

An Evaluation of the *Special Diploma in TVET* Developed by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) in Partnership with the University of Technology (UTech), Jamaica and Offered at a Distance in the Caribbean

Evaluation Report

Professor Krishnapillai Murugan
Consultant
September 2008

Executive Summary

The two-year *Special Diploma in TVET*, offered at a distance in the Bahamas, St. Kitts & Nevis and Grenada through the University of Technology (UTech), a co-partner in the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) initiative, was intended to increase the capacity in the Caribbean as it pertains to technical and vocational areas. The Programme was aimed at the in-service personnel in the technical and vocational Schools and Colleges in the Caribbean who did not possess the formal qualification to become teachers but were serving in these areas.

Launched in 2001, 2002 and 2005 respectively in the Bahamas, St. Kitts & Nevi and Grenada, this *Special Diploma* received mixed reactions from the stakeholders which included the students, tutors/facilitator, employers, policy makers in the Ministries of Education, module advisors, in-country coordinators, project managers and others responsible for the project.

The *Special Diploma* was seen as a boon, though much-delayed, but for the access of which, many experienced in-service personnel in the technical and vocational schools and colleges would not have had the opportunity to become teachers. That said, there were also serious concerns (or doubts) regarding the veracity of Government commitments with regard to incentives, promotional avenues, career path, etc. While the Bahamas-model was much appreciated in relation to incentives, notwithstanding sporadic reservations, nothing of significance in this area was articulated in the other two partner-countries. It was also a matter of concern as to what was in place for those who enrolled but could not complete the Programme, owing to various personal as well as administrative reasons. In general, whether at all the intended purpose for instituting the Programme would be met was the moot question posed by the students, a majority of whom in the Programme were females, representing an unmistakable Caribbean demography.

Another area of concern was the status of the *Special Diploma in TVET*. Though it was intended to have a regional colour in the sense that it would be accredited through a regional accrediting agency, accreditation is yet to take place. Compounding the problem is the fact that there isn't any regional accrediting agency, as yet, in the Caribbean. Questions were also raised about the need for such an arrangement vis-à-vis the COL policy that the materials developed through COL resources and inputs are available to any Commonwealth country aspiring to use them. In this scenario, it was argued, regional accreditation may not make much sense.

As much as the Programme was considered a boon, it was also regarded as a bane, operationally. While many assumed it a Project made available through the UTech by the COL, the former scrupulously followed the norms and regulations in vogue in the University for admissions and examinations for the award for *Special Diploma*. This, many claimed they were not privy to until very late into the Programme.

Also, it was suggested that owing to lack of exposure to the demands of distance learning on the part of the stakeholders including students, many things seemed to have been taken for granted. By extension, work demands were gravely underestimated, leading to reporting and relationship problems. The roles of Module Advisors and Tutors (called Facilitators in the Bahamas), for instance, were not well articulated. It was assumed that people knew what the roles meant. But, as the roles differ depending on the context in which they have to operate, it is of paramount importance that role-domains are clearly described.

During the country visits, the consultant could thus observe mixed feelings about the Programme. On the whole, however, there seemed to be a consensus in that the *Special Diploma in TVET* was an effective Programme as the end-users (and in this context the students) and the employers (and in this context the Principals) unanimously agreed that the Programme had, indeed, changed their classroom practices. They also said that many were on the look out for the second or repeat offerings to enroll themselves. Such was the success of the Programme as far as gaining new pedagogical knowledge was concerned! The caveat, however, is that much is to be done in terms of government commitments, Project organizational structure, regional accreditation, if need be, quality assurance in materials and learner support services, technology-mediated learning provisions as well as clear documentation that defines role domains, expectations, reporting arrangements, etc. Interestingly, no one could see the Programme evolving into a sustainable National or Regional Programme at a distance with the required support from the COL. All continue to see this as a Project with Governments footing the bill!

A descriptive statistical analysis of the feedback of the stakeholders was intended to confirm or negate the claims made at the face-to-face interactive sessions, or the vice versa, and therefore instruments were created. But, it is quite unfortunate that less than 1% of more than 100 copies the evaluation/feedback instruments sent out to the stakeholders seeking their responses to the questions therein was returned. The consultant therefore has to heavily rely on the one-on-one meetings, besides the documents and reports made available to him.

Yet another limiting factor is the number of days made available to the consultant for the country visits. With merely one day each in the Bahamas, St. Kitts & Nevis and Grenada and two days in Jamaica, the consultant could meet with only a representative few in each country, the experience of which itself, however, is edifying and rewarding. So circuitous was the journey in the Caribbean that the consultant found himself in and out of 16 airports in about 10 days!

On the basis of the records perused and country visits made, the following items are suggested for consideration:

- Before embarking on the Programme again in the Caribbean, needs analysis must be carried out.

- The Programme content and format need to be vetted, and an Editorial Team may be put in place for the purpose.
- Additional subject areas could be added and the Programme could be launched on a modular fashion. Similarly, subject areas that have lost their sheen on a particular period in time could be dropped.
- Workshops/orientation programmes for all the stakeholders including students must be organized to sufficiently expose them to the demands of distance learning.
- Appropriate technologies could be inducted for learner management as well as for content delivery. The possibility of using Wiki Educator could be explored.
- Clear budgetary provisions are to be made, if decisions are made to launch the TEVT Programme again in the Caribbean under the COL banner, for extensive M & E exercise in future.
- Articulation arrangements, accreditation policies, etc., must be unambiguously described.

This evaluation exercise could help the COL make decisions as to whether or not to continue the Programme in the Caribbean, depending on the demand. (If the decision is in the affirmative, further interrelated decisions as to whether it should be on "as is" basis or on a revised format, etc., are to be made. The extent of replicability of the Programme elsewhere must also be assessed.)

Acknowledgements

My sincere thanks to COL and particularly Mr. Joshua Mallet (Education Specialist - Learning and Livelihoods) for commissioning me to carry out the M & E exercise. My thanks are also due to Ms. Patricia Schlicht (COL) for facilitating the visit in more than one way.

I must also thank all those who could find time to meet with me, in spite of their heavy schedules. Without their inputs, this report could not have been made.

I recall with humility and a great sense of gratitude for all the support Mrs. Anita Thomas-James extended to me prior to as well as during the country visits, but for whose coordination among various members and institutions, I could not have completed the tasks assigned to me.

Background

On perusing the formative evaluation reports of Doug Shale (2002) and Dennis Irvine (2004), commissioned by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL), it has been observed that the UTech *Special Diploma in TVET* targeting in-service technical-vocational personnel in the Caribbean has had a phenomenal evolutionary process, resulting in avoidable loss in time and to a considerable extent in purpose.

These reports as well as other documents such as country reports made available to the Consultant (see Appendix - I), mostly in person, traced the origin of the Programme to the international conference convened by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) in 1990 in Hong Kong in order to consider the following:

- Offering technical and vocational education and training at a distance.
- Identifying suitable existing distance learning materials/Programmes in the TEVT areas.
- Exploring the ways and means of sharing the available materials/Programmes across the Commonwealth.
- Identifying areas of need in TVET and means for addressing these needs.

Following this conference, a meeting was convened in Vancouver in 1991 at which a regional approach to address the TVET needs was considered appropriate, given the possible identical needs in, and paucity of funds for, TEVT in many developing countries in the Commonwealth.

