

<b>B5</b>	<b>Implementation Note for School B (extract)</b>
-----------	---

These are the personal reflections and observations of the researcher based on feedback from different key persons and departments during the implementation of the Personal Growth Education (PGE) in School B. The table includes some key information of School B during 2004-2007.

Items	Situation and status in School B from 2004-2007
1. History	Nearly 40 years
2. Reputation in the district	Famous
3. Students' performance	Excellent
4. Parents' score	High in the district
5. Number of students	Stable and desirable
6. Campus	New and good
7. Principal	Authoritarian, superficially sociable, and empowering of middle managers. Principal had his own priorities and focused on maintaining the reputation of the school by emphasising the extra-curricular activities.
8. Deputy principal	Sensitive, sociable, and helpful. The DP was slightly passive in the curriculum reform and all new issues, but was a good chairperson in meetings and facilitated discussion in an open and flexible way.
9. Middle Managers	They had the open discussion climate, but they were traditional, independent, superficially cooperative, and communicative. Some loafed and immature. Some were experts for some extra-curricular activities; some shirked their duties skillfully, and were passive to further develop the school
10. Teachers	Mostly cooperative, unmotivated, and obedient to the top. They were quite indifferent and liked gossiping, which was suppressed by the policy bias of school. Some were good and enthusiastic, but weak in counselling skills. Some had difficulties handling the students' problems and the demanding parents.
11. Discipline and Guidance	It was under-developed before. Discipline team was being developed, selection of team members were not controlled by team heads, SGT worked alone on various issues. The guidance and counselling training for teachers was not adequate.
12. Students	Clever, expressive, and not disciplined. They were clever about knowing what games the adults played, especially the 'falsehood' of the teacher. They questioned the lessons and the curriculum critically. Their behaviours were attributed to the laissez-faire discipline policy of the early years. Just a few students had serious behavioural problems. Some were weak in social skills and discipline.

Items	Situation and status in School B from 2004-2007
13. Parents	Demanding, academically oriented and rich, professional level. Somehow their requests affected some normal functions in school.
14. Curriculum Development	Under-developed
15. MCE development	It was organized (by SGT) mainly. There had been no overall development plan in value and life education in the past. Hence, there is room for MCE development.
16. RS development	Weak (no progress and conservative)
17. GS development	Busy and wanted to seek integration with the PGE.
18. Atmosphere	Academic and award-oriented. The school worked like a big and developed company. There was no sustainable development plan because of lack in impetus for change. Therefore, it lagged behind the pace of reform and kept its traditions through survival skills and masking techniques. Gradually, some felt lost in their development and direction.
19. Greatest problems	Ambiguity in direction and position
20. Comment from ESR	It suggested improvement in the teaching quality, the school climate, and MCE, and that more training should be provided to middle management. ESR came and made the change.

#### The development stages of PGE in School B

<i>Stage I</i>	<i>2003-2004</i>	<i>Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2</i>
<i>Stage II</i>	<i>2004-2005</i>	<i>Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with Assistance of an NGO</i>
<i>Stage III</i>	<i>2005-2006</i>	<i>Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with a Funded Project</i>
<i>Stage IV</i>	<i>2006-2007</i>	<i>Post-modification of the PGE curriculum</i>

#### Principal's support

<i>Stage I</i>	<i>2003-2004</i>	<i>Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2</i>
----------------	------------------	---

It is difficult to judge the principal's support for the implementation of the PGE from the document, but I perceived that he knew that it was the duty of SGTs and an important issue to carry out. He had no ideas about the manpower and resource input, the person who is in charge, or the deadlines of the PGE.

<i>Stage II</i>	<i>2004-2005</i>	<i>Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with Assistance of an NGO</i>
-----------------	------------------	--

He respected the ex-SGT's suggestions, and launched the PGE with the help of an NGO. He supported the project with a substantial amount of money. However, he did not care about the progress of the PGE and

did not ask about it; he offered no help to the collaboration between the SGT and other Panel Heads. In spite of no interference and care from him, he was quite open-minded or 'laissez-faire' about letting the project proceed as long as there were no complaints.

