

Report On
Assistance to OERU and OECS Member
States With Data Collection Related to Education
Statistics and Performance Indicators
May, 2001

Consultant: Esther Chitolie-Joseph

Introduction

The overall objective of this consultancy was to work with the OERU and selected member states to facilitate the required data collection, related analyses and written reports that will reliably inform the region, ECERP, and others concerned on the current status of education reform in the OECS.

One of the three tasks needed to perform was to assist the Ministries of Education, by working with two schools in each of the seven countries below to bring their backlogged data up to date so as to bring the first set of the Performance Management Tools up to date.

In keeping with the above objective, the following six islands were visited, Antigua, Montserrat, St.Kitts and Nevis, Tortola, St.Vincent and Grenada. A total of eight Primary and twelve Secondary schools were visited and an average of half a day spent at each school (See Appendix A) to assist them in completing the 2000/01 Performance Management Tool. The Ministries of Education of the different islands were also visited to collect core national data available for the 1999/00 Core OECS Indicators.

Prior to the visit all schools were informed of some of the data needed to be compiled since they required most time to prepare for data entry. Only seven of the twenty schools visited (excluding the five from St.Vincent) had already started entering data in the tools. The local consultant assisted them in collecting some of the required data, entering the data and gave advice on the collection, compiling and entering of the rest of the data (See Appendix B). All schools were given a deadline of June 30th to bring the tools up to date.

Reasons Why Most Schools Had Not Attempted The PMTs (With the exception of St. Vincent who had not been given the tool)

1. Records were not properly kept in most schools and so information was not readily available. For example,
 - a. Teachers registers were incomplete and in some cases not inspected by the principal
2. The data available was in its rawest form and needed lots of refining.
3. Some vital information required for the tool are not always collected/recorded such as teacher punctuality, dropouts and repeaters
4. Timeliness of recording, collecting and refining the data is bad. Too much data is left at the last minute to record and update.

5. The burden of all the data collection, compiling and entry is placed on one individual. In most cases the Vice Principal, who sees it as an impossible task having other duties to perform, is given this task.
6. There is not enough concerted effort by the staff to do their part of the collecting and compiling for their class or grade.

Status of Schools Visited as Regards Performance Management Tools

A detailed status of each worksheet in the PMT for each school visited in each country is given in Appendix B.

Antigua

1. Princess Margaret Secondary – No data had been entered in the tools. However the school had collected some data upon request. Upon arrival, teachers' data, student attendance and some other data were compiled. On entering the data collected, 19 full indicators out of the 33 applicable ones were obtained for the academic year 2000/01. Two other indicators were partly obtained. As the rest of the data is entered these two indicators will adjust themselves. Generally records are poorly kept and organized in the school.
2. Villa Primary – No data had been entered in the tools. However the school had collected some data upon request and had all the student attendance data but to be aggregated for each month. Upon arrival, data on the teachers, student ages by grade and some other data were compiled. On entering the data collected 17 full indicators out of the 30 applicable ones were obtained. Three other indicators were partly obtained, which will be adjusted as the rest of the data is entered. Some records are kept but needs to be improved.
3. Boys Grammar Secondary – The best-kept records were from this school. Although no data had been entered, the school had compiled and refined a lot of data, which was ready for entry. Upon arrival data on computers, teaching learning process, subject teachers and some other data were obtained. On entering the data collected, 22 full and 5 partly developed indicators were obtained.

Montserrat

1. St. Augustin Private Primary – The acting principal had collected quite a bit of data and had begun data entry in the school worksheet. Some more data entry was done. Given the time allocated for this school the rest of the data could not have been collected. However forms were given and instructions as to how to collect the rest of the data. (The diskette on the database was copied got corrupted and so the number of indicators obtained cannot be checked)
2. Brades Primary – The principal and staff had begun the data collection for the tool. However they lacked the confidence to enter the data in the tool. They were assisted in the refining of the data for the tool and also data entry. Upon arrival

data on the teachers were compiled. After entering the data 12 full and 5 partly developed indicators were obtained.

3. Montserrat Secondary – The Vice Principal had already been assigned the task to collect and enter the data for the tools. He had already collected few of the data requested and done some data entry. Given the time constraint we were not able to collect much data. However forms were given and instructions as to how to collect and enter the rest of the data, making it a school effort rather than an individual effort. After data entry 13 full and 6 partly developed indicators were obtained.