Subsequently, in 1992, a Regional Workshop involving 14 Caribbean countries was organized in Nassau (the Bahamas) under the aegis of the CARICOM (Caribbean Community) Secretariat. The objective of this workshop was to initiate the discussion among the Caribbean community the TVET needs as well as the possibilities of a regional solution to address these needs with particular reference to upgrading the in-service TVET personnel to become teachers. At the workshop, a decision to develop a regional TVET curriculum from common national competencies was also arrived at. This was born out of the assumption that a common curriculum would provide current and potential TVET instructors/teachers with the required training that would be acceptable across the Caribbean.

Considering the fact that some local institutions in the Caribbean were already offering face-to-face Programmes in technical and vocational fields, it was also decided at the workshop that the focus of the proposed common core curriculum would be on pedagogy and the delivery of content would be at a distance.

After 2 years of regional consultations, at which all the 14 participating countries were invited to suggest common competencies to be incorporated in the Common

Core Curriculum, a Workshop was held in Trinidad and Tobago in 1994 to select the elements from the country submissions that would constitute the Caribbean Common Core Curriculum. This resulted in, with the inputs from the University of Technology (UTech) in Jamaica, a 12-Module Programme. Producing and vetting the materials, among others, took time.

In 1999, COL and UTech arrived at an in-principle agreement to implement the Programme in the Caribbean countries that were willing to participate. This was presented and discussed at a Regional Steering Committee held in St. Lucia in 1999 with a view to launching the Programme in the same year. However, the Programme could not be implemented until 2001. Coincidentally, this was the year when a formal agreement between COL and UTech was signed.

The Programme commenced in the Bahamas and St. Kitts & Nevis, respectively, in May 2001 and January 2002, and much later in Grenada in September 2005, by which time many enrolled for the Programme in the other countries were able to complete the 2-year Special Diploma Programme.

In short, following the commitment they made in May 1999 to collaboratively offer the Core TVET Curriculum in the Caribbean, the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) and the University of Technology (UTech), Jamaica entered into a formal agreement in January 2001, initially for a 4 year period with the provision for a 2 year extension. This jointly developed Core TVET Curriculum, after a considerable time lag, evolved into a *Special Diploma in Technical and Vocation Education and Training* (TVET) Programme and was offered at a distance through the UTech's School of Technical and Vocational Education in the Faculty of Education and Liberal Studies in three participating countries - the Bahamas, St. Kitts & Nevis and Grenada - with the last of which coming on board about 4 years after the launch of the Programme in 2001.

The objective of this Programme, as observed from the documents and earlier reports, was to increase the capacity of the Caribbean in technical and vocational areas. As a first step towards meeting the demand for skilled or re-skilled workers in the Caribbean, it was thought appropriate to increase the number of teachers in the technical and vocational schools/colleges by upgrading those in-service personnel who have the skills and experience to teach but are short of the necessary qualifications prescribed to become teachers.

While the technical and vocational schools/colleges recognized the imperative need for more teachers than they had on their pay-rolls, they were either severely constrained to recruit new ones or ill-afford to grant leave of absence to in-service personnel to get themselves upgraded or qualified to teach. A provision for increased access was considered one of the solutions to this persisting dilemma. It is against this background that, and after a prolonged period of consultations and negotiations among Governments and providers of technical and vocational education in the Caribbean, a *Special Diploma in Technical and Vocational*

Education and Training (TVET) Programme at a distance was developed by the Commonwealth of Learning in partnership with the University of Technology (UTech), Jamaica.

The Special Diploma initiative, facilitated by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) had come to a logical conclusion in late 2007 in Grenada, and much before in the other two participating countries. Has the Programme met the intended purpose for which it was developed? The COL commissioned the consultant to find an answer to the above question.

A two-pronged strategy to obtain remarks and comments from all the stakeholders which would feed into the answer being sought to the question was devised: (i) creation of evaluation instruments consisting of two questionnaires one each for students and tutors with structured and open-ended items and two interview protocols one each for Country Coordinators and stakeholders including present employers and policy makers and (ii) visits to the Bahamas, St. Kitts & Nevis, Grenada and Jamaica between 28th April 2008 and 7th May 2008 to have face-to-face interaction with as many stakeholders as possible. Prior to the development of the evaluation instruments, the consultant familiarized himself with the COL initiative through the materials posted to him by the Project Manager Mrs. Anita Thomas-James based in UTech, Jamaica, which was the nodal agency for the project. The evaluation instruments were sent through the Project Manager to all concerned about a month before the actual visits were made.

Structural weaknesses in the implementation of the Programme have been eloquently presented in the two reports of formative evaluation commissioned by the COL. While tracing the genesis and growth, the report by Dr. Doug Shale (2002) ably demonstrates the missing links in the organization of the Programme. And, the report of Dr. Dennis Irvine (2004) effectively captures the indifference a pilot Programme meets with but does not fail in projecting the enthusiasm the Programme received from the target clientele, i.e., in-service TVET personnel.

The present summative evaluation was carried out in April-May 2008 to make an assessment of the impact of the Programme on the stakeholders involved, i.e., UTech Project Team, Country Coordinators, Tutors, Teacher-Participants and the institutions which gave them modest time-release, etc.

Terms of Reference

The Commonwealth of Learning appointed Professor Krishnapillai Murugan in March 2008 to undertake an “[E]valuation of the *Special Diploma in Technical and Vocational Education and Training* (TVET) Programme jointly developed by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) and the University of Technology (UTech) Jamaica in the Caribbean” involving the following tasks:

- Review the evaluation undertaken in the past, teleconference calls, minutes taken and related documents and information provided through UTech, in an effort to gain a good understanding of the evaluation activity to be undertaken prior to departure.
- Assist in the identification of further appropriate data (key performance indicators - output, outcome) and strategies, particularly in relation to growth of the Programme, COL's mission and gender equity.
- Visit the Bahamas, St. Kitts & Nevis and Grenada for face-to-face meetings with learners who have been enrolled in the COL-UTech Special Diploma in TVET, Ministry officials and college administrators, to discuss partners' satisfaction or otherwise, for the purpose of an overall evaluation of the TVET programme in each Caribbean country mentioned above before May 09, 2008.
- Administer structured and open-ended questionnaires on the various stakeholders (e.g., curriculum planners, content creators, tutors, course deliverers, trainees, employees, etc.).
- Visit Jamaica to meet with the UTech team responsible for the Programme.
- Assess the quality, outcome and output of the initiative based on COL's 6R-Filter assessment criteria (Relevance, Results, Reach, Regions, Resources and Relationships).

Methodology

The Consultant developed the following instruments (see Appendix - II), sent as email attachments to Mr. Joshua Mallet for comments and to Ms. Anita Thomas-James and others for piloting in April 2008:

1. Questionnaire
2. Questionnaire
3. Interview Protocol
4. Interview Protocol

A common agenda for the face-to-face meeting was also emailed.

On receipt of the feedback, the instruments were fine tuned and again sent as email attachments to Ms. Anita Thomas-James with a request to forward them to the concerned in the four participating countries: the Bahamas, St. Kitts & Nevis, Grenada and Jamaica. In so doing, it was envisaged that the respondents would have completed the questionnaires and posted back to the Programme Manager, ready for scrutiny by the visiting consultant. It was also hoped that face-to-face

interaction with the stakeholders, which was the primary purpose of the planned country visits, would get enriched if the consultant had the responses at hand at the time of the interaction.

