals useful to teachers?’ and ‘do the students understand the main concepts of syllabus X?’, and so on.

There are presently many sets of data available since it is current practice in the Education Division to collect data. All are potential sources of data for NBIPs. These include: EMSS Combined Inspection Reports, BBE Annual Examination Results, Annual Education Conference Proceedings, reports from schools on SBIPs and reports by NBIP course coordinators. For example, we agree with the Hughes Report (see p.31) that examination results are a source of data to test the effectiveness of teaching. On their own, examination data may not be sufficient but in concert with other data, for example the reports of EMSS officers, there may be sufficient evidence on which to initiate an inservice program. The analysis of such data provides the basis for establishing the relevant teachers’ learning needs.

Further, observation by Division staff such as curriculum writers, resource persons or by Head Teachers is an ideal way to determine how a curriculum initiative is being implemented. For example, the new Integrated Science course is currently being trialed and the relevant CAPSS officer has been conducting an observational study of how teachers are coping with it. By all accounts, the data are most revealing and already are indicating possible directions in which additional support may be needed if satisfactory implementation of the new syllabus is to be achieved. Another simple technique is to ask teachers. We have found that teachers will point out their concerns. Surveys of opinion do not have to be sophisticated or be backed by huge computer data analysis packages. A well constructed one page instrument can yield considerable quality data.

**Recommendation 2**

*Where relevant, INSET courses should be based upon appropriate needs analysis of teachers’ concerns.*

The undercurrent of the recommendations made so far indicates that we favour a serious re-think of the current INSET framework with a view to making it *better attuned to teachers’ learning needs*, even if that means it will not be so easy for central personnel to administer. After all, INSET exists to support teachers in their work of implementing the curriculum policy of the day, and there can be little justification for a framework that does not maximise the likelihood of the teachers’ learning that is needed to support that implementation.

**(b) Re-Thinking the Modes of INSET**

While it is not possible for us to identify the precise details of a replacement model or models, we can offer some suggestions that should be seriously considered. However, our data indicate that wholesale change is not needed, rather, what we foresee is evolutionary change that focuses primarily on refinements of the existing framework.
To begin with, it is clear that there is strong support for the retention of NBIPs as a significant part of the framework (see p.80) and for the retention of SBIPs (see p.87).

**Recommendation 3:**

**NBIPs should be retained, though modifications to their design and delivery must be considered as indicated in Recommendations 8-13 below.**

The retention of SBIPs can be argued for from at least two viewpoints. To begin with, they must continue in their role as an automatic follow-up to NBIPs for the purpose of disseminating more widely the contents of the NBIPs. In addition, as the school system matures and the cadre of teachers becomes, on average, better trained and educated, the SBIP will almost certainly become an increasingly important vehicle for staff development in relation to in-school problems. Indeed, there are elements of both roles already evident through the data. However, it is also clear from the data that the current understanding by teachers of how SBIP might operate remains quite unclear to many (see above, p.89). There is a definite need for urgent and immediate policy development here.

**Recommendation 4:**

**Immediate steps should be taken to clarify the intended process by which SBIPs might function within schools. As part of this, consideration should be given to the role that Intervision might play, care being taken to address the problems that Thinley's (1999) research has uncovered. A further consideration should be the issues raised in Recommendation 13.**

It is likely that the lack of clear guidelines for the operation of SBIPs has been a contributing factor to the apparent lack of follow-up, in many cases, to NBIPs. For some teachers, NBIPs are successful despite lack of support (p.65). Whatever the reasons for this lack of follow-up, it is clear that many respondents believe that there is a need for improvement in this regard (see p.84, 90) and the literature and our experience reinforce this. Put alternatively, INSET needs adjustment so that better use of SBIP is to improve the impact of NBIPs upon curriculum implementation, that is, upon the work of teachers in classrooms.

In looking towards a solution, we note the current climate in Bhutan in favour of decentralisation of budgets and the responsibility for their wise expenditure (see p.31). This predisposition is something that could be built upon in any re-thinking of the INSET model.

**Recommendation 5:**

**A significant consequence of the reconceptualisation of the INSET program is the identification of the means by which expertise in classroom practices can be dispersed across the country, with the express task of providing support for curriculum implementation at the school level.**

The data revealed support, from a cross-section of respondents, for the re-introduction of DBIPs (see p.93). While we accept as justifiable the range of reasons offered in support of this change to the INSET framework, we do not favour the re-introduction of
DBIPs in their previous form. Rather we advocate a more flexible support structure for schools on a regional basis. While it is possible that the Dzongkhag might be the centre of some such activities, we recognise that already there are examples of clusters of schools voluntarily aggregating to pursue inservice learning and of cluster style workshops (p.54) and even in-school ‘clusters’ (see p.60). In order to endorse these kinds of activities we suggest that a suitably inclusive label be used to refer to them and in this report we have chosen ‘Cluster Based Inservice Activities’. We have chosen the word ‘Activities’ instead of ‘Program’ because the latter has traditionally referred to something devised elsewhere and presented to the teachers where what is happening in the school-level clusters is devised by the teachers in their workplaces. We recognise though, that there might be occasions when a Dzongkhag-level program might be deemed useful to teachers, for example as a follow-up to an NBIP, and we argue for its inclusion under this label.

**Recommendation 6:**

The feasibility of Cluster Based Inservice Activities (CBIAs) being incorporated into and supported within the INSET framework should be examined in conjunction with Recommendation 7.

At this juncture it is important to pause to recognise that changes to the modes of INSET outlined to date, will not be worth making unless there is commitment to playing their part in the support of teachers learning with respect to curriculum implementation. Such commitment implies that their operations must be adequately budgeted for. While they can be cheap to establish, structures alone can achieve very little, rather, it is the activities that those structures enable that can make a difference.

**Recommendation 7:**

All modes of INSET should be supported by an appropriate budget.

Determination of the overall INSET budget should be the responsibility of the Director of INSET working through the TEB.

Regardless of the mode of INSET that is chosen for a particular purpose, each will be more or less effective depending upon the subject expertise and skill as a facilitator that the resource person(s) bring to the activity. The research data contain ideas pertinent to this theme.

**(c) Improving Workshops**

In the discussion that follows, important principles are identified that have applicability to workshops in general no matter what mode of INSET is in use. The first point to consider is the basis upon which the content of the workshop should be determined. We have already emphasised the need to establish a balance between teachers’ needs, in relation to the implementation of current documents, against those of the central policy makers in relation to promulgating new and amended policy (see Recommendation 1). Further, we have already emphasised that, where relevant, the workshop content should be based upon an analysis of data reflecting teachers’ needs (Recommendation 2). However, even when the workshop is being mounted primarily in relation to policy changes, its design should reflect deliberate judgements about how the content will be
best understood by teachers. It is teachers’ ‘subjective realities’ that must be influenced if change is to follow.

The theoretical framework also offers some insights that are relevant at this juncture and should be considered. In particular, the notion of ‘objective reality’ alerts us to the tripartite nature of any educational change, in the form of its associated new materials, practices and beliefs (see above, p.17). The framework emphasises the desirability of workshop activity focussing first upon the concrete dimensions of materials and practices, with beliefs being addressed only after first-hand experience with those has been gained by the teachers. Yet we found little evidence of this strategy in practice (p.67). This has obvious implications for the course design, particularly for the sequencing of its content. A further implication is that the workshop must not be a ‘one-shot’ wonder, and so follow-up activities, and perhaps an SBIP activity, maybe on a cluster basis, should be planned for. This kind of planning will require leadership (see Recommendation 14).

**Recommendation 8:**

When major curriculum initiatives are being mediated through workshops of any mode, a suitable delivery strategy should be devised that recognises the need for teachers to gain first-hand experience with the materials and practices of the initiative before elaboration of its theoretical assumptions is undertaken through follow-up workshops or cluster activities.

Beyond the issue of content of workshops and its sequencing, other aspects of design that were commented on included length, timing and venue.

With respect to length, the essence of the qualitative data indicate that respondents wanted NBIPs to remain as they currently are or even lengthened while the quantitative data indicated weaker support for workshops longer than 15 days. It seems likely that this reflects the intensive nature of these workshops, words like ‘cramped’ and ‘pressurised’ being encountered quite commonly (see above, p.81). With respect to SBIPs, there was less uniformity of opinion, probably because it is clear that SBIP remains a poorly defined process at this point in time (see Recommendation 4).

We question the wisdom of lengthy workshops, partly because of our experience as workshop resource persons at our University and in schools with which we have worked, and partly because of our knowledge of the adult education literature (p.34). Our experience, supported by the literature, is that by about the third day of an intensive workshop, the participants are beginning to suffer ‘information overload’ and are less able to participate effectively. The adult education literature argues that adults expect to participate in workshops, as opposed to being lectured at, and that their physical and psychological comfort is basic to that being possible. On all these grounds, we question the assumption that long workshops are effective and would urge a re-consideration of this strategy. It is crucial to keep in mind that the purpose of INSET is to assist the learning of teachers and even if long workshops leave resource persons and central administrators satisfied that much has been covered, we believe that teachers’ learning will have been limited. INSET must be organised and presented in a way that recognises teachers as adult learners.
Recommendation 9:
The practice of holding long NBIP workshops should be re-appraised with a view to developing an alternative model based upon shorter, and perhaps more, workshops.

Although this recommendation specifically mentions NBIPs, it also makes little sense for SBIPs to be more than two days in length. However, where they follow-up on NBIPs, it seems most likely that there will need to be more of them in order to cover the entire content and explore its implications for classroom teaching (see p.77).

With respect to timing, while strong support existed for holding NBIPs in the winter break as is the custom, which is necessary if long workshops are to be held, about one quarter of respondents asked that mid-winter be avoided. One third of respondents suggested using a different time, such as the mid-summer break (see p.28). Not surprisingly, there was little useful information on this issue in relation to SBIPs apart from the strong support for ‘SBIP as a planned series of activities’, the implication being that it be on-going over the year on an ‘as needs’ basis (see p.75).

