

TECHNICAL & EVALUATION REPORT

THE LAUTOKA WORKSHOP

**THE PRIDE PROJECT FIRST
REGIONAL WORKSHOP**

www.usp.ac.fj/pride

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Objectives of Workshop	1
3. Participants	2
4. Organisation/Methodology	3
5. General Outcomes	3
6. Outcomes for National Project Coordinators	4
7. Outcomes for Data Managers	6
8. Evaluation of the Workshop	7
9. Conclusion	7
 Attachment A: List of participants at First Regional Workshop.....	8
Attachment B: List of support and resource personnel.....	9
Attachment C: Evaluation report on Pride Workshop.....	10

1. Introduction

The first PRIDE Project Workshop was conducted from 1-8 September 2004 at the Waterfront Hotel, in Lautoka, Fiji. This was the first of two annual regional workshops anticipated in the PRIDE Workplan for 2004. The second was scheduled for later in the year, but at the request of its coordinator, Dr 'Ana Taufe'ulungaki, has been deferred until early 2005.

2. Objectives of Workshop

The overall purpose of the workshop was to provide training for National Project Coordinators and data managers, thereby enhancing their capacities in relation to strategic planning methodologies for basic education.

PRIDE 2004 Programme of Activities and Budget specifies in section 3.1.4:

By the end of September 2004, have held an initial regional (Fiji) workshop on strategic planning methodologies for basic education, including equity strategies (in relation to gender, disability, rural and isolated students and other vulnerable groups), data collection and analysis techniques, and realistic approaches to plan budgeting. A key emphasis throughout the workshop will be on building consultative and participatory approaches among stakeholders. The workshop will use an interactive approach to develop planning processes that are firmly grounded in Pacific values and epistemologies. The workshop will be attended by the fifteen national focal points/project coordinators and by one other key educational planner from each country. It will be of six to eight days' duration.

2.1. The specific objectives of the workshop included the following:

- a) To comprehensively brief PRIDE national coordinators to ensure their full and effective participation in the life and work of the Project.
- b) To provide specific training for focal points and data managers in strategic planning methodologies for education, and in appropriate techniques for the collection, analysis and management of educational data for planning purposes. Particular attention will be given to realistic planning in contexts of fiscal restraint.

In relation to the above objective (b):

- to develop planning principles and processes that are firmly grounded in Pacific values and epistemologies, yet are fully syncretised with the most tried and tested techniques of the globalised world beyond; and
- to give particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups, including those from low socio-economic urban backgrounds, those in remote and isolated areas, those with disabilities, female students, and un- or under-employed school drop-outs and 'push-outs'.

- c) To finalise and prioritise the list of draft benchmarks that are being developed to constructively review each country's strategic plans for education, and through small group workshops to develop a set of specific indicators for each benchmark.
- d) To review and further develop policies and operational procedures for national PRIDE sub-projects. Particular attention will be given to application procedures, financial management, and reporting requirements.
- e) To facilitate stronger social, cultural and personal bonds amongst participants, thereby encouraging a more collaborative, mutually supportive and pan-Pacific approach to educational planning, and paving the way for PRIDE-sponsored study, training and consultative visits between countries.
- f) To explore and document approaches to consultative and participatory approaches to educational planning, especially in the broader context of civil society (e.g., parents, students, private providers, NGOs, employers, and other stakeholders). This objective will be pursued through shared workshops with participants in the concurrent NZAID-ASPBAE workshop on Civil Society Participation in Education Policy.
- g) To brief participants on use of the PRIDE website and on-line resource centre and, in light of ICT resources in each Ministry, to seek their advice on the most appropriate formats and delivery mechanisms.

3. Participants

A total of 31 professionals attended the workshop with two participants from each of the 15 countries associated with the PRIDE project (see Attachment A). A third participant from Kiribati also attended. All 7 members of the PRIDE Project Team, three support staff from the Institute of Education (USP), and three resource personnel from outside USP, also participated in the workshop (see Attachment B).