Country Visits

After extensive consultations among Mr. Joshua Mallet, Ms. Patricia Schlicht, Ms. Anita Thomas-James and the consultant for arriving at a mutually convenient time for the travel, the following itinerary was decided and the same was conveyed to the Country Coordinators in the Bahamas, Grenada and St. Kitts & Nevis with a request to make appropriate arrangements including accommodation, meeting venues, transportation, etc.:

Sl.N	Date of visit	Country
1	28 th April 2008	The Bahamas
2	30 th April 2008	Grenada
3	2 nd May 2008	St. Kitts & Nevis
4	5 th & 6 th May 2008	Jamaica

It may be noted that in the absence of the responses to the feedback instruments sent to all the stakeholders, an almost narrative style is used to report the country visits.

The Bahamas

The consultant reached the Bahamas on 27th April 2008 at about 4 pm (local time) and was received at the airport by Ms. Faye Bascomb, who *used to be* Country Coordinator. A tentative schedule for the meeting on the following day was handed over to him.

On the next day morning, i.e., 28th April 2008, it was informed that due to various operational reasons, the meeting schedule could not be implemented and we could meet only those who would be available at the Ministry and at the TVET institutions which granted release time to its employees to enroll for the Special Diploma. It was also explained that since the Programme was completed by a majority about 3 years ago, not many Tutors and students were willing to take part in the face-to-face interaction. Nor would many be interested in this evaluation as, according to them, it was too late to make any interventions or amendments, if any. The consultant did not therefore receive any filled-in questionnaire which was planned to be used as the base for the face-to-face interaction. Ms. Faye Bascombe also informed the consultant that she was no longer with the Programme.

The following members were met on 28th April 2008 at their respective workplaces between 08.30 am and 05.00 pm:

Country Coordinator

Ms. Faye Bascom - Currently, Quality Assurance Coordinator for the IDB Project

Officials at the Ministry of Education

Mr. Lionel Sands - Director of Education
Ms. Lenora Archer - Deputy Director of Education
Ms. Edith Roach - Assistant Director of Education (TVET)
Mr. Foster Dorsett - Senior Education Officer (TVET)
Mr. Trevor Ferguson - Education Officer (TVET)
Ms. Keyshan Cartwright - Education Officer (TVET)

Participants

Ms. Seeta Arangil-Roberts (Doris Johnson Senior High School)
Ms. Gwendolyn Knowles (Doris Johnson Senior High School)

The consultant left the Bahamas the next day (29th April 2008) at about 8 am and reached Grenada around 9 pm.

Grenada

Upon arrival, the Consultant took a cab to the hotel. The next day morning, he was informed that the booking at the hotel was made only for 30th April 2008 and was expected to vacate at about 12 pm on the day. However, after some negotiations, a night's stay was extended. He also received a phone message informing him that Mr. David Fleming, the Country Coordinator, did not expect the consultant on that day. With the intervention of Ms. Anita Thomas-James, who was informed of the consultant's predicament once for the accommodation and then for this unexpected response from Mr. Fleming, the sailing became smooth with Mr. Fleming despatching one of his colleagues, Mr. Victor D. Philip, to coordinate the consultant's visits and meetings.

The following members were met on 30th April 2008 individually at their respective workplaces:

Country Coordinator

Mr. David Fleming (who handed over the filled in questionnaire)

Tutor

Ms. Gillian Lazarus (who handed over the filled in questionnaire)

Employers

Ms. Madeline Baptiste - Principal, Anglican High School

Mr. Martin Mitchell - Principal, Boca Secondary

Ms. Winnifred Foster - Principal, Westerhall Secondary

Teacher-Participants

Mr. Nickel Williams

Ms. Camille Phillip

Mr. Thomas Noel

Ms. Claudine Neckles

Ms. Fiona Clyne

Ms. Desiree Moore

St.Kitts & Nevis

On 1st May 2008, the consultant left for St. Kitts & Nevis at about 4 am and reached at about 12.30 pm. He took a cab and reached the Hotel. As May 1 was observed May Day, no meetings were scheduled for the day.

The next day, after some interventions from Ms. Anita Thomas-James at the behest of the consultant, the Principal of the Clarence Fitzroy Bryancy College (CFBC) came to meet the consultant at about 10 am and took him to the College. The Country Coordinator, Mr. James Kelly, the consultant was informed, was busy and would join us later. As the Principal had just taken over the Office from Mrs. Marilyn Rogers, who the Consultant was told, played a crucial role in the execution of the Special Diploma Programme, she confessed that her contribution would be limited.

The following members were met on 2nd May 2008:

Country Coordinator

Mr. James Kelly

Tutor

Dr. Lincoln Carty

Student (at the Basseterre High School)

Mrs. Faustina Wilson

As the consultant was told that Mrs. Marilyn Rogers, the former Principal of the CFBC and Mr. Ira McMahon, former Country Coordinator could provide more information on the Programme, they were contacted over phone. Both of them very graciously accepted the invitation to meet the consultant at the Hotel in the evening and enthusiastically participated in the discussion.

In all the three places, the collective view is that the Programme could not have been more timely. Some of the reservations expressed by the members interacted with include the delay in getting the responses from UTech, the tenuous articulation arrangements with the UTech, dated materials in some instances, delay in moderation exercise and the delayed or no incentives from the Governments contrary to their commitment.

The consultant left for Jamaica on 3rd May 2008 at about 4 am and reached at about 3.30 pm. He was warmly received at the airport by Mrs. Anita Thomas-James.

Jamaica

On the way to the Hotel in Jamaica, the consultant was briefed about the meetings at the UTech. May 4, 2008 being a Sunday, no meetings were scheduled for the day.

The Members met and responses gathered on 5th May 2008 are as follows:

Dr. Jeanette Bartley - Associate Vice-President, CEODL, UTech

- Financial problems cropped up as of the 6 countries who initially committed themselves for the Programme, only 2 came forward when the Programme was officially launched in 2001. But budgeting was done on the assumption that all the 7 would participate and therefore the Project Team had to face teething financial challenges with payment for various services still outstanding.
- There were also technical challenges, as the participating countries were not equally endowed with resources and IT infrastructure. Obviously, therefore, learners could not be equally supported. Added to this is the unique problem of learners in the family islands. On occasions, either tutors or learners traveled to the places where face-to-face classes were organized.
- Different institutions handled the Programme at different countries and that also created some tensions in terms of assignment/assessment criteria, etc. While the Ministry of Education in the Bahamas handled the

Programme, the Clarence Fitzroy Bryant College (CFBC) and T.A. Marryshow Community College (TAMCC) handled it, respectively, in St. Kitts & Nevis and Grenada. In the Bahamas, the Ministry chalked out the incentives for those who successfully completed the Special Diploma, as the Ministry itself was handling it. This wasn't the case with the other two countries. In the absence of clear-cut statements regarding incentives, promotion avenues, increments, etc., the learners were skeptical of the outcome of the Programme, though they appreciated the pedagogical value addition it gave to them.

- As there wasn't any Regional Accreditation Agency, the award of the Special Diploma was seen as a Programme of the UTech and therefore it lost the Regional colour that was intended.
- During 2004-2005, the participating countries had to face the wrath of the hurricane, which disturbed the continuity of the Programme to a considerable extent in Grenada and St. Kitts & Nevis. Natural disaster thus played its own role in slowing down Programme implementation.
- There was as well problem of reporting and relationships. As per the letter of agreement, UTech was responsible for Project Administration headed by a Project Director. While the Project Manager mobilized the Module Advisors, the Faculty handled materials development. And, the Country Coordinators were responsible for Local Tutors. However, reporting was not proper. There indeed was a need for a more robust administrative model to implement a Programme of this scale across the Caribbean.