Our reactions to these data again are largely informed by our awareness of the adult education literature as well as our theoretical framework, and we again suggest that shorter, and so more frequent, workshops be held. Apart from the psychological comfort for participants, we note that such a schedule of support for teachers is consistent with the understanding that the learning associated with educational change must be seen as an on-going process rather than an event.

Recommendation 10:
In conjunction with the investigation of shorter lengths for workshops, the possibility of scheduling NBIP workshops more frequently across the year should be considered.

Venue is not an issue for SBIPs but we have already noted that ‘the issue of venue is related to length and timing’ (see above, p.81) in relation to NBIPs. Not surprisingly, here the issue of participant comfort was raised directly with respect to the cold of winter and the lack of adequate heating at venues. Again, we point to the adult literature: if participants are to engage the workshop effectively, then they must be physically comfortable. This is a fundamental tenet of the most basic of psychological models of human needs, such as Maslow’s well-known hierarchy. The underlying premise of this model is that until basic lower-order needs such as physical well-being (food, shelter and safety) are met, then higher-order needs, such as learning related to professional matters, will not be significantly addressed.

Some respondents suggested alternatives, including the proposition that resource people travel to venues closer to them, making it easier for them and others in their locations, to attend. We see merit in this suggestion and assume that if this were done, then shorter, more frequent and more regionalised, and so smaller, workshops would become the norm.
Recommendation 11:

As part of the investigation undertaken in response to Recommendations 9 and 10, alternative venues should be identified that could be used to deliver workshops in periods other than mid-winter.

Finally, and still focussing upon the participants in the NBIP workshop, the data have revealed that as far as teachers are concerned, the process by which participants are selected to attend workshops is seriously flawed and must be addressed as a matter of urgency (see p.98). Their solutions to this problem were many, the most common being that principles of equity should be applied and that criteria of ‘interest’ and ‘relevance’ be used when participants are nominated and selected (see p.98). A related concern expressed by some was the frequency with which participants were transferred to a different school shortly after returning from a workshop. This was seen to be wasteful from the school’s point of view. Clearly addressing this latter issue is one that will involve close liaison with the Personnel Services representative on the INSET Committee.

Recommendation 12:

A major task that the Director of INSET (see Recommendation 14) should engage immediately is the establishment of a clear policy governing the selection of workshop participants and take steps to ensure that the policy is administered uniformly.

With respect to workshop delivery, it is apparent that the central role of resource persons in an effective workshop has not been adequately recognised, especially in the case of NBIPs (see above, p.82). We know, too, that there does exist a useful publication entitled Handbook for Inservice Presenters (RGOB 1995b) that addresses this very issue and we urge that all resource persons be properly prepared for their responsibilities when running workshops. Of course, they must be chosen for their expertise in the first place and they must be given adequate time in which to plan the workshop beforehand. Planning in NBIPs appeared too often to be hurriedly done.

Recommendation 13:

More attention should be given to the appointment of resource persons, particularly for NBIPs, with emphasis upon the relevance of their expertise, their skill as adult educators and the adequacy of planning time available prior to the workshop.

The issue of expertise is the recurring theme of the responses about resource persons in the SBIP context (see above, p.87). While resource persons will never have credibility in any context if they do not exhibit expertise in the topics being considered, the additional problem of resourcing SBIPs across the country with suitable expertise is an extremely difficult one to solve. It is not surprising that there is strong support for access to outside resource persons, such as Divisional and TTC/NIE personnel.

This calls for outsiders to resource teachers’ learning and suggests that most teachers do not yet feel sufficiently professionally autonomous to take charge of their own professional learning, or to accept their immediate colleagues as legitimate sources of
useful ideas. While ever there is only limited access to professional literature in the system, this is understandable. Further, the fact that the system still includes many teachers whose own levels of education and training are limited, and it will be so for some time to come, means that this is a significant issue to address. The fact that it also includes teachers whose skills and attitudes are already such that they could work effectively within a school-based inservice model, as several comments appear to indicate, only serve to exacerbate the problem. *It also emphasises the need for the existing model of INSET to be seriously reconsidered.*

It is this kind of thinking that has led us to propose a place in the INSET framework for Cluster Based Inservice Activities (Recommendation 6) and support personnel to be available (Recommendation 5). In large measure, it is also what has led us to the remaining recommendations in this report. These address the overall interconnectedness of the entire INSET framework, fundamentally in order to maximise both the support for teachers as they strive to implement curriculum policy, and the pressure upon them that seems necessary to maximise the outcomes. We address these concerns through two related ideas, **leadership** and **coordination**.

**(ii) Exercising Leadership**

In the more complex conceptualisation of INSET that is proposed it is evident that leadership will be required *throughout* the system. We endorse the current levels but propose that active leadership at the additional levels will significantly improve INSET in Bhutan.

(a) **Headquarters and System**

We understand that at present the overall coordination of the INSET program is the responsibility of the HRD/TEU, on which the agencies identified above are already represented. However, as we have noted (p.97), one senior educationist has suggested that this has not been a satisfactory arrangement and another indicated that more coordination is required (p.97). The implication clearly is that some alternative is needed, and some impression of the nature of that alternative is indicated in this interview excerpt with a senior educationist:

> We can be course directors and resource people and being course directors we can provide facilitators, we don’t mind doing that, but sometimes the whole thing you know coordination of the whole usually comes to us. Before there was nobody to look after it and there was no one and it went on an ad hoc basis, then TEU came with [person named] and he tried to put things together, at least tried to coordinate on paper … HRD could continue to do the coordination but this is only a small part of that for inservice. A major part is to keep track of what happened before, what is happening now and what will happen. … That is my major concern.

Collectively, this comment and those on page 97 from people well placed to make valid judgements give a clear indication that any review of the INSET program must include its leadership and management structure.

We noted at the outset of this section that INSET is but one of the agencies within the education system. It is now timely for it to have designated and expert leadership. INSET needs to be coordinated and managed by a person or persons who have direct
oversight of the vision and day-to-day practice of INSET. Funding will need to be found for such an educational leadership role.

**Recommendation 14:**

Funds should be allocated for the creation of a leadership position for INSET (that will be referred to throughout this report as the ‘Director of INSET’).

The need is especially important now as the reconceptualisation of INSET will require a champion, one who can make sure that the full range of recommendations can take shape over the next five years or so. While it would be possible to list here the roles and responsibilities that should attach to this position, we will not do so, rather, we will let them emerge from the following discussion as the implications of the data dictate.

**Recommendation 15:**

The feasibility of establishing educational leadership positions, to be located regionally, perhaps within each Dzongkhag, should be seriously considered. Such Dzongkhag Educational Leaders (DEls) would provide a complementary service to that of current DEOs and should not be involved in essentially administrative matters.

We understand that there is currently a discussion paper in circulation that proposes a re-definition of the work of the DEO’s office. To the extent that this proposition is consistent with the establishment of an educational leadership capacity at the Dzongkhag level, then we support it wholeheartedly. The position could be a promotion position for able Bhutanese teachers with incentives to reflect the level of importance of the position. We note too the proposed build up of resources at the Dzongkhag level (see p.28 and p.31).

In the event of DEls being appointed, we suggest that their further professional development also be considered, and as circumstances permit, they be offered inservice support aimed at honing their skills as resource persons. In addition to the skill needed for facilitating workshops, they should be assisted to develop a sound knowledge of theories of educational change and the role of consultants in that change process.

**Recommendation 16:**

As soon as possible, DEls should be assisted to develop their skills as consultants through suitably designed and delivered inservice education and training.
DELs would be an excellent support resource for NBIP and SBIP implementation (see p.20). They could be called upon by Head Teachers to assist in resolving difficult problems being raised by teachers in their schools. In making this observation, we are signalling that we believe that the other main source of on-going professional support for teachers should be their Head Teachers.

*(c) Head Teachers and Educational Leadership*

The key person in school level educational leadership should be the Head Teacher. The reason for this is that the Head Teacher is the one who must deal with all of the day-to-day issues relating to whether or not students are learning and the extent to which teachers are facilitating that learning. The Head Teacher cannot hope to be an expert in all teaching and learning situations (the instructional leader role) but can aspire to be an educative leader of the teachers in the school (see p.21).

The Head Teacher would normally be involved in making sure there were opportunities for all staff to develop professionally. The Head Teacher, as educational leader in the school, should be the source of pressure upon teachers by reinforcing that the changes identified at the system level are to be implemented (see p.91 & p.85). For example, one way to exert pressure on teachers is to make it clear that attendance at future NBIPs is conditional on trying out NBIP ideas in a professional manner.

The theoretical framework alerts us to the difficulty that Head Teachers have in finding a balance between their administrative/managerial responsibilities and their leadership responsibilities. This tension has been recognised at the DEO level in the discussion papers proposition to split that role. While we do not suppose that any similar split in responsibilities is possible at the level of Head Teacher, it is clear that time must be found for the exercise of educational leadership.

As a tool for exercising curriculum leadership, Head Teachers should devise School Development Plans that include short-to-medium term staff development plans. The development of the staff in a school has to be linked in with the development activities designed by Headquarters. If NBIPs are to be successful, the right people have to attend, and as noted already the issue of nomination/selection for NBIPs is highly contentious (see p.110). A needs analysis of the school, the analysis of which is incorporated in the school development plan, is one basis upon which a justification can be made for a particular teacher or teachers to be nominated. It is a bonus if the school development plan (or a modified academic calendar in the first instance) has clearly set out what nominations are required. However, at other times that will not be the case because the school’s needs will not necessarily match with the focus of the NBIPs that are offered. Head Teachers, the DEL, EMSS officers, and others, may well identify needs that cannot wait for an NBIP. These too would be included on staff development plans and be resourced through some form of CBIA or SBIP.