4. Organisation/Methodology

- 4.1. The workshop proper began with an opening address by Dr Shrinivasiah Muralidhar, the Head of Education and Psychology at the University of the South Pacific.
- 4.2. The workshop was generally divided into three sections. First, daily devotions, housekeeping and a summary report on workshop discussions from the previous day were presented. Second, the PRIDE Team or a resource consultant made a presentation on a key topic.
- 4.3. Group discussions formed the substantive part of the workshop. A participatory approach was used where at least three quarters of the time was utilized in small work groups discussing key questions and suggesting new approaches to educational planning and data management.
- 4.4. Since the workshop was designed for two distinct groups of professionals, parallel training sessions were held with the two groups with the intention of preparing them fully for their new roles and responsibilities.
- 4.5. In order to address the role of stakeholders in education policy formulation and planning, there was a combined session with the 'Education Policy from a Civil Society Perspective Pacific Regional Workshop' organised by the Asia South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education (ASPBAE) at the request of NZAID. This occupied two half days of the workshop, and included country specific discussions on particular in-country policy issues and future possibilities for civil society organization involvement in policy development. As well, a simulation activity on how civil society can contribute to education policy and planning development was a highlight of one combined session.
- 4.6. In addition to the professional training of participants, four evenings were set aside for social activities. These included a welcome reception, a dinner at a restaurant, a visit to a cultural/tourist site complete with dinner, and a farewell dinner on the last evening.
- 4.7. Since evaluation was considered to be an important component of the workshop, Dr Seu'ula Johannson-Fua was recruited as workshop evaluator, with a mandate to provide both formative and summative evaluations. She developed a detailed evaluation instrument to assess the effectiveness of the workshop. Her evaluation report is included as Annex III and is given further attention in Section 8.

5. General Outcomes

The following are general outcomes of the workshop:

- 5.1. Participants were fully briefed on their roles and responsibilities, either as national coordinators or data managers.
- 5.2. They now have an increased understanding of the PRIDE Project and its goals and objectives.
- 5.3. There was an increased consciousness of the value of blending best practice from both local and global planning processes and principles. An appreciation of

Pacific cultures and their importance reflected in strategic planning were well articulated by participants.

- 5.4. The sense of 'ownership' of the PRIDE Project by participants and their Ministries of Education is an important outcome of the workshop.
- 5.5. Improved networking between participants, countries, and PRIDE staff was firmly established at the workshop.
- 5.6. Sharing and learning from each other's experiences, particularly those of good practice in individual countries, was a valuable outcome of the workshop.
- 5.7. The benchmarks to constructively review each country's strategic plans for education, including principles, were finalized and prioritized, and specific indicators developed for each one.
- 5.8. The participants were introduced to the on-line Resource Centre and PRIDE website and gained an understanding of their aims and goals and their required input to the system.
- 5.9. A better appreciation of how civil society organizations can be better engaged by government in educational policy and planning was gained from the combined sessions with ASBAE.

6. Outcomes for National Project Coordinators

- 6.1. The sessions for National Project Coordinators included discussions on the following themes:
 - their roles and responsibilities in the implementation of the PRIDE Project in each country
 - the Forum Basic Education Action Plan (FBEAP) and its relationship to the PRIDE Project
 - the management of in-country sub-projects with a specific focus on policies and selection criteria, preparation of proposals, application processes, operational procedures, financial management, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting
 - the identification of resource needs and budget to support the work of national coordinators
 - the management of on-the-job training programmes, study visits and attachments
 - development of communication and networking strategies
 - arrangements for monthly meetings using audio-conferencing facilities
 - the needs of vulnerable students, including those from low socio-economic urban groups, those in remote and isolate areas, those with disabilities, female students, and school drop-outs and push-outs.

Other important outcomes of the National Project Coordinators' workgroups include the following:

- The group unanimously recommended that they be called National PRIDE Project Coordinators (NPCs) instead of 'Focal Points'.