Dr. Johnson - Head of the Faculty

- The Project Steering Committee could not meet as often as it was required, as people moved, retired or deceased.
- Had all the countries which initially committed for the Programme participated, an economy of scale could have been achieved and the Project would not have met with the financial problems it faced.
- Accreditation was a problem for the Special Diploma. It would not also fit into the UTech Diploma category as the latter had a 90-credit equivalence which the former lacked.
- There was also justifiable skepticism about the Special Diploma, it being a distance learning Programme. The skepticism was born out of the traditional assumptions that for subjects in the technical and vocational areas, which require as much of hands-on experience as possible, distance learning was unsuitable. For these areas, therefore, more face-to-face

- classes were necessary. If the Programme were to be launched again, this should be seriously considered.
- In addition, the potential of the technology had to be harnessed for delivering the Programme. The Commonwealth of Learning could think of offering the Programme online. In the Caribbean, there was no dearth of technical content, but it should be properly packaged to make it technology-fit. This would certainly add value to the Programme, if it were to be again launched in the Caribbean.
 - Compensation packages both in kind (e.g., time-off, replacement, etc.) and cash for the administrators/managers of the Project must be thought of, lest the responsibilities would be considered an add-on with the attendant element of indifference.
 - The Special Diploma seemed to have underestimated the diversity in the Caribbean leading to, among others, relationship as well as perception issues.

Mrs. Shermaine Barrett - Head of the School

- From the strategic perspective, this Programme had a close fit to the University's mandate for outreach. Both the faculty members and the learners involved in the development and administration of the Programme were very pleased about the outcome, as the collaboration with the COL proved professionally useful and experientially rewarding. The partnership in fact turned out to be an excellent learning opportunity for the University, as it was for the first time that it had taken up distance education at this regional scale. While the training in the development of 'manual writing' helped the faculty in honing their skills of presentation, for the rest this Programme helped in ascertaining the need to build in-house capacity.
- From the operational point of view, it should be acknowledged that resources could be available across the Caribbean, but they should be accessed without much travel and costs. The present experience should help us find means to introduce electronic medium for content delivery. Also, the means for transforming the Programme into a mixed or blended mode must be explored. This would help ease out the learner demand for more real-time, though at a distance, interventions.

Mrs. Sybil Hamil - Former Head of the School

- Belize, St. Vincent & the Grenadines and Antigua showed interest in the Programme, but could not join owing to various financial and administrative reasons.

- The excellent cooperation COL extended to UTech at every stage must be mentioned, but for which the Programme would be limping.
- It was a matter of concern that distance education did not happen the way it was expected. Skepticism about its relevance as a mode for technical and vocational subject areas was there among the faculty and the learners, who wanted more face-to-face interaction.
- In the Bahamas, the Ministry of Education was deeply involved in the Project to the extent that it had its own review mechanisms to assess the progress of the Project, which was noteworthy. With the per capita income of US\$ 12,000 in the Bahamas, the Ministry's involvement helped in charting a career path for the Special Diploma holders. The infrastructure was excellent with state of the art laboratory and adequate resources. The only sour point is limited access particularly for the learners in the family islands.
- Though the three countries participated in the Project began their works at different points in time, on hindsight, it was a blessing in disguise as the Bahamas experience helped in St. Kitts & Nevis and their combined experience helped in Grenada in fine tuning Project implementation, notwithstanding the difference in the socio-cultural situations prevailing in the three countries.
- On the whole, the Programme went very well, despite some weak links in coordination and funds mobilization. However, there is a need to review the Modules. Though payment to Module Advisors and Course Designers was still pending, non-payment did not affect the work.
- The question now is how to deal with those who could not complete the Programme. Are there any alternative arrangements for these learners?

Dr. Geraldene Hodelin - Former Dean of the Faculty (Telephone Interview)

Her dental work did not hold Dr. Hodelin from participating in the interaction. She very graciously consented to speak with the consultant over phone.

- The experience had been good. But there indeed were lessons to be learned. What this Project showed was that champions were necessary to carry forward any Project. And, people must be carefully selected.
- Many, including the learners, in the Project underestimated the work involved. Lack of exposure/experience to distance education could be a major factor.

- A Programme accreditation process must be put in train if the original goal of making the Special Diploma a regional Programme, acceptable in the CARICOM, was to be achieved. It was generally seen as UTech Programme, whereas some in the UTech could not accept it that way because the admission criteria as well as the academic credits for the Special Diploma did not match with those prescribed for UTech Programmes.
- COL proved to be a willing partner and ever-ready for support.

Ms. Joanne Williams - Learner from St. Kitts & Nevis now pursuing a face-to-face Bachelor's Programme at the UTech

- At the time of joining the Special Diploma, it was given to understanding that those who successfully completed the two-year Programme at a distance (at home) could enroll for the UTech Bachelor's Degree Programme in TVET face-to-face and complete the customary 3-year Programme in 2 years. In other words, a one-year waiver for having undergone the 2-year Special Diploma at a distance was assured. However, this did not happen and no waiver was instituted because the Special Diploma did not have any status at the UTech. This was dampening, as huge loans were to be taken for completing the Bachelor's Degree Programme at the UTech.
- Many would have been interested in the Programme, had the Government committed some incentives in writing.
- On many occasions, no tutor showed up for the classes and the feedback on assignments from many tutors did not come by. It appeared no accountability was built in.
- Though there seemed to be an agreement that the teachers would have release time, in spirit it did not happen. Teachers were given with a lot difficulty half-a-day and very rarely a full day for the purpose. When the time release fell on Friday, neither the learners nor the tutors showed interest.
- The UTech prior learning mechanism and other "technicalities" must be reworked for those who completed the Special Diploma.
- Provisions for listservs, email groups, blogs, etc., could be thought of for sharing of experiences and support.

The Members met and responses gathered on 6th May 2008 are as follows:

Mr. George A. Roper - the Senior Vice-President (Academic)

At 9 am, the consultant along with the Associate VP (Academic) Dr. Jeanette Bartley made a courtesy call on Mr. George A. Roper, the Senior Vice-President (Academic) and briefed him of the work done thus far. Mr. Roper evinced keen interest in taking the Special Diploma forward and reiterated that this was the flagship Programme of the CEODL wing of the UTech. He expressed his gratitude to the COL for having identified UTech for the implementation of this Project, which had far reaching implications in the years to come as countries participated would have adequately qualified TVET teachers to meet their respective needs. Gradually, with the participation of the other countries in the venture, the collective capacity of the Caribbean would be enhanced and enriched.

He also pointed out that he would be out of the office soon but assured that the University would always be interested in collaboration with the COL.

Module Advisors

At around 10.15 am, 6 Module Advisors were met in the Board Room of the Faculty of Education and Liberal Studies.

- People involved in the Programme, be they administrators, coordinators, tutors or learners, had seriously underestimated the time-requirements and workload, resulting in avoidable frustrations.
- Module Advisors were given an orientation by the Dean to introduce the Module to them. Intensive orientation programmes, in addition to the initial orientations, for all those concerned could have helped them in assessing the extent of involvement required of them.
- When the Programme was initially put together in 1999, there was not any Advisory Committee. The claims for the work done by the Module Advisors were sent to the Dean of the Faculty. Some of the claims are still pending.
- Modules were seen in isolation, and in the absence of any meeting of the Module Advisors, they felt marginalized. Added to this was the fact that there was no provision for face-to-face interaction with the Tutors, whom Module Advisors were supposed to be in touch with. Also, when Tutors chose the assignment questions, they did not have any dialogue with the Module Advisors, which was fondly expected.
- Though demands were made for technology-mediated TVET programme, experience showed many tutors and learners were not technology-ready. Nor did many TVET Schools have the required technology. Unless the respective Governments made commitments in upgrading the laboratories, etc., technology-mediated TVET could sound a misnomer.