*Stage III    2005-2006            Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with a Funded Project*

Still, there was no input from the principal about implementing the PGE. In one of the administrative meetings, he listened to the proposal for rendering a regular lesson for the PGE. The idea was discussed and passed.

Curriculum Coordinator

*Stage I    2003-2004            Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2*

In this year, she was asked by the ex-SGT to attend the seminar of the PGE introduction; then she was asked to deal with the PGE matter. Her reaction was aggressive. She insisted that PGE was not her business. Finally, the educational psychologist was invited to participate in the pilot test and wrote about eight lessons of the PGE for both P1 and P2. The CC should have explored the resources of the school and initiated the project instead of complaining. Her actions showed that she is inexperienced in handling new policy, and she expressed her anger and fear naively. On the other hand, it was reasonable for the ex-SGT to get the CC involved because she was the curriculum leader. No matter whether the duty is being shirked or not, it is good to let the EP help with the PGE.

*Stage II    2004-2005            Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with Assistance of an NGO*

In the second year, I was assigned to serve School B. At the very beginning, the CC was very enthusiastic about discussing with me the framework of the PGE and the possibility of integration with General Studies and Religious Education. I was so glad to have her participation as well as that of the Panel Heads from GS, RS, and DM. We created a framework for the PGE for the new academic year. Then, support, concern, and assistance from the CC disappeared; she no longer cared about the progress and integration of the PGE. After a period of time, she just wanted me to be in charge of the gifted education. I did feel strange about it.

*Stage III    2005-2006            Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with a Funded Project*

The CC had no concern about the progress of the PGE, but she insisted on integrating the PGE and other subjects to save time. She then encouraged the SGT to develop MCE, which was also the duty of the ex-SGT. I did this quite successfully. In due course, the CC gradually showed her dictatorial nature, arrogance, and jealousy, and offered no help to the SGT. She just wanted me to follow what she suggested based on what she said in informal conversation. I found she continuously forced me to lead her gifted education, create rumours in the staff room, and skillfully commented and blamed her 'enemies', but forgot her responsibilities as a CC.

#### The Discipline Master and the D&G team

##### *Stage I 2003-2004 Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2*

At the preparation stage, some enthusiastic members from the D&G team helped with co-teaching the PGE in P1 and P2.

##### *Stage II 2004-2005 Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with Assistance of an NGO*

D&G team members showed no refusal of the PGE and were willing to participate in the new trial of the mixed mode. With the help of the NGO in lesson demonstrations and the mixed mode implementation, the involvement of the D&G team was not obvious. As a newcomer, I found that the organization of the D&G team was quite loose as it had been in School A, with most of the jobs carried out by the SGT and DM. Members of the D&G team were only involved in the meetings, where they aired their opinions. The Whole-school Approach was not thoroughly implemented.

##### *Stage III 2005-2006 Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with a Funded Project*

This year, a new DM was appointed; she was diligent, more open-minded, and responsive to developing the discipline and guidance issues. She was eager to alter the atmosphere of the school and the functions of the D&G team by such means as adding form representatives to help with the PGE pre-lesson meeting and other administrative jobs with the support of the administrative team. Then some D&G team members performed quite well and were appreciated by the class teachers. Both the DM and I did feel happy about the changes.

#### Moral and Civil Education

##### *Stage I 2003-2004 Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2*

In School B, MCE (even the education about national identity) was traditionally handled by SGTs before 2000, but there was no MCE team in School B. The ex-SGT had not been involved in long-term development for MCE, and MCE was treated as a supplementary activity in the ECA period every week. The main purpose of MCE was to entertain P1 to P3 students (without ECA arrangement) in the hall while the higher forms enjoyed ECA in the campus. With such a questionable purpose, MCE was not well developed, and similar topics were repeated and repeated again. Although the ex-SGT was the coordinator for both the PGE and MCE, no integration, planning, or link-up between the two domains was accomplished.