The following were clearly understood:

- Each National Project Coordinator will coordinate the activities of the PRIDE Project at national level, act as the liaison person between the national government and the PRIDE secretariat, and be the contact person for all Project activities in-country
 - National Coordinators could apply through their Chief Executive Officer or Permanent Secretary for the establishment of their in-country PRIDE office in terms of the purchase of basic equipment approved under the Finance Agreement (FJ\$10,000 per country already approved)
 - The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) governing the relationship between the countries and PRIDE regarding the implementation of in-country sub-projects must be signed before sub-projects can be implemented
 - Countries that have completed their Strategic Plans are in a position to submit their sub-project proposals for consideration
 - PRIDE will assist countries requiring assistance with their strategic plans
 - In sub-project proposals, there should be a clear linkage with the Forum Basic Education Action Plan (FBEAP)
 - The quality of Strategic Plans would be measured against the specific benchmarks finalized and prioritized at the workshop, once they are endorsed by the Project Steering Committee
 - Regarding the transfer of funds from PRIDE to Ministries of Education, the purchasing policies, protocols and procedures of each government will be followed
 - The need for proper internal control in each Ministry of Education was emphasized
- 6.2. There was unanimous agreement by the group that there was a pressing need in most countries for the appointment of a professional assistant to enable each NPC to be effective in her/his role, and a unanimous recommendation to the PSC and donors that funding be made available for this purpose.
- 6.3. The group was also unanimous in their suggestion that in terms of the distribution of available funds for sub-projects, 70% should be divided amongst the 15 countries at 3 levels, namely:
- 13.33% each for the two large countries (4 parts)
 - 6.67% each for the nine medium-size countries (2 parts)
 - 3.33% each for the four small countries (1 part)

It was also recommended that the remaining 30% of the funds allocated for sub-projects would be distributed on a needs basis, the group defining 'need' as any expressed need relevant to basic education with particular reference to: extent of universal primary education; level of literacy; isolation or vulnerability; the disadvantage of size, such as smallness (e.g., Nauru); political complexity (e.g., FSM); and access to other sources of external funding.

- 6.4. A recommendation was made by the group that CEOs or Permanent Secretaries for Education should attend PSC meetings in place of the Ministers. Furthermore, the group also requested for the invitation that usually goes to the Minister for Education to attend PSCs be directed to the CEO or PS or Director instead.
- 6.5. A set of planning principles and processes was developed that are firmly grounded in Pacific values and epistemologies, yet syncretised with the acceptable techniques of the global world. The best of the local and global was the underlying thread that underpinned the whole workshop.

7. Outcomes for Data Managers

The sessions for data managers included the following:

- Showcasing of the Kiribati Education Management System (KEMIS)
 - description of what is planned for the Solomon Islands (SIEMIS)
 - discussing the challenges of data collection, particularly sharing of approaches and instrumentation and techniques for dealing with non-responding schools
 - data entry and analysis including alternative computer software packages and advantages or opportunities of a common approach
 - reporting on educational data, in particular the preparation of statistical reports for educational planners
 - the role of student achievement and examination data in educational planning, in particular integrating school- and student-based data for planning purposes and reporting on student achievement and examination data to educational planners
 - maximizing the utility of data for planning purposes
 - development of measurable indicators to evaluate the extent to which a strategic plan achieves its objectives.
- 7.1. The presentations by Rebecca McHugh, Project Coordinator, UniQuest, Canberra, on the role of data in educational planning, and by Dr 'Uhila Fasi of the South Pacific Board for Educational Assessment (SPBEA) on the role of assessment in educational planning, provided a framework for the discussions by data managers.
- 7.2. The data management group agreed unanimously that in order to have good quality data for more effective educational planning, they needed further training in the area.
- 7.3. A valuable outcome of the group was the learning that took place from sharing experiences of how they managed data in their countries.

8. Evaluation of the Workshop

An independent evaluator was recruited for the workshop and the summary of her findings are in Attachment C. Her two key findings are:

- Participants agree that strategic plans be contextualized to reflect the social, economic and political environment; and
- Participants have developed a strong sense of community and desire future dialogue amongst themselves.