**Recommendation 17:**

Head Teachers should be supported to develop their role as educational leaders and in particular assisted to resolve the relative tensions that will arise between managerial and educational roles.
As we understand the current INSET structure, the only personnel who are regularly in contact with schools are the officers of the EMSS, but their visits are necessarily infrequent. We understand too that moves are currently under way to reduce even further that contact by enlisting selected Head Teachers to work with clusters of nearby schools and furnish reports to the EMSS. Headquarters staff are too busy to provide the necessary support for classroom skills development on a regular basis. In any case Bhutan’s geography, and its workforce shortage, preclude this in the immediate future. And at the Dzongkhag level the DEO’s role, as presented in the historic First Education Conference, is challenging to say the least, and virtually precludes that office as a source of professional support for, and pressure on, teachers.

We note with concern the current move to add both management and leadership responsibilities to some of the Head Teachers. We refer here to the development of the ‘Network of Focal Persons’ being established by the EMSS in which selected Head Teachers have the additional task of ‘monitoring schools in the clusters annually’ (which contain up to 11 schools) and furnish reports to the EMSS, as well as ‘organise and resource SBIPs for the cluster schools’ (RGOB nd). We argue that Head Teachers have more than enough to do as it is, so that asking any of them to take on more is quite unreasonable and contrary to the tenor of our argument. In our view it would be sufficient that Head teachers organise the development of their own staff over time. Pressure (monitoring) is important in the overall process of INSET. However, we seriously question the assumption that neighbouring Head Teachers will see their Focal person as a ‘colleague’ when it is known that they have to write a report for submission to the EMSS on each of the schools in their cluster. Instead, we favour Head Teachers being left to provide as much leadership in their schools as they can, together with support for each other as Head Teachers, and the EMSS officers being left to provide most of the pressure. It is much easier for a Head Teacher to in turn apply pressure to his staff if he can deflect some of the negative reactions that sometimes come from staff by indicating that he has been so instructed by the EMSS Officer.

(iii) System-wide Coordination

We have argued that INSET should move away from an annual series of NBIP workshops with follow-up SBIP workshops to a more complex system. The new INSET will be more responsive to the needs of teachers in various ways and the needs of central curriculum initiatives. It will also be much more concerned about follow-up in the forms of pressure and support. A major responsibility remains, that of the coordination of the efforts of all relevant personnel to support the priorities of the inservice system in Bhutan.

As indicated in the theoretical framework, there is good reason to believe that teachers take their cues about what is important to strive to achieve and what is not, by the actions rather than words of their superiors. Consequently, it is important that when system priorities have been determined, all personnel in positions of responsibility should strive to ensure that whenever they are communicating directly with teachers in the course of their work, their words and actions reinforce those priorities in the minds of the teachers (see p.21). We note that Dorji’s (1998) research indicates teachers would appreciate more, and more timely, communication. The recommendations that
EMSS officers make is a classic example of the ways that communication can take place between levels in the system. Others include the Newsletter and the radio program, again support services that are already operating and well received by teachers. For the future, Hughes et al (1998) in their third model, recommend ways in which present effort within BBE could be re-directed to provide diagnostic services based upon the analysis of examination results at the national and school levels. Our data indicate that SBIP reports need to be replied to. Publication well in advance of plans for NBIPs would assist the planning by schools greatly. Our view is that these are support mechanisms for teachers and avenues by which pressure can be brought to bear upon teachers, but they need to be coordinated. Reinforcing this view, a senior colleague observed:

All of us in the Education Division, we talk about the importance of wholesome education and therefore all of us are responsible for providing teacher education in terms of inservice programs. I think it is important for us to sit together and see how and where our contributions complement each other.

Hughes et al (1998 p.60) came to a similar conclusion regarding coordination in their recent study and they pointed to a current problem.

In our discussion with members of the different sections we have noted their appreciation of the need for ever closer cooperation among sections but we also noted their perception of a tendency in the sections toward isolationism and separation rather than collaboration.

We are attracted to the suggestion that senior colleagues should ‘sit together and see how and where our contribution complements each other’. There can be no doubt that all the agencies identified in these comments (see p.103) exist primarily to support the work of teachers in schools. We are also attracted to the suggestion that a ‘small group of people’ should have the responsibility of developing a coherent overview of inservice education and training provisions and be active in determining future needs. This is where a major coordinative task arises because the key policies of curriculum (CAPSS), examinations (BBE) and monitoring (EMSS) are the ones that most powerfully direct the work of teachers. It seems logical that these three agencies should be the key players in that small coordinating group. We have included representatives from TTC/NIE for their significant role in resourcing INSET workshops, and Personnel Services for the central role played in the coordination of INSET in the past and in the deployment of teachers.

Recommendation 18:

A working party, under the chairmanship of the Director (or his nominee) should be formed immediately to work out the ways in which CAPSS, BBE, EMSS, TTC/NIE and Personnel Services can, and should, work together to coordinate the INSET program. Careful consideration should be given to the establishment of a standing committee to exercise this control and leadership. It should report directly to the Teacher Education Board and have the Director of INSET as its executive officer.

In the recommendations above we have set out the essential ideas for the development of INSET over the short to medium term. In doing so we have not included many good ideas which the Director of INSET might take up as occasion demands. For example,
levels of NBIPs might be instituted, or, packages could be developed on generic skills (see p.67). Like-minded teachers might develop a cluster or even a professional association at some future point. In short, we hope that this Report will act as a resource for future development at all levels of the education system.

In order to assist in this future development, we have developed scenarios which for us would be expressions of the principles in the framework. These can be found in Appendix 6 (p.148). They represent the ‘best case’ type of scenario. Using some imagination, the scenarios will hopefully provide a picture for people at different levels in the education system in Bhutan to think about the ways that the principles might interact.

Conclusion

In proposing a fundamental reconceptualisation of INSET in Bhutan, we recognise that we are asking those concerned with inservice in Bhutan to think differently and hence to plan and act differently. Any large group of people with a common concern can be thought of as sharing a culture that has developed over time. Certain values, beliefs, rituals and practices define that culture and we recognise that it has nurtured remarkable development in Bhutanese education in the modern era. In this report we are, to some degree, challenging that culture. We are questioning the ‘way things are done around here’ in relation to INSET by suggesting some changes while recognising the appropriateness of existing assumptions and practices. Consequently, if our recommendations are taken up, they will, to some extent create a certain uneasiness as familiar habits, that are routine and anxiety free, are replaced by new ones. This is entirely natural and appropriate and is essentially the same kind of learning process that teachers are subjected to each time a curriculum change is introduced. This is the essence of Marris’ observation, that we cited in the theoretical framework:

When those who have power to manipulate changes act as if they have only to explain, and when their explanations are not at once accepted, shrug off opposition as ignorance or prejudice, they express a profound contempt for the meaning of lives other than their own. For the reformers have already assimilated these changes to their purposes, and worked out a reformulation which makes sense to them, perhaps through months or years of analysis and debate. If they deny others the chance to do the same, they treat them as puppets dangling by the threads of their own conceptions.

We strongly believe that the framework we have developed, with great assistance from the many respondents to our questions, is appropriate for the times.

We would be pleased to continue a dialogue with Division of Education personnel about any aspect of the report if that would assist in developing further planned changes in the design and delivery of inservice education for teachers in Bhutan.

Thank you for entrusting us with the research that has underpinned this report. We have appreciated the opportunity to work with Bhutanese colleagues and are pleased to see that the skills learnt during the project already are being put to use in a locally initiated and implemented study of curriculum implementation. We look forward to this development gaining momentum in the years ahead.
Dr David Laird  Dr Tom Maxwell  Mr Wangpo Tenzin

Tashi Delek
Acronyms

The acronyms used in this report are listed below.

BBE Bhutan Board of Examinations
BEd Bachelor of Education
BTF (Env. Ed.) Bhutan Trust Fund (Environmental Education)
CAPSS Curriculum and Professional Support Section
CBIA Cluster Based Inservice Activities
CS Community School
DA Daily Allowance
DBIP Dzongkhag Based Inservice Program
DEO Dzongkhag Education Officer
DEL Dzongkhag Education Leader
DEVS Dzongkha Environmental Studies
DRT Dzongkhag Resource Teacher
EMSS Education Monitoring and Support Section
EPGI Education Policy Guidelines and Instructions
EVS Environmental Studies
HRD Human Resource Development
HS High School
ICSE Indian School Certificate Examinations
INSET Inservice Education and Training
ISC Indian School Certificate
JHS Junior High School
MEd Master of Education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>New Approach to Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBIP</td>
<td>National Based Inservice Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE</td>
<td>Non Formal Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>National Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUD*IST</td>
<td>Non Numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>Post Graduate Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Pre Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>Primary Teachers’ Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCSC</td>
<td>Royal Civil Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGOB</td>
<td>Royal Government of Bhutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIM</td>
<td>Royal Institute of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBIP</td>
<td>School Based Inservice Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSE</td>
<td>School Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Travel Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEB</td>
<td>Teacher Education Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEC</td>
<td>Teacher Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEU</td>
<td>Teacher Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTC</td>
<td>Teacher Training College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YGCS</td>
<td>Youth Guidance and Counselling Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZTC</td>
<td>Dzongkha Teachers’ Certificate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendices

Appendix 1 - Methodology

The Project Brief and so the nature of the questions demanded a multi-method approach. This was because the issues raised are complex. They exist as part of an entire system of education, that of the Education Division, Royal Government of Bhutan. By ‘multi-method’ was meant that both qualitative and quantitative strategies for gathering data are employed and thus the advantages of both can be judiciously designed into the data gathering strategy. This approach also maximises the potential for methodological triangulation.

Consistent with the overall design of the Project, the methodological design for the research consisted of three phases:

Phase 1 when instruments were drafted and piloted and some data was collected by interview, and documents collected;

the Inter-phase period when data were collected in the schools and from Headquarters (Education Division, Ministry of Health and Education) and data analysed; and

Phase 2 when the analysis data was completed and meanings developed with the assistance of the Task Force of the Project.