Dr. Nancy George - Former Head of Curriculum & Evaluation Division, UTech

Following the meeting with the Module Advisors, there was a luncheon meeting (which went well beyond the lunch) with Dr. Nancy George, who spearheaded the Programme during the initial stages.

Dr. George gave a compendious account of the history of the Programme which had its beginning in the 1990s with Dr. Irvine Dennis seeking the COL's support for TVET programme in the Caribbean. She also narrated the involvement of Dr. John Bertram (the former Education Specialist for TVET at the COL) in making the Project happen in the Caribbean; how the materials COL supplied for the purpose were repackaged at the UTech, etc. The indication, in short, was that quite a considerable period of time and money had been invested in the development of what took shape as Special Diploma over a decade.

- For the UTech, this Programme was the first ever attempt at distance learning. Though the University lacked in exposure to this mode, the enthusiasm it showed in learning by doing or learning on-the-job was significant.
- Antigua and St. Lucia wanted to partner with the UTech for the Programme, but could not mobilize the funds.
- Lack of knowledge of what was needed created problems. Thus, what was supposed to be a distance education programme ended up as a "badly constructed" face-to-face programme.
- Budgets were not created for quality assurance.
- UTech employs very stringent entry requirements, but Special Diploma did not have any, excepting that respective Ministries recommended the learners. Obviously, credit transfer proved to be difficult.

Dr. Errol Morrison - President, UTech

The consultant along with the AVP (Academic) made a courtesy call on the President, UTech, Dr. Errol Morrison. The President wished for continued COL support for the distance education initiatives of the UTech and suggested that COL could make positive interventions in the establishment of a Regional Accreditation Agency in the Caribbean. He also wished that the COL-UTech partnership must transcend the present Project. He said he was fully committed to the cause of distance education and hoped that COL could support the UTech in its efforts in putting in place mechanisms for staff development and infrastructure development for technology-mediated distance learning.

Assistant Librarians and Assistant Registrars

In the evening, Assistant Librarians and Assistant Registrars who had some involvement in the Programme were met. Collectively, they expressed that sufficient training/orientation was not made available to them to fully exploit their services/experiences. Assistant Librarians also pointed out that students did not ask for any books from the library for additional reading, despite the fact that the library had over 600 eBooks and a database of 3000 classics. It was possible, they concurred, the learners was not aware of the availability. And, the Assistant Registrars suggested online admission as well as evaluation processes could have helped in saving time and bettering record-keeping.

The consultant also had a discussion with Mrs. Anita Thomas-James, who gave him some of the documents needed for the evaluation.

After two days of marathon meetings, the consultant left Jamaica on 7th May 2008 at about 4 am and reached Chennai, India around 1 am on 9th May 2008.

The complete list of members met is given in Appendix - III

Limitations of the evaluation/consultancy

Besides the review of the available documents pertaining to the Special Diploma in TVET Programme, a comprehensive feedback was planned to be obtained from all the stakeholders involved. Accordingly, appropriate tools comprising feedback questionnaires and interview protocols were developed and sent to the Project Manager for dissemination to all the individuals. The intention was to give them sufficient time to assimilate the questions and provide relevant answers, on recollection of the processes they may have undergone. The respondents were advised either to hand over the filled-in questionnaires to the consultant in person or to post them to the Project Manager Mrs. Anita Thomas-James. It was also assumed that the feedback would be ready by the time the consultant meets with the stakeholders to provide him with a solid base to construct further questions for feedback. However, the strategy did not work. In other words, by the time the consultant reached the Caribbean, none posted the filled in questionnaires to the Project Manager. And, only the Grenada Country Coordinator and one Tutor in Grenada gave the filled-in interview protocol to the consultant. Nothing of significance could be drawn from these isolated responses.

Pre-empting the possibility of receiving limited responses, the consultant however had planned for recording the face-to-face interaction schedules as thoroughly as possible. Nonetheless, the consultant was not prepared for just 2 responses!

This almost nil response from the stakeholders could be attributed to the significant time gap between the completion of the Programme by many and the evaluation exercise. Added to the likely individual apathy or indifference to evaluation is the lack of a robust coordinating mechanism among the various

players in the Project. The paucity of responses is considered a limitation of the evaluation.

Yet another limitation is the number of days allocated for the consultant's country visits, owing to budgetary considerations. Within the total travel period of 12 days, the consultant spent a little more than 40 hours for interaction, one day each in the Bahamas, Grenada and St. Kitts & Nevis and 2 days in Jamaica. As the number of days is limited, the consultant found himself in and out of 16 airports within the 12-day period. By implication, the number of days allocated for the M & E exercise is a limiting factor.

Recommendations

On perusing the documents and reports on the Special Diploma in TVET offered at a distance through the UTech under the auspices of the COL and on the basis of the oral responses collected during the country visits, the following recommendations are made for consideration:

- There is a huge enthusiasm, among the people whom the consultant could meet in person, for the continuity of the Programme in the Caribbean. While this enthusiasm must be appreciated, the extent of real needs for TVET in the Caribbean must be gauged through country studies to be commissioned by the COL. Alternatively, Governments could send reports of the needs, if there are any, in the area under consideration to the COL seeking its intervention. In the main, before embarking on the Programme in the Caribbean, needs analysis must be carried out. In any case, the Programme cannot be offered on "as is" basis.
- The Programme needs to be revamped in terms of content and format. The suggestion made above for needs analysis could help in identifying either appropriate content to be dovetailed into the present or appropriate areas to be added to the present. The materials need to be vetted in such a way as to facilitate independent learning. An Editorial Team may be put together for the purpose.
- The needs analysis exercise suggested above could also indicate as to whether or not it is feasible to offer the Programme following a modular approach. In the present offering, the general feeling is that the cultural diversity in the Caribbean was underestimated leading to some avoidable tensions among partners. To extend this further, the theme of 'common core curriculum' that seemed to have been used as the basis of the Special Diploma needs to be revisited. A modular approach by definition will have a wide array of subject areas for the students/countries to choose from,

depending on their needs. From time to time, more could be added to the list and, if warranted, some could be dropped.