The key recommendations include:

- Improved organization of personnel team
- Improved usage of technical equipment
- Set up communication strategy for members
- Training needs analysis for data managers.

The conclusion of the evaluation report is that “key objectives of the first regional workshop have been successfully achieved”. In the words of the evaluator:

Participants have gained a better understanding of PRIDE and what its purpose is as well as the scope of work. Participants have also enjoyed formulating new relationships both professional and personal, relationships that will be key to the continuity and success of the PRIDE project for the next five years. One of the most important outcomes of this workshop has been the fostering of these relationships and I think this has been done extremely well by the PRIDE Director and the team. There is a strong sense amongst participants of ownership of the project and that it is their project.

9. Conclusion

Further feedback received from participants after the workshop confirm their rating of a successful workshop. Comments from the workshop evaluator regarding recommendations for further improvement will be useful in the planning and organization of the second regional workshop tentatively scheduled for early February 2005.

ATTACHMENT A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT FIRST REGIONAL WORKSHOP

TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE FIRST PRIDE PROJECT REGIONAL WORKSHOP

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT FIRST REGIONAL WORKSHOP

Countries		National Coordinators	Data Managers
1	Cook Islands	Ms. Repeta Puna Director of Planning & Policy	Ms Maria Enetama Statistics Officer
2	Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)	Mr. Aier Willyander Post Secondary Administrator	Mr Burnis Danis Assessment & Evaluation Specialist
3	Fiji	Mr. Filipe Jitoko Deputy Secretary for Education (Special Projects)	Ms Betty Kalou Assistant Senior Education Officer
4	Kiribati	Mr. Matana Anterea Education Officer, Primary & Junior Secondary	Ms Era Etera Education Officer (Statistics) Mr Nauto Tekaira Senior Education Officer (Tertiary/Non-Formal Education)
5	Marshall Islands	Mrs. Glorina Harris Actg Assistant Secretary for Elementary Education	Mr Stanley Heine Testing Specialist
6	Nauru	Mr. Jarden Kephas Secretary for Education	Ms Tryphosa Keke Acting Principal
7	Niue	Ms. Tiva Toeono Director of Education	Mr Kennedy Tukutama Administration Manager
8	Palau	Mr. Emery Wenty Director of Education	Mr Raynold Mechol Chief, Division of Research & Evaluation
9	PNG	Mr. Uke Kombra Assistant Secretary – Planning, Facilitating & Monitoring Division	Mr Pala Wari First Assistant Secretary Policy & Planning, Research and Communication
10	Samoa	Mrs. Doreen Roebeck-Tuala Assistant Chief Education Officer for Curriculum, Material & Assessment Division	Mrs Lufi Taule'alo Assistant Chief Executive Officer Schools Operation Division
11	Solomon Islands	Mrs. Mylyn Kuve Director, Planning Coordination, Research Unit	Mr Ben Karai Principal Planning Officer
12	Tokelau	Ms. Lili Tuioti Education Advisor	Ms Hana Atoni Data Officer
13	Tonga	Mr. Tatafu Moeaki Deputy Director of Education	Ms Pelenaise To'a Education Officer
14	Tuvalu	Ms. Katalina Taloka Senior Education Officer	Ms Valisi Tovia Curriculum Officer
15	Vanuatu	Mr. Antoine Thyna Policy Analyst	Ms Fabiola Bibi Senior Statistician Officer

ATTACHMENT B: LIST OF SUPPORT AND RESOURCE PERSONNEL

TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE FIRST PRIDE PROJECT REGIONAL WORKSHOP

LIST OF SUPPORT AND RESOURCE PERSONNEL

Pride Project Team

- | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1. | Dr. Bob Teasdale | : | Project Director |
| 2. | Mr. Epeli Tokai | : | Education Adviser |
| 3. | Dr. Priscilla Puamau | : | Education Adviser |
| 4. | Mr. Mahendra Singh | : | Project Manager |
| 5. | Ms. Libby Cass | : | Information Specialist |
| 6. | Mr. Leonaitasi Taukafa | : | Accountant |
| 7. | Ms. Titilia Uluiviti | : | Administrative Assistant |