To assist in the design of the research of the Project, a Research Matrix was developed (Appendix 2, p.129). The key feature of the Matrix consisted of the research questions and their sub-questions. Using these, the sources of data were identified and the techniques for gathering data decided upon. Decisions regarding data gathering technique were made on the basis of size of the data source and the purpose of collecting those data. Interviews were used where the data source was at hand and the numbers were small. Interviews allowed some probing. Questionnaire was used where the data source was large and/or dispersed. Using the Research Matrix, a check could be made concerning the triangulation by source and by method. Note the research methodology was somewhat constrained, though not seriously, by the two senior researchers being unable to enter certain southern Dzongkhags. Each data gathering strategy is now described in turn.

Interview

Sources for interviews included (with the numbers interviewed in parenthesis): NBIP Course Directors and Resource Persons (N=26); Officers of EMSS (N=3); Key persons (N=7); Head Teachers (N=13); and teachers (N=52)

Selection for persons to interview in the first group was based upon identification of the people involved and then making a selection based upon their experience. More experienced persons were selected, structured according to whether they were course
directors or resource persons and according to subject area. Some course directors and resource persons from schools and institutes outside the Thimphu and Paro valleys and NIE Samtse could not be included due to lack of resources. All three EMSS persons who were available in Phase 1 were interviewed. Key persons were those available in the Task Force plus those in Thimphu who had had considerable experience in inservice education in Bhutan. These people included CAPSS section heads, or higher. These interviews were conducted in late August to early September 1998 and analysis begun soon afterwards.

The selection of Head Teachers and teachers was completed on a different basis. The approach taken here was to explore the data indicated from the questionnaire analysis. Head Teachers’ and teachers’ lived experiences were the focus, and these interviews were conducted subsequent to the initial analysis of the questionnaire data.

Interview Schedules were developed for each data source (Appendix 7, p.156). Initial drafting was based upon the key research questions, modified according to the data source and their experience. Probes were also identified from the literature, for example, follow-up and support, and from knowledge of the Bhutanese context. The language of the questions was checked for appropriateness for Bhutanese people. In the case of the key persons (Campbell and Levine 1970), some modification of the probes was required according to the particular area of responsibility of the respondent. For example, additional probes relating to inservice administration were included when interviewing the key inservice administrator. These interviews with key persons tended toward more open ended discussions of the issues. Interview schedules were modified slightly as data from interviews became evident. For example, the strong feeling about the necessity for follow-up and yet its almost total lack was probed more deeply as time went by. Another example was the exploration of the basis of the need for NBIP; the apparent lack of teacher needs analysis versus the preoccupation with Headquarters need for curriculum renewal. Copies of the major questions were presented to the interviewees for their perusal prior to beginning the interviews. Only one person declined to have the interview recorded. Interviews were not possible for the District Education Officers despite their importance to education in each Dzongkhag and to inservice in particular. Instead an open-ended questionnaire was developed.

As mentioned above, interviews for those except Head Teachers and teachers were carried out during August and September, including a visit to TTC, Paro and to NIE at Samtse. Interviews in schools were undertaken during the Inter-phase period. Interviews of key persons were undertaken by Maxwell, otherwise all researchers conducted interviews as work schedules allowed.

All interviews were transcribed, and those with Lopens translated and transcribed by a member of the Sub Task Force. Transcription followed a template based upon the main questions of the interview to facilitate introduction to the qualitative data analysis software program, NUD*IST (QSR 1991).

Documents

A range of relevant documents were collected, summarised where necessary or notes taken and made ready for introduction into NUD*IST. Documents processed in this way included: EMSS reports on schools (’96: N=48; ’98: N=14); reports of NBIPs
\textbf{Qualitative Data Analysis}

NUD*IST is a sophisticated electronic package ideally suited to the purpose of handling large quantities of data. It is one of the leaders in the field. The analysis begins by developing an hierarchically organised coding tree based upon construct categories structured around the three questions identified in the Research Matrix. Preliminary data analysis occurred in September 1998 but the major part of it was completed in the Inter-phase and Phase 2 periods. The analysis of these qualitative data, together with the open ended comments from the questionnaire respondents eventually expanded into over 600 nodes on the NUD*IST coding tree to facilitate pattern searching.

\textbf{Questionnaire}

The data required from District Education Officers (DEOs) could not be obtained by interview due to time and other constraints. While telephone interviews were considered, it was finally decided to compile an open-ended questionnaire (Appendix 8, p.160) which was sent by post for them to complete in October. These data were transcribed and entered into NUD*IST.

The items for the main questionnaire (Appendix 3, see p.131) were developed specifically for this study except for those associated with Head Teachers’ and teachers’ problems and concerns (needs). There were six sections to the questionnaire, consistent with the Research Matrix: (1) biographical data, (2) problems and concerns; (3) current practices and impact of NBIP; (4) current practices and impact of SBIP; (5) past and future preferences for inservice; and (6) suggestions for improvement. A Dzongkha version was also prepared (Appendix 4, p.139) with the assistance of two members of the Dzongkha Unit of CAPSS. This Dzongkha translation benefited from the close involvement of the two Dzongkha speaking researchers since they had taken part in the development of the English version and so had an understanding of the intention of each item. Uncertain items were reconsidered and sometimes lead to a further refinement of the English version.

The biographical data were selected on the basis of the literature and the extent to which biographical variables had shown some main and interaction effects in previous work (Dorji 1998; Thinley 1999). These included, for example, nationality where Indian nationals in the teaching cadre were shown to have significantly different perceptions of some areas of the curriculum. Ballantyne et al (1995) provided the items for the needs of teachers and Head Teachers in this study. In their research the problems and concerns of beginning teachers in Australia were studied. The items from this questionnaire were considered appropriate since teachers in Bhutan, whose training was less extensive than teachers in the west, whose classes were on the whole considerably larger, whose resource base was poor, and whose custom and practice was the use of ‘chalk and talk’ and/or rote learning, would be roughly equivalent to beginning teachers in Australia in terms of their problems and concerns, that is, their needs. Data from this section could thus be used to interpret Head Teachers’ and teachers’ expressed needs. Items for current practices in NBIP and their impact (Section 3) were taken from the literature, especially Fullan (1991), as well as from the analysis of the early interviews.
undertaken and documents collected during August, 1998. The pilot work of Strawbridge (1997) was also of assistance. The items for the current practices and impact of SBIP were developed and piloted in a similar manner to those items in the previous section. The items for past and future preferences for types of inservice were developed from a study undertaken by Maxwell (1993). The items for the final section concerning improvements that could be made were developed from the Research Matrix.

The matters related to the administration of the questionnaire were carefully considered. The questionnaire went through several drafts over a period of four weeks prior to the pilot being carried out on a high, primary and community school in the Thimphu valley. The drafting process included a careful search for items that were insufficiently discriminating for the Bhutanese teachers, some of whom were not familiar with an extended educational language. Nor was the process of asking teachers for their views a common one in Bhutan so considerable attention was given to directions within the questionnaire itself. The pilot at the three schools also included the letter to the Head Teacher and the letter to the teachers. The essential purpose of these letters was to try and encourage a good response rate. Questionnaires were posted to schools by 13 October, 1998, that is, at the beginning of the Inter-Phase period. Later than this would have incurred invigilation/examination as well as post difficulties. We decided against school identification on the advice of members of the Task Force who thought that the return rate would be higher than we had anticipated. We included a reply paid envelope assuming that this would assist schools to return the completed questionnaires. Numbers sufficient for general and Dzongkha teachers were sent to each Head Teacher, plus an additional copy of each version. A smaller envelope, which could be sealed, was included to ensure teacher anonymity.

The sample for this part of the study was based upon a structured random sampling technique since we were interested in generalising to the population of teachers in schools in Bhutan. A random sample is assumed for statistical analysis and it would also provide us with the full range of teachers’ perceptions we required concerning inservice. Our starting point was that we needed a minimum sample of 200 for analytical purposes and we assumed a conservative return rate of 30%. Thus, approximately 600 teachers were required, that is, one in four in Bhutan. The structuring of schools in Bhutan is four fold; high, junior high, primary and community schools. We randomly selected every fourth school from a listing with each of these categories. In the case of community schools the sampling was one in three since the number of community school teachers would be quite small leading to cell size problems in subsequent analyses. The resultant sample is presented as Table 1 in the text.

Analysis of quantitative data produced by this questionnaire was undertaken using the SPSS computer package which is very suitable for the kinds of descriptive and inferential statistics required for this study. Additional analyses were completed using a Rasch analysis on Quest software (ACER 1996) in order to check the nature of scales, by deleting items that did not conform to a unitary scale. In the case of Concerns (section B of the questionnaire), the unitary scale of all 25 items was used. In this case, the scale reliability of item estimate was high (0.98) and the reliability of case estimates, the more crucial measure, was moderately high (0.75) and well within reasonable limits.
Cases (approximated 10%) were eliminated where case tau were off scale. The scale estimates for each case from the Rasch analyses were fed into the general linear model univariate analysis to determine differences between groups based upon biographical data.

The National Based Inservice Programs items (C1-C33) were first analysed in a confirmatory factor analysis procedure but the factor structure indicated by the theoretical development of the items was not confirmed. The items were then analysed for a single scale dimension using Rasch modelling and items deleted that did not conform to the model. Sub scales, based upon the conceptualisation of the items were also investigated separately, and again items were eliminated where each did not conform to the single sub-scale model. The remaining items were factor analysed (KMO sampling adequacy >0.7 and Bartlett’s sphericity test sig.<0.001) in a first order factor analysis using the scree test resulting with eleven factors explaining 66% of the variance. Since these data were required for policy decisions, a second order factor analysis was obtained using the first order factors. The second order factor analysis of 28 of 33 NBIP items remaining after the Rasch (KMO sampling adequacy >0.67 and Bartlett’s sphericity test sig.<0.001) produced four factors using eigen value one as the criterion. The factors were interpreted as ‘Improved classroom management for student learning but lack of support’ (Improved Learning for short), ‘Focus on classroom concerns’ (Classroom Concerns for short) and ‘Lecture delivery okay’ (Lecture for short). A fourth factor was not interpretable (27% of the variance) due to the single high loading of one first order factor which itself had a number of low item loadings. Together, these second order factors explained approximately two thirds of the variance. These factors were then used as the dependent variables in general linear model multivariate analysis to determine differences between groups of teachers (N=216) who had experienced NBIPs.