- Intensive orientation/workshop in distance learning is necessary for all those providers of the Programme. Appropriate mechanism for the purpose is to be instituted. (One of the reasons cited for some on-course tensions, during the consultant's meetings with the stakeholders, was traced to the lack of sufficient exposure to distance learning. Unfortunately, distance learning was seen only in terms of physical distance!).
- Student induction meetings are necessary to expose them to the demands of distance learning, the nature of demands students could make on the system, etc., lest there is a danger of misinterpretation as evidenced during the present offering.
- Appropriate technologies may be inducted for learner management (providing two-way information from the stage of admission to certification and other activities in between) as well as for content delivery. If possible, an LMS could be thought of. Also, the possibility of hosting the materials on the Wiki Educator could be explored.
- If decisions are made to continue the Programme (with appropriate modifications), through the UTech, it is important to clearly articulate the status of the Special Diploma in relation to the University's comparable Programme(s). It cannot be 'Special', if the processes involved in admission, examination, etc., follow those in place for UTech on-campus Programmes. In other words, this should be either a 'Special Diploma' having its own regulations defined under a Project (of COL or of other Partners) or a distance learning Special Diploma Programme of UTech having its own regulations. Other possibilities could also be explored. Without establishing accreditation policies, articulation arrangements (Is the Special Diploma less or more than a Diploma?) government commitments such as incentives, career path, etc., in writing, well-established project management structure, implementing the Special Diploma again in the Caribbean will not make much sense. In any case, the present arrangement needs to be thoroughly overhauled.
- Sufficient budgetary allocations are necessary for M & E activities, if they have to transcend theoretical needs and provide substantial inputs for informed decision-making and project improvement. If the Programme is offered under a Project, therefore, clear budgetary allocations are to be made for the M & E excise with timelines.
- Continuous assessment mechanism as well as feedback mechanism with definite turn around time must be chalked out and implemented.

- As getting the data proved a problem, and documents are with individuals, it is necessary that a data repository should be established. With people moving to various other projects within the departments or leaving the place after retirement, etc., a common digital repository of data and documents is imperative for various reasons and particularly for the M & E activities.
- External evaluation must complement internal one. Put differently, projects must clearly articulate the time for internal evaluation, reporting arrangements, follow-up activities, etc. Reporting relations are to be firmed up. Periodical reporting of the events/activities must be encouraged.
- Contingency plans in the event of natural disasters, people movement, etc., should be a part of the project plan.

Appendix - I Documents Reviewed

The following documents, presented not in any particular order, were made available to the consultant prior to/during the country visits:

1. Evaluation Report by Dr. Doug Shale (February 2002)
2. Evaluation Report by Dr. Dennis Irvine (December 2004)
3. The Bahamas' Report (February 2002) - PowerPoint
4. A Report on Special Diploma in TVET (the Bahamas) by Ms. Faye Bascom and Ms. Gwendolyn Knowles (January 2005)
5. Copy of the student Grade Sheet (the Bahamas) generated during the local reception for students going to UTech for graduation in November 2005 (Unsigned and undated)
6. Country Report (St. Kitts & Nevis) by Mr. Ira D McMahon (February 2004)
7. Report on the visit to St. Kitts by Mrs. Anita Thomas-James (May/June 2005)
8. Country (St. Kitts & Nevis) Progress Report (June 2006)
9. Country (St. Kitts & Nevis) Progress Report by Ms. Marilyn Rogers (August 2006)
10. Country Report (Grenada) by Mr. David Fleming (June 2006)
11. Report on the launch and orientation of *Special Diploma* (Grenada) - Unsigned and undated
12. Annual Report (Grenada) by Mr. David Fleming (December 2005)
13. Report of the Senior Administrators Round Table Meeting held in Barbados on 26th, 27th and 28th June 2006 (Undated and unsigned)
14. Report of the Steering Committee Retreat held in April 21, 2006 by Mrs. Anita Thomas-James (Undated)
15. Report on Student Teaching Assessment and Module Moderation Exercise for the Special Diploma in TVET (the Bahamas) conducted between March 1 and 10, 2005 by Ms. Sybil Hamil and Ms. Leonie Clarke (Undated).
16. Report on the Workshop on Tutoring and Distance Learners held at the T.A. Marryshow Community College, Grenada during August 16-19, 2004 by Dr. Marirette Newman (Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Education and Liberal Studies, UTech), September, 2004
17. Some internal notes (e.g., Steering Committee Meeting of January 2002, Notes for the Meeting of Module Advisors held on March 2000, etc.)
18. The Programme Structure of the *Special Diploma in TVET*
19. Sample letters to students from Mrs. Anita Thomas-James
20. Letter of Agreement between COL and UTech (February 2001)

Appendix - II Feedback Instruments

Feedback Instrument (Programme Participants)

General Instructions

1. In connection with the Programme/Course you have just completed, a few items have been listed here to get your feedback on the degree of usefulness of the Programme/Course according to the 5-point scale: 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1, meaning respectively, Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree.
2. Please place an X in the box against each item and where applicable on the 5-point scale to reflect the degree of its usefulness.
3. In addition, you could write your views under the 'Comments' column.

Personal Data

1. Name:
2. Gender: Female Male
3. Age: < 25 25-35 36-45 > 45
4. Highest education qualification:
5. Marital status: Married Single
6. Work Address:
7. Title of the Programme/Course you have completed:

Feedback items	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
1. The subject matter/content was informative.						
2. The subject matter was presented well for easy understanding.						

3. The connection among topics and subtopics was very clear.						
It was difficult to understand the content because:						
a. There were statements without examples/illustrations.						
b. There were gaps in the presentation of content.						
c. Difficult words (vocabulary) were often used.						
d. Complex sentence structures (syntax) were used.						
e. The presentation was not interactive.						
f. There were many technical words.						
g. Any other (Please write under the 'Comments' column)						
5. The way the content has been structured helped me understand the sequence of the content.						
6. Learning objectives were clearly stated						
7. Overview/Introduction helped me understand what I would be learning in the Unit/Lesson.						

8. Overview/Introduction gave me information as to what could be expected of the Unit/Lesson.						
9. Overview/Introduction indicated the approach to Unit/Lesson.						
10. The content given was inadequate to meet the objectives.						
11. The statement of objectives and content did not match.						
12. The quantum of information given was adequate.						
13. The number of Learning Activities provided was adequate.						
14. The placement of the questions was appropriate.						
15. Model answers to Learning Activities were given.						
16. The questions demanded a lot of time to answer.						
17. Model answers to the Learning Activities were not accurate.						
18. Learning Activities and their model answers helped me understand the content well.						
19. The letter styles/sizes used made the reading easy.						

20. Illustrations (tables, charts, figures, etc.) were available.						
21. Illustrations (tables, charts, figures, etc.) available were clearly presented.						
22. Illustrations (tables, charts, figures, etc.), if given, could have enhanced my learning.						
23. Additional reading materials were necessary to meet the objectives.						
24. The language was easy to follow.						
25. There were examples and illustrations.						
26. The examples/illustrations were relevant.						
27. The content did not require examples/illustrations.						
28. I need online support.						
29. The online support was available.						
30. The online support available was not adequate.						
31. There was no need for any online support.						
32. There was a built-in immediate feedback system.						
33. The feedback system was satisfactory.						

34. There was a lot of text.						
35. The Course is complete in terms of:						
a. Clearly stated learning goals.						
b. Promotion of self-evaluation and progress monitoring.						
c. Clear statement of assessment requirements.						
d. Adequate coverage of topics.						
e. Appropriate quantity of material and workload.						
36. There were enough face-to-face tutoring sessions.						
37. There were enough practical sessions.						
38. Teleconferencing sessions were conducted.						
39. The tutoring sessions were helpful in my learning.						
40. The sessions were useful because they simulated a classroom atmosphere.						
41. The sessions were useful because the tutors were quite knowledgeable.						

42. There were enough tutor-marked assignments.						
43. The tutor comments (feedback) on the assignments were useful for learning.						
44. Tutor feedback on the assignments was given to me on time.						
45. More practice-oriented activities are necessary.						
46. The tutoring schedule was convenient.						
47. The schedule for assignment submission was convenient.						
48. I did not face any problem in completing the Programme.						
49. I received support from Course Coordinator and others.						
50. The Course is fit for purpose in that:						
a. Learning goals are realistic and appropriate.						
b. Content and processes promote goals achievement.						
c. Interest and motivational factors are catered to.						
d. Quality of outcomes is measurable.						

e. Appropriate learning skills are developed.						
f. Realistic assumptions about prerequisite skills are made.						