Support Team from USP Institute of Education

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|---|---|
| 8. | Mr. Henry Elder | : | Fellow, Institute of Education and Workshop Convenor |
| 9. | Dr. Seu'ula Johannson-Fua | : | Fellow, Institute of Education and Workshop Evaluator |
| 10. | Ms. Vasiti Nalatu | : | Administrative Assistant |

Resource People

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|---|
| 1. | Ms. Rebecca McHugh | : | Project Co-ordinator, UniQuest Pty Ltd, Canberra, Australia |
| 2. | Dr. 'Uhila Fasi | : | South Pacific Board for Educational Assessment (SPBEA) |
| 3. | Ms. Monica Driu Fong | : | HRD Policy Officer, Development & Economic Policy Division, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat |

ATTACHMENT C: EVALUATION REPORT ON PRIDE WORKSHOP, LAUTOKA

TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE FIRST PRIDE PROJECT REGIONAL WORKSHOP

Prepared by Dr Seu'ula Johansson Fua, Institute of Education, USP

A. Purpose of the Evaluation Report

I had been asked by Dr. Bob Teasdale, Project Director for PRIDE to conduct an evaluation activity during PRIDE's regional workshop. This workshop was held in Lautoka, Fiji from the 1st – 8th of September 2004.

The purpose of the evaluation was two fold; one, to appraise the organization of the workshop and, two, to capture participants' thinking process during the workshop. This evaluation report is in no way an assessment of participants' perspectives or the ability of presenters to convince an audience. It is an attempt to capture occurrences within a single event that will suggest trends for the improvement of future workshops. Findings and interpretation of data presented in this report are to be understood within the context of this workshop.

B. Research Methodology

To gather the needed data for this evaluation report, a qualitative research approach was adopted through the use of participant observation, informal discussion and written evaluation forms. The gathered data was then analysed by tracing emerging trends and common themes. A basic statistical analysis was also used to interpret numerical data gathered from the participants' evaluation form.

Admitted data included; completed evaluation forms and summary of written and statistical data (enclosed with this report), daily reports presented by Dr. Priscilla Puamau and Mr. Epeli Tokai and my observation notes recorded during the workshop. While I conducted the qualitative analysis of the data, Ms. Vasiti Nalatu helped enter and process the statistical data.

Every effort was taken to analyse and interpret the data as close as possible to the 'voices' and perspectives of the participants. I am responsible for the interpretation of data presented in this report and subsequently my apology for any mis-interpretation that I may have over looked in my analysis.

C. Key Findings

1. Logistics and Organisation of the Workshop

- 1.1 PRIDE team was able to successfully meet unexpected technical difficulties as they occurred during the course of the workshop. This is a strength.
- 1.2 Participants rated the general organisation of the workshop highly satisfactory (refer to statistical summary). PRIDE team is to be applauded for this effort.
- 1.3 Room for improvement however are still wanting in the following areas:
- 1.4 Registration of participants needs to be more organized
- 1.5 Timing of the workshop was too long for some participants, but nevertheless, other participants wanted a longer time frame for the workshop
- 1.6 Per diem was well received by everyone and 60% of the participants were more than pleased with the management of the per diem
- 1.7 Physical set up of different work space was not always effective nor timely
- 1.8 Participants request access to internet, computer and hard or electronic copies of presentations.

ATTACHMENT C: EVALUATION REPORT ON PRIDE WORKSHOP, LAUTOKA

TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE FIRST PRIDE PROJECT REGIONAL WORKSHOP

- 1.9 Variety of interesting social activities requested by participants
- 1.10 Participants want to be better informed of workshop program prior to departing to host country
- 1.11 Participants request greater involvement in the selection of topics and issues to be discussed in workshops
- 1.12 Organisation and management of tasks within PRIDE team was sometimes unclear resulting in the overload of certain tasks upon few people. Similar pattern was observed when equipments and tools were not readily available for some members of the team to complete their tasks in a timely manner.