The School Based Inservice Programs items (C42-C72) were first analysed in a confirmatory factor analysis procedure but the factor structure was not confirmed. These items were then analysed for a single scale dimension using Rasch modelling and a single scale was evident. Sub scales, based upon the conceptualisation of the items were also investigated, and two items were eliminated. The remaining items were factor analysed (KMO sampling adequacy >0.7 and Bartlett’s sphericity test sig.<0.001) in a first order factor analysis using the scree test resulting in nine factors explaining 66% of the variance. The first order factors were adequately interpreted. Since these data were required for policy decisions, a second order factor analysis was obtained using the first order nine factors. The second order factor analysis resulted in 54% of variance explained (KMO>0.7, Bartlett’s test sig.<0.001) when two factors were extracted using eigen values greater than one. The 54% of variance explained is considered satisfactory for policy work. The two factors were readily interpreted as ‘Improved learning with Headquarters materials and provide practical ideas, collegiality’ explaining 38% of the variance (‘Improved Learning’ for short) and ‘Poor content and input’ (‘Poor Content’ for short). The correlation was -0.381 between the factors. These two factors were then used as the dependent variables in general linear model multivariate analysis to determine differences between groups of teachers (N=402) who had experienced SBIPs.
The qualitative data from the questionnaires (responses to nine open ended items) were transcribed and entered with the corresponding biographical data into NUD*IST for analysis. Analysis proceeded in concert with the other qualitative data (see above).
## Appendix 2 – Abbreviated Research Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>How Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the current INSET practices?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *(a) How, and by whom, are courses designed?* | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons)  
Report analysis  
*Open survey to DEOs* |
| *(b) Whose needs are addressed?* | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS, teachers and Head Teachers)  
Survey |
| *(c) How, when, where and by whom are courses implemented?* | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS)  
Analysis of reports |
| *(d) How are courses evaluated?* | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS)  
Report collection. |
| *(e) What is the relationship between inservice providers (centre, dzongkhag and school)?* | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS)  
*Open survey to DEOs* |
| *(f) What relationships exist between inservice courses and support mechanisms, eg inspectorate, newsletters, CAPSS, radio* | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS, teachers and Head Teachers)  
Analysis of Newsletters, radio broadcasts.  
Survey. |
| *(g) What are the administrative procedures?* | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, teachers and Head Teachers) |
| *(h) What are the financial costs?* | Interview (Key Persons)  
Report analysis |

### 2. What has been the impact of INSET?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>How Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(a) What is the usefulness of the courses that they have attended?</em></td>
<td>Survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *(b) Have these courses improved teachers' professional knowledge and skills as a teacher?* | Survey.  
Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS, teachers and Head Teachers) |
| (c) Have these courses improved teachers' personal education? | Analysis of reports. Survey. |
| (d) Have these courses led to improved learning by students? | Survey |
| (e) What has been the 'flow on' effect to the schools? | Survey |
| | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS, teachers and Head Teachers) |
| (f) How has/does the level of language effect the implementation of the courses? | Survey. |
| | Interview (Course Directors, Resource, teachers and Head Teachers) |
| (g) How does the impact vary, for example, why don't people attend? | Analysis of reports. |
| | Interview (Course Directors, Resource Persons) Survey. |
| (h) What factors enhance impact? | Survey |
| | Interview (Course Directors, Resource Persons, teachers and Head Teachers) |

3. How might INSET be improved?

| (a) In what ways might the system-wide inservice program model be changed to make it more useful to teachers and others? | Interview (Key Persons) |
| | *Open survey to DEOs. |
| (b) What content needs to be improved in inservice courses to make them more useful for participants? | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS, teachers and Head Teachers) Survey |
| (c) What course delivery needs to be improved in inservice courses to make them more useful for participants? | Interview (Course Directors, Resource and Key Persons, EMSS, teachers and Head Teachers) Survey |
Appendix 3 – INSET Project Questionnaire (English)

Dear Head Teacher,

Your school has been selected as one out of every four in the country to provide information that will assist in the improvement of teacher inservice education and the development of a master plan for the inservice program in Bhutan for the next five to seven years. Since teachers are the most important resource of the education system, the task here is extremely important.

Please assist us in this important work by asking every teacher in your school to read the introductory letter on the front of each questionnaire. Please ask all teachers to complete the questionnaire independently and to follow the instructions carefully. We would like you to complete it too. You will notice that we have provided sufficient questionnaires for all your staff and for each person there is also a small envelope that can be sealed after the completed questionnaire has been placed inside. There are sufficient copies in Dzongkha for the lopens.

We would be grateful if you could collect all the envelopes containing the questionnaires from the teachers and place them in the large envelope, which has been prepaid for your convenience. Would you put all the unused questionnaires in this envelope too? You will notice that the return envelope has the words ‘urban’, ‘semi-urban’, ‘rural’ and ‘remote’ on the address label. This is so that we can simply identify the geographical location of your school but since there are more than twenty schools in each of the four categories we will not be able to identify your specific school. Please post the large envelope with the questionnaires inside back to us about one week after you receive this letter.

Thank you for helping us to obtain the information that we need.

Yours sincerely

Chairperson, INSET Task Force

cc DEO concerned
Logo

Bhutan INSET Project

6\textsuperscript{th} October 1998

Dear Teacher,

The purpose of this survey is to improve staff development for teachers in Bhutan. You, along with each teacher in your school, have been given this questionnaire because we want your honest opinions about the impact of inservice programs within Bhutan. With your views, and those of others, the intention is to develop a master plan for inservice programs for the next five to seven years for the whole of Bhutan.

By ‘impact’ we mean the influence or effect on you of inservice such as National Based Inservice Programs (NBIP) or School Based Inservice Programs (SBIP). By NBIP we mean courses or workshops held at the national level. By SBIP we mean workshops, planned discussion or such processes as Intervision organised by the school or clusters of schools.

The questionnaire should take about thirty minutes to complete and your opinions will be anonymous. We have provided a small envelope for this purpose so that you can place the completed questionnaire in it, seal it up and then give it back to the Head Teacher. We want your own ideas so please complete the questionnaire independently. **Complete the questionnaire as soon as you can or at the most within a week, please.**

Thank you in anticipation.

Yours sincerely

INSET Sub Task Force Team
Bhutan INSET Project

Section A Biographical Information

Please complete the following questions as they apply to you.

A1. Sex (Tick one)
   - Male
   - Female

A2. Age (Tick one)
   - less than 25 years of age
   - 25 to 30
   - 31 to 40
   - over 40

A3. Nationality (Tick one)
   - Non Bhutanese
   - Bhutanese

A4. Academic qualifications (Tick one)
   - Class IX & below
   - Class X pass
   - Class XII pass
   - Bachelors degree
   - Masters degree or above

A5. Professional qualifications (Tick one)
   - ZTC/PTC
   - BEd
   - PGCE
   - MEd
   - Other, eg, induction course, untrained

A6. Teaching experience (Tick one)
   - Less than two years
   - Between 2 and 5 years
   - Between 6 and 10 years
   - More than 10 years

A7. Type of School you are currently teaching in (Tick one)
   - Community School
   - Primary School
   - Junior High School
   - High School

A8. Category of Teacher (Tick one)
   - Head Teacher/Principal
   - Subject teacher
   - Dzongkha Teacher
   - Class teacher
   - Multigrade teacher
   - Other, eg, apprentice, temporary

A9. What is the average number of students in your class(es)  ...........  students
### Section B  Teaching Problems and Concerns

Using the scale provided, carefully tick in the box that best describes the extent to which each of the areas noted has been a cause for concern for you. *Remember that your responses are anonymous.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Concern</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Simply getting through the day/week/term</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Finding time for lesson preparation</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Mastering teaching skills</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Making on-the-spot decisions in the classroom</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Motivating students to learn</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6. Problems with discipline</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7. Lack of teaching/learning materials</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8. Understanding students' social and emotional needs</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9. Planning learning activities for the week</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10. Feelings of inadequacy as a teacher</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11. Balancing competing time demands</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12. Relating to parents</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13. Relating to students as individuals</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14. Being accepted/liked by pupils</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15. Being accepted by colleagues</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16. Meeting the expectations of the authority</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17. Coping with worries</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18. Unfamiliarity with subject-matter</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19. Establishing and maintaining classroom and school rules</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20. Problems with the textbook</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21. Problems with the teacher’s manual</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22. Problems with English</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23. Lack of support</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24. Class size</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25. Lack of access to professional development</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>🟢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26. Any other comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section C  Impact of Inservice Programs

We are interested in the impact of National Based (NBIP) and School Based (SBIP) Inservice Programs upon your knowledge and skills as a teacher. Please complete all of this section using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For example, we would expect a varied range of responses to the statement “Bhutan is developing too fast”. If you strongly disagreed with the statement you would place a tick carefully in the SD (strongly disagree) box as shown below. However if you thought differently you would have selected one of the other boxes.

Bhutan is developing too fast

Please make sure that you use the full range of the scale wherever you can.