Nevis

1. Charlestown Secondary – The principal and vice-principal had quite a bit of data collected but had not entered any. Some data on the school and teachers were further compiled and entered. Given time constraints all the data available could not be entered. Instructions were left as to how to collect the rest of the data and enter. After the data was entered, 20 full and 8 partly developed indicators were obtained out of the 37 applicable ones.
2. Gingerland Primary – The principal had already collected and entered 80% of the present data in the tool. The data entered was checked and some more data on teacher attendance and teacher enrolment by subject was further entered. After the data was entered, 11 full and 3 partly developed indicators were obtained out of the 34 applicable ones.

St. Kitts

1. Dr. William Connor Primary – The school had only compiled data on teacher attendance, grades and certification and no data had been entered. Given we had one day to spend there, tables were printed from the tool and distributed to the class teachers and principal to compile data for the tool. Data was compiled and entered on all tables except teacher punctuality and student attendance. Teacher punctuality records are kept at the MOE and student attendance data have to be aggregated for each month instead of week as is presently done. The data required for standardized national exams could not be compiled since exams have not been written. After all the data was entered, 28 full indicators out of the 34 applicable ones were obtained. The remainder 6 indicators (Nos. 4,5,32,38,39 and 40) will be obtained when the teacher and student attendance and punctuality and national examination data is entered.
2. Verchild's High Secondary - Forms had been sent to the school the previous day to begin data collection for the tool. Upon arrival few data had been collected and none entered. The computer assigned to use did not have excel installed on it. As a result the information technology teacher opened the tool in a similar software, quarto pro, which we used. This school seemed to be a bit disorganized in terms of their data collection. Most of the required data was collected and compiled upon arrival. After entering the data 26 full indicators out of the 36 applicable ones were obtained. Data on teacher and student attendance and punctuality, Student textbooks, Teachers guides, average sizes of rooms and efficient use of

teaching/learning classroom time still have to be compiled and entered in the tool. The tool was copied on diskette but was unable to convert it back to excel.

BVI (Tortola)

1. Enid Scatliffe Pre-Primary – Upon arrival at the school, the principal had already entered about 60% of the current data. The tables were revised with her and corrected where necessary. Some data such as student attendance, enrolment by age, grade and gender, student transfers in and out were compiled and entered. After all data was corrected and entered 23 full and 1 partly developed indicator out of the 28 applicable ones were obtained.
2. Althea Scatliffe Primary – Upon arrival at the school few data had been compiled and none entered in the tool. Data was collected and compiled from the staff and principal records and entered in the tool. After entering all the data available in the given time, 18 full and 3 partly developed indicators were obtained from the tool.

St. Vincent – The Performance Monitoring workshop was held on Monday, May 28, 2001. About 15 secondary school principals, 10 information technology teachers, 2 Education Officers and 3 MOE personnel were in attendance. Attached is an agenda for the workshop.

Five schools were selected to begin their actual data entry on the following day, Tuesday, May 29, 2001. Four secondary schools namely, Emmanuel High school, Girl's High school, St. Vincent Grammar school and St. Martin's High School reported to the computer lab at the Grammar school at 9:00 am with available data. Few data was collected given the time frame. They were assisted in entering that data and given directions on how to collect the balance of the data for entry. After entering their data the schools had obtained the following indicators:

- Emmanuel High – 17 full and 8 partly developed indicators
- Girl's High – 8 full and 1 partly developed indicators
- St. Vincent Grammar – 11 full and 3 partly developed indicators
- St. Martin's High – 14 full and 6 partly developed indicators

In the afternoon of May 29, 2001, The Georgetown secondary school was visited to assist them in entering and collecting their data. The principal using the advice given had the teachers involved during the morning in the data collection and already had about 70% of the data collected but not entered. Upon arrival the data was entered and directions were given as to how to obtain the balance of the data. After entering all data given the time frame, 24 full and 2 partly developed indicators were obtained.

Grenada

1. Wesley College – Upon arrival at the school the principal had already entered some data in a few tables in the school and teachers worksheet. The data entered were verified and corrected where necessary. The rest of the current data were

collected and compiled and entered in the tool. After the exercise was completed, 25 full and 3 part indicators were obtained.