##### *Stage II 2004-2005 Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with Assistance of an NGO*

When I came to School B, I was astonished about the arrangement. Then I found that ECA was the focus of the school. It had several music bands and choirs. To ensure the bands had plenty of time to practice, the

rest of the students were asked to do their “homework” in the classroom in ECA periods. Finally, just five to six times of ECA were arranged annually for the higher forms and MCE was taught for the lower forms in the hall. After half a year, I could not cope with the situation anymore and wanted to change it. School B was packaged with multi-intelligence development—indeed, it was academically oriented. Love and care seldom existed; the students lacked security, social skills, and emotional control. This motivated me to reform MCE by widening its coverage and involving all students (not only the lower form kids).

*Stage III 2005-2006 Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with a Funded Project*

With regard to the APASO results, I alerted the school of the need to have affective and social skills learning. Then I tried to reform MCE and the PGE together, and gave colleagues a whole development picture to accommodate all students. Then I fought for a definite lesson time for the PGE and changes to MCE, and let two levels of students take turns joining the MCE mass lessons in hall. However, what upset me was that the school was sluggish in setting up an MCE team. I attempted to set up one sub-group within the D&G team. However, the MCE team sub-group could not work well because of limited resources and lack of support from the top.

*Stage IV 2006-2007 Post-modification of the PGE Curriculum*

More new elements and resources were introduced into School B this year by the acting SGT, and there was no progress in the team development of MCE.

**General Studies**

*Stage I 2003-2004 Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2*

No data showed any cooperation with student guidance.

*Stage II 2004-2005 Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with Assistance of an NGO*

The Panel Head of General Studies came over and discussed the integration of the PGE and GS. We found all the relevant lessons at the beginning. I expected the integration would be a breakthrough for the PGE. After a year of practice, my observation and feedback from teachers and students showed the integration did not work because teachers were not ready for it, and they needed full support from SGTs and the Panel Head. Interestingly, the Panel Head still insisted that integration was possible. Then I wondered what she meant by ‘integration’. Was it to combine the overlapped lessons in the PGE with the GS syllabus to save time for teachers?

*Stage IV 2006-2007 Post-modification of the PGE Curriculum*

Owing to different interpretations of ‘integration’, I abandoned the idea of integration with GS and developed the whole set of PGE curriculum in School B by avoiding the overlapped elements as far as I could.

## Religious Education

*Stage I    2003-2004        Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2*

There was no involvement.

*Stage II    2004-2005        Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with Assistance of an NGO*

With the help of a senior teacher in the D&G team and the ex-DM, we tried to integrate the PGE into the RE curriculum. It was exciting to find that quite a number of topics were closely related to the framework of the PGE. I tried to find out the corresponding lesson plans and held a meeting with all RE teachers. I introduced them to the lesson plans and asked for their comment; the process was all right. The RE form representatives were assigned to help with the implementation. I then invited all RE teachers for co-teaching. The effect was apparently acceptable. It showed me that they understood what the PGE was. At that point, my expectations for successful integration were high; however, at the end of the academic year, the feedback from students told me that most of the RE teachers did not teach the relevant PGE topics. They had no confidence in their abilities to handle the materials. Meanwhile, the RE panel head was passive about motivating the integration or reform. At that time, the most common pedagogy of RE were showing videos, storytelling, doing worksheets, and reciting prayers.

*Stage III    2005-2006    Modification of the PGE with the Collaboration of an NGO with the Addition of Pre-lesson Meetings, Collaborative Teaching, and Parallel Parental Education*

As for GS, I gave up on integrating the PGE with RE and waited for another chance in the future.

## Teacher training

*Stage I    2003-2004        Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2*

Introductory training was arranged for all staff to help them understand what the PGE was. To help P1 and P2 class teachers fully understand the pedagogy and content of the PGE, co-teaching was arranged to evaluate its effectiveness and feasibility.