Workload

Please complete the following items to assess the workload and the difficulty level:

1. I spent _____ hours to complete the Programme (If you wish, you could give a Course-wise workload)
2. The workload is: ____ 1 = very light, 2 = light, 3 = just right, 4 = high, 5 = very high.
3. Overall, the Programme 1 is: _____ 1 = very easy, 2 = easy, 3 = just right, 4 = difficult, 5 = very difficult.
4. Your comments on workload:

Tutoring & Assessment

1. Were the assignment requirements clearly outlined? Yes / No
2. If your answer to Question 1 above is 'No', suggest how they could be improved.
3. The assignment is ____ 1 = very easy, 2 = easy, 3 = just right, 4 = difficult, 5 = very difficult.
4. What improvement you would suggest for improving the tutoring component?

Further Comments

What are the strengths of the Course?

What are the weaknesses of the Course?

If you have any suggestions for improvement of the Programme, please feel free to record them here.

Feedback Instrument (Tutor)

Please place an X in the box against each item and where applicable write your views.

PERSONAL DATA

1. Name:
2. Gender: Female Male
3. Age: < 35 35-45 46-55 > 55
4. Highest education qualification:
5. Marital status: Married Single
6. Work Address:

7. Title of the Programme/Course you taught:

PROGRAMME/COURSE-RELATED

1. The Course helped in adding value to the participants' knowledge base/skill sets? Y N
- 1a. If 'yes', list the kind of value addition.

1b. If 'no', make a list of suggestions to improve the Course for value addition.

2. The materials supplied were sufficiently important to widen the knowledge base and deepen the skill sets of the participants. Y N
3. Was the content current? Y N
4. Did it address the concerns of the market/nation? Y N
- 4a. If no, what should be done to make it current/relevant?

5. Do you support the distance mode for TVET Programmes? Y N

5a. Please list the reasons for saying, "Yes"

5b. Please list the reasons for saying, "No"

6. As a tutor, have you felt the need for providing additional information over and above what is given in the study materials?

6a. If 'yes', were you able to provide that addition?

6b. If 'yes' again, what were these additional inputs?

7. Was sufficient time available for tutoring? Y N

8. How much time was spent - approximately - for face-to-face tutoring sessions per week?

< 2 hours 2-5 hours > 5 hours

9. Did the Programme give sufficient time for practical inputs? Y N

10. Was the practical input given sufficient? Y N

11. Comment on your participants.

12. Did they join the Programme on compulsion? Y N

13. Did they enjoy the Programme? Y N

14. Could you assess their learning needs? Y N

14a. If 'yes', what were these?

15. Was the curriculum designed in such a way as to meet their learning needs? Y N

16. Have you felt any constraints in carrying out the sessions? Y N

16a. If 'yes', what were these constraints?

17. Did you get the required cooperation from partners in carrying out the sessions? Y N

17a. If no, what were the problems you faced?

18. Was the content motivating? Y N

18a. If 'no', what should be done to make it motivating?

19. Was there any continuous assessment process?

19a. If 'yes', what was the medium/tool for assessment?

Tutor-marked assignment
Computer-marked assignment
Any other (Specify)

19b. If 'no', do you think there is a need for continuous assessment? Y N

20. Was there any practical component in the continuous assessment process? Y N

21. Was sufficient time given to participants for assessment? Y N

21a. If no, what should be a realistic time frame?

22. Was there sufficient time for you to give feedback to the participants with reference to continuous assessment? Y N

22a. If no, what should be the ideal time frame?

23. Was feedback on continuous assessment required of you? Y N

24. What was the turn around time with regard to continuous assessment, i.e., the time between students' submission of the assessment tool, your valuation & feedback and students' receipt?

< 5 working days 5-10 working days 11-21 working days > 22 days

25. Was the total time allocated for face-to-face tutoring sufficient? Y N

25a. If 'no', how much time must be given for tutoring?

< 10% of the Programme duration 10%-20% > 20%

26. Were the questions framed for the continuous assessment sufficiently motivating? Y N

27. Who prepared these questions?

I did Course Designer Coordinator No idea

28. Did these questions cover the syllabus? Y N

29. Could they prepare the participants for examination? Y N

30. Were there any tutoring at a distance (e.g., teleconferencing)? Y N

30a. If 'yes', (i) how many times teleconferencing sessions were conducted and (ii) what was the duration for each such session per week?

(i) Once Twice More than twice

(ii) 1 hour 2 hours > 2 hours

31. Was the number of teleconferencing sessions sufficient? Y N

32. Who conducted these sessions?

I did Course Designer Expert in the field

33. Was teleconferencing used for administrative purposes? Y N

34. Were there problems in this mode of conducting tutorial sessions? Y N

34a. If 'yes', what were these problems?

35. Was feedback given to the students on their assignments/projects? Y N

36. Do you think there should be some inputs very specific to your country that need to be incorporated in the learning materials? Y N

36a. If 'yes', what could be these inputs?

37. Do you think your interventions helped compensate for the absence of these country-specific inputs in the materials? Y N

37. Were you able to give country-specific inputs for the benefit of the participants? Y N

38. Do you think your efforts as a tutor have been sufficiently compensated? Y N

LEARNING MATERIALS

- A few items have been listed here to get your feedback on the degree of usefulness of the Programme/Course according to the 5-point scale: 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1, meaning respectively, Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree.
- Please place an X in the box against each item and where applicable on the 5-point scale to reflect the degree of its usefulness.
- In addition, you could write your views under the 'Comments' column.

Feedback items	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
1. The subject matter/content was informative.						
2. The subject matter was presented well for easy understanding.						

3. The connection among topics and subtopics was very clear.						
4. There were statements without examples/illustrations.						
5. There were gaps in the presentation of content.						
6. Difficult words (vocabulary) were often used.						
7. Complex sentence structures (syntax) were used.						
8. The presentation was not interactive.						
9. There were many technical words.						
10. The way the content has been structured helped participants understand the sequence of the content.						
11. Learning objectives are clearly stated.						
12. Overview/Introduction was helpful to understand the aims of the Course.						
13. Overview/Introduction indicated the approach to Unit/Lesson.						
8. The content given was inadequate to meet the objectives.						

15. The statement of objectives and content did not match.						
16. The quantum of information given was adequate.						
17. The number of Learning Activities provided was adequate.						
18. The placement of the questions was appropriate.						
19. Model answers to Learning Activities were given.						
20. The questions demanded a lot of time to answer.						
21. Model answers to the Learning Activities were not accurate.						
22. The letter styles/sizes used made the reading easy.						
23. Illustrations (tables, charts, figures, etc.) were available.						
24. Illustrations (tables, charts, figures, etc.) available were clearly presented.						
25. Additional reading materials are necessary to meet the objectives.						
26. The language was easy to follow.						

27. There were examples and illustrations.						
28. The examples/illustrations were relevant.						
29. The content did not require examples/illustrations.						
30. There was a built-in immediate feedback system.						
31. The feedback system was satisfactory.						
32. The Course is complete in terms of:						
a. Clearly stated learning goals.						
b. Promotion of self-evaluation and progress monitoring.						
c. Clear statement of assessment requirements.						
d. Adequate coverage of topics.						
e. Appropriate quantity of material and workload.						
33. The Course is fit for purpose in that:						
a. Learning goals are realistic and appropriate.						

b. Content and processes promote goals achievement.						
c. Interest and motivational factors are catered to.						
d. Quality of outcomes is measurable.						
e. Appropriate learning skills are developed.						
f. Realistic assumptions about prerequisite skills are made.						