**National Based Inservice Programs (NBIP)**

*If you have not been involved in NBIP in the last three years do not complete (a). Instead please go straight to (b) on the top of page 4, and tell us why.*

(a) *If you have been involved in NBIP during the last three years please complete the following questions.*

The last NBIP that I attended:

|   | C1. changed my beliefs about teaching | C2. helped me learn new ideas about my work | C3. did not help me learn new classroom/school practices | C4. showed me how to use the teacher’s manual | C5. helped me with continuous assessment practices | C6. showed me how to use the students’ textbook | C7. showed me materials that I could use | C8. has improved the learning of my students | C9. has not helped me with my classroom/school planning | C10. allowed me to share practical ideas with teachers in my school | C11. taught me more than just practical ideas | C12. did not stimulate professional discussion back at my school | C13. helped me to organise co-curricular activities | C14. helped me to make learning more interesting | C15. helped me to relate learning to everyday life | C16. helped me to manage my classroom better | C17. was too long | C18. had enough practical activities | C19. had too much explanation | C20. did not deal with classroom realities | C21. focussed too much upon the curriculum/teacher’s manual/text | C22. had resource people who did not know the content | C23. was followed by SBIP at my school | C24. covered too many topics | C25. was supported afterwards by the authorities (eg Head teacher, DEO, ...) | C26. had resource people who knew about classroom/school realities | C27. had workshop facilities that were inadequate | C28. had too many ideas that I did not understand | C29. gave me an opportunity to discuss new ideas during the NBIP | C30. was followed up with some support at my school | C31. did not deal with my classroom/school concerns | C32. focussed more on the content of the course than my needs | C33. had resource people whose language skills were not very good | C34. Any other comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you completed (a), please go straight to *School Based Inservice Programs* on page 4.
(b) Complete this section only if you have not been involved in NBIP over the last three years.

I have **not** attended an NBIP over the last three years

1. because I need a holiday
2. for family/health reasons
3. because they are a waste of time
4. as I have not been nominated
5. because I have already attended a similar NBIP(s)
6. since I am already good enough at teaching
7. Any other reason? …………………………………………………………………………………

School Based Inservice Programs (SBIP)

If you have not been involved in SBIP at a school over the last three years, please go straight to (d) on the top of page 5 to tell us why.

(c) If you have been involved in SBIP during the last three years please complete the following questions using the Strongly Agree (SA) to Strongly Disagree (SD) scale as before.

The last SBIP I participated in

1. changed my beliefs about teaching
2. helped me to learn new ideas about my work
3. did not help me to learn new classroom/school practices
4. showed me how to use the teacher’s manual
5. helped me with continuous assessment practices
6. showed me how to use the textbook
7. showed me materials that I could use
8. improved the learning of my students
9. did not help me with my classroom/school planning
10. allowed me to share practical ideas with teachers in my school
11. taught me more than just practical ideas
12. did not stimulate professional discussion in my school
13. helped me to organise co-curricular activities
14. helped me to make learning more interesting
15. helped me to relate learning to everyday life
16. helped me to manage my classroom better
17. had enough practical activities
18. had too much explanation
19. did not deal with classroom realities
20. focused too much upon the curriculum/teacher’s manual/text
21. was supported by the authorities (eg Head Teacher, DEO, …)
22. gave me an opportunity to discuss new ideas during the SBIP
23. was followed up with some support from my colleagues
24. was initiated by teachers
25. did not deal with my classroom/school concerns
26. only had input sessions
27. focussed more on the content of the course than my needs
28. had resource people whose language was not very good
29. was initiated by the Head Teacher
30. had at least one Intervision cycle
31. had too many ideas that I do not understand
32. Any other comment:

If you completed (c), please go straight to Section D on page 5.
(d) Complete this section only if you have not been involved in SBIP over the last three years.

I have not been involved in SBIP in the last three years because

C74. none were organised
C75. none were in my subject area
C76. I was too busy
C77. the number on the staff was too small
C78. they are not useful
C79. Any other reason? ………………………………………………………………………………..

Section D: Improvement

(a) Here we are interested in the ways of improving inservice and so would like to know your preferences. Please complete the following items using the same scale as before.

In future I would like to take part in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. group participation in developing teaching plans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. single SBIP activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. SBIP as a planned series of activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. SBIP with Intervision resourced by the school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5. SBIP with Intervision resourced by others, for example, NIE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6. short inservice courses (1 to 5 days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7. NBIP(s) (7-14 days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8. NBIP(s) (15-28 days)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9. undertaking further college/university study for an award</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10. Intervision activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11. NBIP followed by SBIP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12. listening to radio broadcasts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13. reading CAPSS newsletters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14. follow up after NBIP by Head Teacher/DEO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15. follow up after NBIP by resource persons</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16. NBIP requiring classroom practices as follow up</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17. subject-based NBIPs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18. inservice based upon teachers’ needs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19. inservice based upon continuous assessment practices</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20. inservice based upon classroom/school planning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21. inservice based upon new classroom/school practices</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22. inservice which showed me how to use the teacher’s manual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23. inservice which showed me how to use the textbook</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24. Any other comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Describe how NBIP can be improved to ensure a greater positive impact upon your work.

(approx one third page available)

(c) Describe how SBIP can be improved to ensure a greater positive impact upon your work.

(approx one third page available)

**Section E Other comments**

Please add any other comments here about inservice that you would like to make.

(one third page available)

**Thank you.**

Please place this questionnaire in the small envelope and return it sealed to your Head Teacher.
Appendix 4 - INSET Project Questionnaire (Dzongkha)
### APPENDIX 5 - Improvement – Item Frequencies and Ranks

#### Section D: Improvement

(a) Here we are interested in the ways of improving inservice and so would like to know your preferences. Please complete the following items using the same scale as before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In future I would like to take part in</th>
<th>SA/A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D/SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. group participation in developing teaching plans</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. single SBIP activities</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. SBIP as a planned series of activities</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. SBIP with Intervision resourced by the school</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5. SBIP with Intervision resourced by others, for example, NIE</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6. short inservice courses (1 to 5 days)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7. NBIP(s) (7-14 days)</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8. NBIP(s) (15-28 days)</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9. undertaking further college/university study for an award</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10. Intervision activities</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11. NBIP followed by SBIP</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12. Listening to radio broadcasts</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13. reading CAPSS newsletters</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14. follow up after NBIP by Head Teacher/DEO</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15. follow up after NBIP by resource persons</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16. NBIP requiring classroom practices as follow up</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17. subject-based NBIPs</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18. inservice based upon teachers’ needs.</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19. inservice based upon continuous assessment practices</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20. inservice based upon classroom/school planning</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21. inservice based upon new classroom/school practices</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22. inservice which showed me how to use the teacher’s manual</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23. inservice which showed me how to use the textbook</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24. Any other comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6 - Scenarios

If the framework principles are to be put into practice then they challenge the ways that INSET has been ‘done’ previously in a number of important ways. What we present below are several scenarios suggestive of ways in which the framework might operate in Bhutan. We address first of all NBIPs in a number of complementary ways. We try to set out a scenario for the way that SBIPs might follow NBIP successfully, and then we delve into the ways in which clusters of various kinds might be supported at the Dzongkhag level. At issue here is the way that the separate principles of the framework work together. We end with a scenario for the new position of Director of INSET. Perhaps each of these scenarios could begin ‘Dangbo ..o.oo Dingbo..o.oo’.

National Based Inservice Programs

We have said that here is a tension between establishing NBIPs that depend upon Headquarters initiatives as opposed to their being based upon the needs of teachers. We cannot make such decisions. These are for the judgment of the new Committee which oversees INSET in Bhutan and which is carried out through the drive and foresight of the INSET Director. What we can do is set out scenarios for two kinds of NBIPs.

**Headquarters Initiated NBIP**

The new maths curriculum had been introduced with much fanfare and a large NBIP the previous year. As part of a series of NBIPs the second one was organised, again for a large group. The materials for the session were selected and improved based on experiences from the last one and some new resource persons chosen based upon the previous year too, but the core of resource persons remained those involved last year. Preparation by the course coordinator was not as demanding as before and the basic materials went out to resource persons on time, about one month before. The resource persons knew that they had to be familiar with them prior to arriving for the three day preparation period. Once again the second edition of the ‘Handbook for Inservice Presenters’ was used and the previous resource persons were able to assist in acquainting the new ones with its content and provided stories about their successes (and otherwise) with the ideas it contained. SBIPs following the NBIP were a key feature of the overall curriculum implementation strategy so they knew that the NBIP had to include sessions on the ideas from the Handbook as well. The workshop session delivery concentrated upon the new ideas in the curriculum by active sessions concentrating upon new materials to be used and new ways that the teachers would work in the classroom. The principles from the Handbook were adhered to as much as the resource persons could. Teachers practised the new ways with the new materials that were flexible enough to cater for small classrooms with large class sizes. The course coordinator found out that a small minority of those who came had been to the previous NBIP. So these people were placed into a group with a very competent resource person and their sessions were only loosely based upon the NBIP plans, but rather contained professional discussion about the teachers’ own successes and
problems with what they had tried the previous year. Ideas from this group were shared with the other resource persons at the end of each day. The Handbook and materials to support the presentation of SBIP sessions were covered in three sessions at the end of the NBIP for the majority of those present. A small number of younger teachers were not leading SBIPs back in their schools so additional parallel sessions were conducted on more activities and materials in support of the main ideas of the new approach. Discussion of the teachers’ difficulties also took place.

The course coordinator sent with each returning teacher, a short letter to the Head Teacher outlining the main ideas that had been presented at the NBIP workshop. Each was asked that the SBIP workshop presenters not be required to conduct the SBIPs until they had a chance to try out some of the materials and practices in their own classroom. The returning teacher was asked to show the Head Teacher the action plan for SBIP workshops and implementation ideas for the other teachers so that these could be built into the year’s academic calendar. The course coordinator liaised with the Director of EMSS so that EMSS officers knew of the recent developments in maths. Being in CAPSS, he arranged with the Director to visit a sample of schools about five weeks into first term to see with his own eyes what implementation was taking place. After about three months the course coordinator also began to receive back reports of the classroom implementation that was taking place. These reports were based upon the framework of questions that the course coordinator had prepared and given to teachers at the NBIP workshop previously. He sent a reminder and some extra materials in support of all the teachers.