2. Grenville Secondary – The principal had already compiled and entered most of the data in the school, and teacher’s worksheet. The tables were reviewed and corrections made were necessary. The rest of the data were compiled and entered. This school seemed to have better recording keeping than most others visited. After entering the available data 25 full and 2 part indicators were obtained.

Generally all schools showed great interest in the tool and the principal assigned an individual to continue the process till completion.

Changes Made to the Tool and Limitations

1. In the secondary tool the formula for Indicator 32 had to be changed from StudentL202 to StudentI116 since this attendance indicator was reading from the wrong cell (a cell in the national standardized exam table).
2. In Primary schools the National Standardized exams in Antigua, Montserrat, St.Kitts and Nevis are done in Grades 3 and 5. Hence in the indicator worksheet, the indicator names were adjusted.
3. In one sex schools for example Boys Grammar school in Antigua Indicators 42 and 43 are incorrect since it adds boys and girls information and divides by two. Since no girls are recorded the formula does not work. Hence the Indicator should only be reading results of males or females.
4. The formula for calculating Total actual Teachers attendance and punctuality in the Teachers worksheet of both primary and secondary tool is incorrect. The formula was changed to F159-H159 for males and G159-I159 for females.
5. In the primary tool table 2 of the students worksheet does not cater for schools which begin at grades 2 or 3 as in the case of the Alpheia Scatliffe primary school in Tortola. This table will have to be changed to “New entrants to grade 2 or grade 3” and the ages adjusted to suit that age group.
6. One adjustment that needs to be made and was not made to the tool: In the school worksheet, table 4 on income/expenditures, if the school balance is negative (credit) the expenditure per pupil is still calculated as a positive figure (debit).
7. In the secondary tool table 2 in the Student worksheet does not cater for those new entrants into forms 2 and 3 from the senior primary level, grades 7 and 8. It only caters for those entrants into form 1.
8. The format for indicators 14 and 15 should be number and not percentage (with a percentage format, the average age and years experience are being multiplied by 100). This format was changed in the schools visited.
9. In the secondary tool student worksheet, table two does not cater for children greater than 14 years of age. These children are coming from grades 7 and 8 into form 1 as is the case of Grenada.
10. In the school worksheet table 6.6 of the secondary tool, the formula for calculating the percentage of students with all the required textbooks is incorrect especially in forms 3, 4 and 5 where all students do not take a particular subject. The formula assumes that every one is supposed to take all subjects. This is not

true for subjects such as Chemistry, Physics and Biology where students choose their subjects from form 4 and in some cases from form 3.

Action plan and Recommendations to Bring PMTs up to Date.

All schools have some more data to collect and enter in order to bring the tool up to date, some to a lesser extent than others. However data such as standardized school-based and national exams and Appraisals can only be done after those events have taken place, which is usually in July. Most secondary schools used their 2000 CXC results to obtain the cxc indicator since results for the current year is only obtained in September of the new school year. Hence the formula calculating percentages sitting and passing exams had to be adjusted to read from the previous years form 5 enrolment.

Appendix C gives a detailed guide as to what each school needs to do to bring their PMT up to date.

In each country one individual was assigned from the Ministry of Education to attend the school visits so as to follow-up with the schools visited and assist the new schools with the tool when they come on board. Below is a table of these persons.

Country	Contact Person	Designation
Antigua	Doristeen Etinoff	Planning Officer
Montserrat	Rosamund Mead	Planning/Statistics
Nevis	Arlene Matthew-Weste	PS Secretary/IT Officer
St. Kitts	Nigel	Planning Officer
Tortola	Tyronne Smith	IT Officer
St. Vincent	Gillian	IT Officer
Grenada	Junior Alexis	Statistician

Conclusion

1. Corrections should be made to the tool and re-distribute to all countries.
2. The rest of the schools should begin their data collection, compiling and entry as soon as possible with the assistance of the local contact persons at the Ministry of Education and if needs be the coordinators from the various schools visited.
3. In general it is of my view that in all schools one individual be assigned not to collect and enter data in the tool, but instead to act as a coordinator for collecting, compiling and entering data for the tool, as this should be a school effort. Even the students should be involved where necessary, such as taking measurements of the different rooms and spaces used for the students in the school. The coordinator may be the principal or as in most cases the vice principal. The diagram below shows the different levels of responsibility for data collection in a school with two grades/forms.