FURTHER COMMENTS

1. The workload is: ____ 1= very light, 2 = light, 3 = just right, 4 = high, 5 = very high.
2. Overall, the Programme 1 is: _____ 1 = very easy, 2 = easy, 3 = just right, 4 = difficult, 5 = very difficult.
3. Please comment on workload.

4. Make suggestions to further improve the Programme.

Interview Protocol (Coordinator)

Please place an X in the box against each item and where applicable write your views.

PERSONAL DATA

1. Name:
2. Gender: Female Male
3. Age: < 35 35-45 46-55 > 55
4. Highest education qualification:
5. Marital status: Married Single
6. Work Address:

PROGRAMME-RELATED

1. Title of the Programme you are making comments on:
2. Did you get a chance to see the learning materials? Yes N
- 2a. If 'yes', comment on them in terms of design, relevance and currency.

3. Was there any delay during the course of implementation of the Programme? Y N
- 3a. If 'yes', at what stage and what level?

4. Did you make the tutoring schedule? Y N
- 4a. If 'yes', specify the rationale followed in allocating time for this component?
5. Were there teleconferencing sessions? Y N
- 5a. If 'yes', who scheduled them?
I did Course Designer Tutor No idea
6. Were they used for tutoring purpose administrative purpose both ?
7. How many hours had been given for this component per week?
< 2 hours 2-5 hours > 5 hours
8. Did you face problems during the implementation of the Programme? Y N
- 8a. If yes, what were these problems?
9. I coordinated the following:
- 9a. Student admission
- 9b. Learning materials despatch
- 9c. Collection and distribution of student assignment for evaluation
- 9d. Collection of the evaluated assignments from the tutors/evaluators
- 9e. Disbursement of payment to the evaluators
- 9f. Distribution of evaluated assignments to students
- 9g. Conduct of face-to-face tutoring sessions
- 9h. Conduct of teleconferencing sessions
- 9i. Identification of course writers for the Programme
- 9j. Identification of tutors/evaluators
- 9k. Identification of learners
- 9l. Negotiation with stakeholders

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL (STAKEHOLDER)

Please place an X in the box against each item and where applicable write your views.

PERSONAL DATA

9. Name:

10. Gender: Female Male

11. Age: < 25 25-35 36-45 > 45

12. Highest education qualification:

13. Marital status: Married Single

14. Work Address:

PROGRAMME-RELATED

1. Title of the Programme you are making comments on:

2. Have you seen the Course Materials? Yes No

2a. If 'yes', please comment on usefulness of the materials for your purpose.

3. Did you accept your employees' absence from work while undergoing the Course? Y N

4. Was it necessary for them to be absent from work to complete the Course? Y N

4a. If they were absent from work, state/indicate the period of absence per week.

< 2 hours 2 - 5 hours > 5 hours

5. Do you think the Course/Programme adds value to your employees' skill sets? Y N

5a. If 'yes', list the value addition.

5b. If 'no', what do you think should be done to create value addition?

6. Do you think the skills the individuals may have acquired help them in terms of social mobility, i.e., promotion, increase in salary/social status, etc.? Y N

7. Do you allow your employees to undertake similar Courses/Programmes in future? Y N

8. Do you think the duration of your employees' absence from work is within the acceptable limit? Y N

9. Do you support skills development Courses/Programmes at a distance? Y N

10. Do you think skills development Courses/Programmes can be offered only at face-to-face situations? Y N

11. Do you think credible hands-on experience can be given at a distance in the context of skills development Courses/Programmes

12. Do you employ people with Certificates in TVET acquired at a distance? Y N

13. List the kind of support you extended to your employees in completing this Course/Programme.

14. Do you think the duration of absence from work could be further reduced? Y N

14a. If 'yes', what should be done to effect this?

15. Do you observe any changes in the employees after their Course/Programme? Y N

15a. If 'yes', list the positive/negative changes in terms of attitude, knowledge and skills.

16. What was your objective in ending your employees to undergo this Course/Programme?

17. Do you think your objective has been met? (Are you satisfied with the outcome, i.e., required changes you expected from your employees?) Y N

18. Do you think the Courses/Programmes of this nature help in building the capacity of the nation in this field? Y N

19. Comment on the support of COL partnership in developing/implementing this Course/Programme?

20. What is the next step you think this collaborative venture should take?

Appendix - II

List of members met in person

I acknowledge with gratitude that the following members graciously accepted to meet with the consultant, despite their otherwise heavy schedules, during the country visits:

The Bahamas

1. Ms. Faye Bascom - Currently, Quality Assurance Coordinator for the IDB Project
2. Mr. Lionel Sands - Director of Education
3. Ms. Lenora Archer - Deputy Director of Education
4. Ms. Edith Roach - Assistant Director of Education (TVET)
5. Mr. Foster Dorsett - Senior Education Officer (TVET)
6. Mr. Trevor Ferguson - Education Officer (TVET)
7. Ms. Keyshan Cartwright - Education Officer (TVET)
8. Ms. Seeta Arangil-Roberts (Doris Johnson Senior High School)
9. Ms. Gwendolyn Knowles (Doris Johnson Senior High School)

Grenada

1. Mr. David Fleming - Country Coordinator (who handed over the filled in questionnaire)
2. Ms. Gillian Lazarus - Tutor (who handed over the filled in questionnaire)
3. Ms. Madeline Baptiste - Principal, Anglican High School
4. Mr. Martin Mitchell - Principal, Boca Secondary School
5. Ms. Winnifred Foster - Principal, Westerhall Secondary School
6. Mr. Nickel Williams (Anglican High School)
7. Ms. Camille Phillip (Happy Hill Secondary School)
8. Mr. Thomas Noel (Happy Hill Secondary School)
9. Ms. Claudine Neckles (Boca Secondary School)
10. Ms. Fiona Clyne (Westerhall Secondary School)
11. Ms. Desiree Moore (Westerhall Secondary School)

St. Kitts & Nevis

1. Mr. James Kelly - Country Coordinator
2. Dr. Lincoln Carty - Tutor
3. Mrs. Faustina Wilson (Basseterre High School)
4. Mrs. Rogers, Principal, CFB College
5. Mr. Ira McMahon, Former Country Coordinator

Jamaica

1. Dr. Jeanette Bartley - Associate Vice-President, CEODL, UTech
2. Dr. Johnson - Head of the Faculty
3. Mrs. Shermaine Barette - Head of the School
4. Mrs. Sybil Hamil - Former Head of the School
5. Dr. Geraldene Hodelin - Former Dean of the Faculty (Telephone Interview)
6. Ms. Joanne Williams - Learner from St. Kitts & Nevis now pursuing the Bachelor's Programme (face-to-face) at the UTech
7. Mr. George A. Roper - the Senior Vice-President (Academic)
8. Dr. Nancy George - Former Head of Curriculum & Evaluation Division, UTech
9. Dr. Errol Morrison - President, UTech
10. Mrs. Anita Thomas-James - Project Manager

In addition, 6 Module Advisors as a group and 2 Assistant Librarians and 2 Assistant Registrars as a group were met whose names are not immediately available.