**Teachers’ Needs-Based NBIP**

One of the Bhutanised curricula has been in schools for several years. The relevant CAPSS office’s interest had been aroused by a number of letters from teachers. She confirmed this concern by reviewing the materials and she checked the results from the previous two years of relevant BBE results. She talked to the EMSS officer who had a particular interest in the area. By doing so she confirmed there was a need for an NBIP and she talked the idea over with the INSET Director. Her proposal was accepted by the TEB. A month before the workshop she sent materials to the resource persons that she had carefully chosen with a request they be read through. They were surprised that the materials included content on adult learning for teachers as well as themselves! They found, too, that they were required to make a commitment to follow up, and so organised with their superior to visit schools nearby. The course coordinator and resource persons met one week before and carefully worked through the planned sessions, leaving some sessions available for responses to the needs of the teachers who came to the workshop. The course coordinator took them through the ‘Handbook for Inservice Presenters (2nd Ed.)’ and many of the resource presenters’ problems were talked over before the workshop. Toward the end of the five day workshop two sessions were set aside for sessions in parallel where those generally more senior teachers who were required to run SBIPs back in their own school worked through the implications from the Handbook. This is what the new Director of INSET had advised and she could see the sense of it. Teachers were given a plan of action in which the main ideas from the workshop were set out as a series of inputs and follow-up activities in teachers’ classrooms. (No wonder the course coordinator was exhausted at the end of the NBIP.) Teachers were advised not to run the SBIP until they had tried out some of
the ideas themselves. The other teachers used these sessions to further develop resources and to discuss common problems. It was no surprise that the workshop went well.

The CAPSS officer knew that the real test was the implementation in the classroom. She organised the resource persons to visit the schools allocated to them about one month after the start of school. She visited as many as she could during term one. She coordinated with the EMSS Directorate about who had been to the NBIP. She had also run a short session with the EMSS officers to let them know the main new ideas using the same materials that had been used for the teachers to run SBIPs. Three months after the start of term, she sent out a one page open-ended item questionnaire to get additional information about the successes and problems that the teachers were having with the new ideas. From this she was able to develop a short article for the CAPSS Newsletter and also put together some additional resources that she sent to each of the NBIP teachers based upon her analysis of the problems that they were encountering.

In the scenarios that follow we want to portray possible responses in schools to NBIPs, and the tension that can arise for head teachers in trying to juggle the needs of the teachers of the schools against the pressure created when NBIPs are offered. This is particularly the case when the NBIP is about a new curriculum document. We do this through the two extremes of the urban/large and the remote/small schools. In so doing we indicate the fundamentally important role that the Head Teacher has and the important relationship that ‘SBIP following NBIP’ has for development. These scenarios, we believe, are actually not so hypothetical. Our data indicate that there are already a number of schools assisting teachers’ development in just these kinds of ways.

Responses to NBIPs

Urban/Large School Response to an NBIP

The TEB had indicated the previous year that a major NBIP was to be conducted on an update to the Class VI maths curriculum. This information had been recorded on the school’s Development Plan and so the Head Teacher was not surprised when the request for nominations arrived. He requested the DEL for two people to go arguing that the two staff could support one another on return, one because she was an excellent teacher and the other because he was respected for his experience. The Head Teacher reminded his staff that their major staff development activity for the following year was to be in the Class VI maths curriculum area, while other developments would continue. He began preparing his timetable for the following year so that the ones who would go to the NBIP were sure to be teaching that subject in the following year. He tried not to move too many teachers, as in this year they had been involved in development in the EVS curriculum area.

In the first few weeks of first term the Head Teacher had to revise his staffing because of a deployment but he was relieved that his two NBIP teachers had returned to the school. He listened intently to what the NBIP had been about and noted the kinds of
resources that he would try to find in support of his two teachers. More resources would be needed later after the SBIP process had begun. He wondered how he could do this because resources were so scarce and decided to write to the course coordinator for some assistance. He told his teachers what he had done. He planned for the first workshop making sure that resource persons were organised for the other subjects and class teachers to conduct their own staff development while the maths teachers were busy. The first SBIP workshop for the year was resourced on a Saturday afternoon in week six of first term by the senior teacher, supported by the other NBIP participant. The Head Teacher was surprised at the way that the workshop was run but was pleased as the teachers responded well to the materials and ideas. (He alternated his attention between this workshop and the other activities during the afternoon.) He made sure that he visited classrooms during maths periods and arranged for one of the maths teachers on the staff who was having some problems to be visited by the senior teacher to model some teaching practices. He encouraged the two teachers who had gone to the NBIP to talk informally about what they were doing at interval times with the other maths teachers. He tried to find resources to support them. He encouraged them to meet for a short period after school in week eight to talk about their problems and successes in the classroom. The SBIP in the first week of term two, again on a Saturday afternoon predicted on the School’s academic calendar, again addressed further maths issues from the NBIP, but not before getting the teachers to talk through some of the difficulties and successes they had experienced the previous term. By the end of term two the work was progressing but the Head Teacher still supported two of his teachers (the younger of the original two and ‘encouraged’ the teacher who was having difficulties) to attend the follow-up workshop that the NBIP coordinator had arranged near to his school in the summer vacation. This was a bit new to him but seemed to be a good idea because there were some problems coming up within his maths staff that they could not resolve within the staff themselves. By the end of term three, the Head Teacher was ready to write his report on the SBIP to the Director, INSET in which he would set out what had been achieved in his school in maths since the NBIP and SBIP follow-up processes. In writing it he found he could easily recall his visits to classrooms and the many discussion that he had had with his teachers as well as having access to the SBIP workshop notes and the minutes of the staff meetings. He would also inquire about why he had received no response to his request for support from the NBIP course coordinator. The Head Teacher thought that the first three terms had gone well in Class VI maths but there was still more to do.

Remote/Small School Response to an NBIP

Lopen Dorji had a problem. He knew that the Maths NBIP coming up at the end of the year was important but he also knew that his teachers, including himself, were not really ready for it. The EMSS report had made it clear that they were still struggling with the Dzongkha EVS initiative of the previous year. Their Development Plan was all worked out and they really needed to work another year on EVS. He had contacted the CAPSS EVS person who had agreed to visit the school next year in April. After checking, Dorji was relieved to see that the maths NBIP would be run again the following year and decided to consult with his staff and discuss this with them at the next staff meeting.
Meanwhile Dorji was pleased with the way that his staff was developing. They had been together now for three years. Initially wary about sharing ideas, they now quite often spent time informally chatting about problems and successes. He had tried to get across the idea that teaching was a complex job that required a life-long learning approach. It seemed to be working with his two young teachers. Staff meetings now were more collegial discussions which, Dorji observed, were probably not that possible in large staffs. The ideas in the SBIP Handbook had been very useful to him and his teachers. They appreciated the support that he gave them as they tried to improve their classroom practice. Dorji found it hard to fit in his administrative duties with all the other things he was supposed to do but thought that what really mattered was what his teachers were teaching so he gave this priority. Certainly the children and their parents were happy.

We know that it may be some time before there are sufficient funds and capacity to build in a Dzongkhag level of support for INSET. What is needed is to build upon what is already happening in a small number of cases. We refer here to the initiatives of remote schools to cluster for teacher development, and other developments. In the scenario that follows we portray the range of possible clusters and at the same time the pivotal role of the DEL. Our view is that these clusters cannot be mandated but they can be encouraged.

**Cluster-Based Inservice Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters (with and without the support of the DEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several years after Lopen Dorji was considering his problem of the maths versus the EVS staff development, Dechen was new to her position of DEL. She was a bit apprehensive but was pleased that her work in recent years had been rewarded by this promotion. She decided to do a series of tours of as many schools that she could. Since she was new to the area she wanted to find out what was happening ‘out there’ and so in what ways she would be needed. After the first series of visits, Dechen, found that texts were missing in some schools, and manuals in others. She resolved to get in touch with the relevant store to find out what the problems were.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After three months Dechen realised that she was needed everywhere! There was so much to do. She was also worried that she did not have Class X to XII experience and some requests had been made for help. She would need to identify senior people experienced in Class X to XII subjects who could assist. Dechen also decided to focus her work on where it would have the most impact. She decided that these were the schools that showed the most interest and had the greatest need. No point in spreading herself too thinly. Some of these she would have to work directly with. Others had excellent Head Teachers and for those schools she could best work through them. She was encouraged in her work by some of the ideas in the INSET Report that she had read recently. There were two schools that might be able to be identified as ‘Best Practice’ schools. What a pity that Lopen Dorji’s school was so remote as the work that he and his staff were doing in EVS, in particular, was excellent. She loved visiting that school.
The other school that she had noticed was doing terrific things in Integrated Science and could be a model for others. One of the feeder primary schools was acting as a parent for a cluster of community schools and there was another potential cluster based upon this idea. Already there were several remote school clusters and all she had to do was support and encourage them. Several other remote clusters could be developed as there was some interest shown when she discussed the possibility with the Head Teachers concerned. She was from the west and she noticed that speaking in Dzongkha and to a lesser extent reading and writing seemed to be weak across her area and she decided to request copies of the EMSS Combined Report for last year to see if there were any ideas on this. When she was in Thimphu next she would arrange to visit BBE so that she could go through the Dzongkha results for her area. She might have to arrange a workshop in Dzongkha and luckily there was some budget for precisely this need. If she were clever she might be able to organise the relevant person from CAPSS to be a resource person (at no cost to her budget). After all, it was CAPSS job to support the teachers in the field. She would try anyway. The Resource Centre in her area was going quite well and this would act as another catalyst for change that she would be able to actively support. She would use it herself. She recalled several teachers who were trying hard in difficult circumstances but were not getting much support and decided that she would have to do something for them. She had mentioned the TEB’s INSET plans as she went around and generally the schools were aware of them but some hadn’t yet seen the importance of getting prepared for these and including them in the school’s Development Plan. She found out that EMSS had been right, there were still quite a few schools that did not yet have a Development Plan. She set about making a plan for the rest of the year. She also needed to talk to the INSET Director. Maybe she could coordinate different groups of teachers to meet each month when the pays were collected. She had heard this idea somewhere. Perhaps it would work here.

It would not be appropriate to finish these scenarios without some mention of the work of the central coordinating body of INSET and the crucial work of the INSET Director. Once again, we wish to make use of what is already happening but also to suggest practices that need to be modified, otherwise things remain the same.