2. Presentations

- 2.1 While participants generally rated method of presentation delivery to be highly satisfactory (refer to statistical summary) there are still areas needing improvement.
- 2.2 Participants request hand outs of presentations to be given prior to the presentation to enable better facilitation of discussion.
- 2.3 Use of visual aid and other presentation tools need to be better utilized for clarity.
- 2.4 Use of hard copy material as well as electronic copies for dissemination of presentation materials
- 2.5 General consensus requesting more time for discussion, questions and comments on presentations. However, this is contrary to presenters' perception of timing for discussions.
- 2.6 Content of presentations to include more case studies from the Pacific
- 2.7 Meaningful topics were presented and participants request more detailed and elaborate discussion on some of these topics
- 2.8 Daily devotions could be improved
- 2.9 Participants appreciated daily reports and wanted more preliminary analysis given.

3. Training

- 3.1 Training needs for Data managers in setting up data base systems, data collection, analysis, reporting and monitoring.
- 3.2 Continuing support for National Coordinators from PRIDE team as well as from other Pacific colleagues
- 3.3 Training be provided by consultants within the PRIDE group and within the region before looking for consultants from outside the region
- 3.4 Detailed training needs are listed under written summary provided in the appedices.

4. Workshop Objectives

- 4.1 Although all of the workshop objectives were favorably rated, the attainment of these workshop objectives is to be seen as work in progress. The current ratings are to be build upon within the follow up workshops.
- 4.2 Workshop objectives that rated below 4 (refer to list of statistical summary) are to be emphasized in future workshops.
- 4.3 Participants felt that the workshop was most successful in achieving the following objectives; developing close network amongst PRIDE participants and with team, understanding of the purpose of PRIDE, awareness of planning processes and principles and of emerging local and global issues. Refer to statistical summary for rating on each objective.

ATTACHMENT C: EVALUATION REPORT ON PRIDE WORKSHOP, LAUTOKA

TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE FIRST PRIDE PROJECT REGIONAL WORKSHOP

5. Future PRIDE Workshop

- 5.1 Participants are conscious of the desire to have a united Pacific voice but at the same time are cautious of losing each country's unique specific needs.
- 5.2 How to monitor and evaluate plans implemented
- 5.3 Further training that is specific to each country's needs and circumstances
- 5.4 Venue for next workshops be circulated around the region

6. Formative Analysis

- 6.1 Participants gathered at the workshop came with a diversity of knowledge (not just educational planning) but also with different levels of working experiences, both educational and non-educational.
- 6.1 The following ideas and concepts were discussed on the first day of the workshop and it reflects prior knowledge and interest of the participants:
 - 6.2 Planning process should be localised and contextualised
 - 6.3 Global perspective should not overwhelm local Pacific perspectives
 - 6.4 Consultation was needed for ownership of the plan
 - 6.5 Strong leadership be given
 - 6.6 Training be given for capacity building
 - 6.7 Plan within resources available
 - 6.8 Communication strategies and networking
 - 6.9 Importance of terminology in planning
 - 6.10 Borrowing foreign models should be adopted to suit local needs

7. Summative Analysis

- 7.1 Participants were interested in ideas of post modernism and relevance of educational planning within this paradigm to the Pacific context.
- 7.2 Participants recognised that continued dialogue is crucial to explore the dimensions of local and global perspectives in educational planning
- 7.3 Questions were formulated out of emerging issues that participants began to discuss. Participants left the workshop with the following questions:
 - 7.4 To what extent do participants want their culture included in their Strategic Planning? Is it enough that their Strategic planning principles reflect Pacific values? What about organizational structures, are they reflecting systems that are conducive to Pacific values? Are they learning organizations? Or are they trying to force post modern ideas into structuralist and modern systems?
 - 7.5 How much of these aspired values do they really live up to in their day to day work as educators? Are these values reflected in organizational cultures? Have issues of ethics been carefully considered in strategic planning?
 - 7.6 What is Pacific leadership? What is consensual decision making? And is consensus necessarily best practice? Are problem solving processes then context specific?
 - 7.7 The challenge then is whether participants can come together to define a body of knowledge that is decidedly contemporary Pacific and thereby legitimizing themselves as knowledge builders rather than knowledge borrowers.

D. Conclusion

Key objectives of PRIDE's first regional workshop have been successfully achieved. Participants have gained a better understanding of PRIDE and what its purpose is as well as the

ATTACHMENT C: EVALUATION REPORT ON PRIDE WORKSHOP, LAUTOKA

TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE FIRST PRIDE PROJECT REGIONAL WORKSHOP

scope of its work. Participants have also enjoyed formulating new relationships both professional and personal, relationships that will be key to the continuity and success of the PRIDE project for the next five years. One of the most important outcome of this workshop has been the fostering of these relationships and I think this has been done extremely well by the PRIDE Director and the team. There is a strong sense amongst participants of ownership of the project and that it is their project. This is important and that it be maintained by PRIDE.

The workshop has also been successful in introducing more academic concepts in educational planning and challenging participants to rethink their approach to planning. The concept of contextualizing and localizing educational planning into a Pacific context will continue to be a dialogue between PRIDE participants. Subsequently, this dialogue will continue to question and re assess traditional notions and new perspectives about planning and about education in the global scene as well as in the Pacific.

While there was positive and encouraging feedback on the organisation of the workshop, there are certain aspects that may be considered for future workshops. These areas are listed in the following section of the report as suggested recommendations.

E. List of Recommendations

1. Logistics and Organisation of the Workshop

- 1.1 Registration of participants needs further organisation. Also need to consider people who were not invited but wants to observe workshop activities.
- 1.2 Timing of the workshop needs further rethinking to suit the task at hand and also the level of participation desired of participants.
- 1.3 Careful planning needs to go into creating physical spaces for different group and presentation activities.
- 1.4 Dissemination of information system needs to be in place during the workshop for copies of presentations and other resources.
- 1.5 Participants be informed clearly of where and how they may access computers and internet connections
- 1.6 Social activities, particularly welcoming dinner needs better organisation and more creative thinking
- 1.7 Any information distributed to participants prior to arriving in the workshop be carefully thought out and given ahead of time.
- 1.8 Future design of workshop program should seek consultation from participants.
- 1.9 Careful rethinking of the number PRIDE team members to be present in a workshop at one time. Division of responsibilities amongst team members need to be planned carefully with clear definition of allocated tasks.
- 1.10 Members of PRIDE team involved in workshop need to be given necessary equipment and tools to enable their work to be done in a timely manner.
- 1.11 Set up of Communication strategy to maintain communication between member countries and with PRIDE team. This is absolutely vital to maintaining the momentum and continuation of the project.

ATTACHMENT C: EVALUATION REPORT ON PRIDE WORKSHOP, LAUTOKA

TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE FIRST PRIDE PROJECT REGIONAL WORKSHOP

2. Presentations

- 2.1 Presentation papers need to be handed in to Project Director before the workshop begins.
- 2.2 Presentation papers and other photocopying resources need to be done before the workshop begins to avoid overload of work during the workshop itself.
- 2.3 Timing of presentations need to be carefully planned to allow discussion and comments.
- 2.4 Allow greater involvement of participants in the selection of topics for presentation as well as show casing their own thinking and experience. This will give participants a better sense of ownership of the workshop.
- 2.5 Allow room for participants to report their own group work.
- 2.6 Provide technical equipments (eg. Microphone) to better facilitate presentation.

3. Training

- 3.1 Training needs analysis for Data Managers
- 3.2 Training providers to be sought within the PRIDE members and within the region

4. Workshop Objectives

- 4.1 Continue work towards improving workshop activities particularly the following objectives: understanding of planning processes and principles both local and global, and how Pacific principles influence planning processes, finalised and prioritised benchmarks and understanding of the PRIDE web site and electronic library.

5. Future Workshops

- 5.1 Suggested topics include: monitoring and evaluation of strategic plans, processes of planning – how to construct a strategic plan, leadership, learning organisations, training for data managers.