**INSET Director and Committee**

The new Director of INSET had read the INSET Report carefully. He agreed with a lot of it, especially with the need for follow-up, with what the INSET Report had referred to as a reconceptualisation. There were some things there that meant things would have to change. He understood that it was his job to make sure that these changes did happen, but within the policy framework set by the TEB. It was important that he set a good working relationship with the TEB sub committee that had INSET as its brief.

The INSET sub committee had set out his priorities. NBIPs had to become more effective and the follow-up SBIPs also. As a first step, he decided to add to the
‘Handbook for Inservice Presenters’ the idea of INSET being much more than a one-shot workshop. This idea had to permeate all INSET in the Kingdom. The new Handbook needed to be printed ready for the next round of NBIPs. A prior workshop with course coordinators would be necessary and he would make himself available during the ‘NBIP season’ to resource workshops and to provide pressure and support as necessary. Adult learning principles, the needs of teachers and treating teachers as colleagues would be his three main thrusts for the first few years. He would keep on hammering away on these in support of this priority.

Getting the right teachers to the NBIPs is crucial. How could this be done better? The TEB had set out the policy but the new INSET Director knew that this was only the beginning of the matter. Perhaps the inequalities of the past will begin to fade as NBIPs became shorter. Perhaps too, as the DELs are put into position he could insist upon the adherence to the policies by putting pressure on the DELs. This change would take time. Habits take time to break. Perhaps too, the Director could be sounded out about the possibility of lowering the DA especially since teachers’ salaries have recently been raised. After all, teachers’ development is also the responsibility of the teachers’ themselves as professional individuals and we have to strive towards achieving that goal too in the long term, he thought to himself.

Making SBIPs following NBIPs more effective was a more difficult task. The INSET Report indicated there were special problems here. Again, it would take time to change what had become normal for many schools. Still, the development of the system depended upon the improvement of this kind of SBIP. The reconceptualisation was fundamental. Much effort must be put into this, especially for Head Teachers and Principals because he agreed that they should be educational leaders first, and managers/administrators second. He decided to request a series of sessions with the course coordinator of the next few NBIPs for Head teachers/Principals, and continuing for some years. Course coordinators needed to build assistance for SBIP leaders into their NBIP sessions too.

The INSET Report also mentioned the development of budgets for the three levels of INSET in the Kingdom. He wished that the TEB had given guidelines on this but instead had asked him to come up with a position paper. He agreed with the principles that the different levels of INSET - national, Dzongkhag and school - should get some funding in support of initiatives. In addition, he knew that his salary was coming out of the present budget. The first thing he had to do was make a formal meeting with the Director to see if there was any way that extra funding could be found. In the meantime the present in-country budget would have to be considered. Almost all of the in-country budget was going to NBIPs. Since they would now be shorter and more focussed, funding would be released from NBIPs for the other levels. How much was the question. He decided to precipitate this issue by suggesting a limit on NBIP workshops of five days to the TEB. That would also give course coordinators incentives to run follow-up workshops in the summer in different venues. He speculated that the relative amount of funding of NBIPs compared to Dzongkhag and school-level support would slowly decrease over the next few years, eventually to level out. What would that levelled out proportion be? He didn’t know. Perhaps 50% national, 20% Dzongkhag and 30% schools? He would wait and see since it depended upon so many factors. He made a mental note to raise the issue in his paper about the relative funding of out-of-
country INSET compared to in-country INSET as this is essentially a policy matter for the TEB, he thought. How to distribute the money was also a difficulty. He decided to seek advice from the concerned parties. Perhaps in the first few years Dzongkhags and schools could apply to him, making a case, and he would have a budget for each level from which funding would be dispensed.

The INSET Director was impressed with the case that had been made in the INSET Report about the need for data-based decisions and could see that there was a lot of scope for better use of data that the Division already collected. The TEB also had given this to him as a priority. He decided to make better use of that data and arranged for meetings with the Directors of BBE and of EMSS. He was interested in the trends that had been shown up by the BBE examination results and wanted to go into some of the specific results with them. Also he was interested to see if the EMSS had followed up the implied use of NUD*IST software on the annual Combined Reports in the INSET Report. Perhaps he would have to learn NUD*IST, but he hoped not. He had already thought that the SBIP reports too could be a source of more grounded information and they too should not be overlooked. He was looking for a rationale for the kinds of NBIPs on teaching skills that might be put together as NBIPs, or as packages, to complement those NBIPs initiated by CAPSS and others. Teachers’ needs could be determined, at least in the first instance by looking at these. Before getting down to the tasks he had considered, he rang the chair of the INSET sub committee of TEB to discuss the number of meetings that should be held. Perhaps one two hour meeting per month would do it?
Appendix 7 - Interview Schedules

(i) Course Director and Resource Person Interview Schedule

What has been your experience as a NBIP Course director/resource person?
What were the reasons for conducting your most recent inservice course?
   Needs? (teachers’ felt needs or centre curriculum needs)?
What was your role in planning your last inservice course?
   Admin., materials, practices and beliefs?
   Problems of planning?
Briefly, how were the workshops at your last inservice course implemented and evaluated?
   Follow-up? ‘Flow on’ effect (SBIP)?
   Problems?
What was the impact of the inservice course on participants?
   Usefulness? Professional knowledge? Personal education? Students’ learning?
   Evidence of the above?
   Variation? Factors which enhance? Evidence?
   Level of English (participants and facilitators)? Evidence?
How might inservice courses be improved?

(ii) Interview Schedule for Head Teachers

What has been your experience as a Head Teacher?
What experience have you had of NBIP courses?
   Number, content, where, length, timing, needs/how selected, linkage to current work in the school, administered, DEOs?
What is the impact of NBIP courses?
   On you/your staff?
Usefulness? Professional knowledge? Personal education? Students’ learning?

Evidence of the above? In what ways does it vary (level of English)? Value for money?

What experience have you had of SBIP courses?

Number, content, where, length, timing, linkage to current work in the school, resource people?

What is the impact of SBIP courses?

On you/your staff?

Usefulness? Professional knowledge? Personal education? Students’ learning?
Evidence of the above?

What is the relationship between SBIP and NBIP in your school?

How might inservice courses be improved?

NBIP, SBIP: Quality, quantity, timing, length, expenses, felt needs,

(iii) Interview Schedule for Teachers

What is your teaching experience?

What experience have you had of NBIP courses?

Number, content, where, length, timing, how selected, linkage to current work in the school, etc.

What did you learn from the best NBIP you have attended?

Usefulness? Professional knowledge? Personal education? Students’ learning?
Evidence of the above?

Was your level of English a problem? Evidence?

Have you been a resource person for SBIP on your return to the school from NBIP?


What is the impact of NBIP courses?

Usefulness? Professional knowledge? Personal education? Students’ learning?
Evidence of the above? In what ways does it vary (level of English)? Value for money?
What experience have you had of SBIP courses?

Number, content, where, length, timing, linkage to current work in the school, resource people?

What is the impact of SBIP courses?

Usefulness? Professional knowledge? Personal education? Students’ learning? Evidence of the above?

What is the relationship between SBIP and NBIP in your school?

How might inservice courses be improved?

NBIP, SBIP: Quality, quantity, timing, length, expenses, felt needs.

(iv) Interview Schedule for Inspectors

What has been your experience as an inspector?

What NBIP Impact have you observed in schools/classrooms?

Usefulness? Professional knowledge (knowledge, practices, beliefs), Personal education? Students’ learning? Evidence? Variation across schools? Names of specific schools?

What SBIP impact have you observed in schools/classrooms?

Beyond the input stage and into Intervision; change over time; specific schools?

Calendars and plans used?

What is the relationship between SBIP and NBIP in schools?

Specific schools? Follow up, DEOs and DBIP?

How might NBIP be improved?

How might SBIP be improved?

Any other comments?

(v) Interview Schedule for Key Personnel

What experience have you had of NBIP courses?
Number, content, where, length, timing, how selected, linkage to current work in the school, etc.

How are NBIP courses administered?

Relationship between the centre, Dzongkhags and the schools?

What is the impact of NBIP courses?

Usefulness? Professional knowledge? Personal education? Students’ learning? Evidence of the above? In what ways does it vary (level of English)? Value for money? Teacher/centre needs; model o INSET; articulation between levels, admin.; change process?

What experience have you had of SBIP?

What is the impact of SBIP?

What is the relationship between SBIP and NBIP?

How might the overall inservice program be improved?

How might NBIP be improved?

How might SBIP be improved?

Any other comments?
Appendix 8 - Questionnaire: District Education Officers

Logo

Bhutan INSET Project

13th October 1998

Dear District Education Officer,

You will be aware that an impact study has begun concerning the inservice program for teachers in Bhutan. This letter is to ask your assistance, specifically, to provide us with your views regarding key aspects of inservice in the Kingdom since you provide a fundamental link between the schools and the headquarters. We are also aware that one of your roles is the support of NBIP and SBIP in the schools. Since teachers are the most important resource of the education system, we are addressing an issue of fundamental importance in this project. We would have liked to interview you on these matters but our schedule and the distances involved make this impossible. Our objective is to develop a five to seven year plan for inservice and your views will assist us in achieving this.

We hope that you will find time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Please use the questions on the sheet provided as a stimulus to your ideas and respond in the spaces. Should you need to, add further pages and indicate to which question you are responding if you do so. **Please post the reply paid envelope we have provided back to us about one week after you receive this letter.**

Thank you for helping us to obtain the information that we need.

Yours sincerely

Sub Task Force Team
Questionnaire for DEOs  (Compressed from 2 pages)

How long have you been involved with teacher inservice education as a DEO?

How are people selected for NBIP courses in your Dzongkhag?

How would you describe the impact of NBIP courses?

How would you describe the impact of SBIP across the Dzongkhag?

What do you think the ideal relationship between SBIP and NBIP should be?

What is the actual relationship between SBIP and NBIP?

How might NBIP be improved?

How might SBIP be improved?

Any other comments?