*Stage III    2005-2006        Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with a Funded Project*

At this stage, the focus was put on the parent education and co-teaching. Teacher training was given twice to the class teachers at different levels, with lesson demonstrations in the workshops. In addition, one more training session about personal growth was arranged for all staff to give them an in-depth understanding of the importance of personal growth.

*Stage IV    2006-2007        Post-modification of the PGE Curriculum*

Co-teaching was used to facilitate the teaching skills of class teachers. Some demonstration lesson videos were put onto the school servers for reference. Through the introduction of the UAP, more training sessions

were given to teachers about resilience.

#### Curriculum design and Collaboration with NGO

##### *Stage I    2003-2004        Introduction of the PGE with a Pilot Test in P1 and P2*

At this stage, about eight lesson plans were provided by the Educational Psychologist by referring to the teaching kit of Baptist University.

##### *Stage II    2004-2005        Implementation and Modification of the PGE Curriculum with Assistance of an NGO*

The curriculum was designed by the NGO and SGT, and opinions from teachers were collected for the continuous improvement of the curriculum through evaluation forms, meetings, and interviews with teachers or students.

##### *Stage III    2005-2006        Implementation and Modification of the PGE curriculum with a Funded Project*

At this stage, an element of parent education was added into the design. The SGT and NGO collaborated in an interactive mode to refine the lesson plans and the family worksheet. Teachers' comments were collected every semester. Their spontaneous feedback about the PGE lesson plan design was noted before and after each lesson via the preparation meetings. At the end of the academic year, both the parents' and students' feedback was collected.

Some snapshots to note:

#### 2004-2005

- Principal B: [in the meetings] If you have any problems, please feel free to speak up and let's discuss it. If you do not tell me, how could I know and help you solve them together?
- Principal B: Miss Wong, yes, we have problems in the school, especially the teaching attitude and counselling skills of some teachers, so please help!
- CC: Happy to see you joining our team, you know how frustrated I was about the PGE and the MCE development, so I am glad to cooperate with you in the coming days.

#### 2005-2006

- A teacher: It is training time for my team, so if you make it for the PGE, it is unfair to my students, and I will have to abandon this duty (i.e. to abandon an award for school reputation) [the PGE was then arranged for at the expense of the intensive remedial class period]
- A teacher: I must use this room for training; there is no space for your Play Time and Peer Tutoring Scheme. [She occupied all the rooms during lunch and recess time for a kind of extra-curriculum activity; no one cared and it is the priority of School B.]
- SEN coordinator: Here in School B, everyone is busy. You should complete the job on time without excuses. Don't ask for extra help! It is nonsense! What you request will devastate the development of our school.

### Overall reflections

To sum up, the merits in School B regarding the PGE implementation are:

1. The ex-SGT had facilitated the pilot project of the PGE in the lower forms; this reduced the resistance of the teachers and paved a good route for further development. The CC had attended the seminar about the PGE, so she understood what the PGEG was. At the beginning, the involvement of the EP was worth referring to and continuing.
2. The Principal of School B was more open-minded about allowing discussions about the arrangement of the PGE in any meetings. This continuously improved the PGE. The senior teachers and Panel Heads of the administrative teams were willing to support and help through discussions and consensus-making in the meetings. School B provided sufficient financial support to let the NGO help with development.
3. The resistance from teachers in School B was lower: they were willing to follow the implementation of the PGE and gave constructive feedback in meetings. Basically, the CC and the Panel Heads of GS and RE were willing to give their opinions at the beginning to further improve the PGE. Members of the D&G team were ready to help if the workload was acceptable.
4. The contradiction emerged between the hidden agenda of school and the missions of guidance curriculum. It affected the time and human reallocation, a priority of teachers and parents. The question is whether the actual needs of students are appropriately addressed.

### Summary of the Strategies Used for PGE Development in School B and the Outcomes

Strategy (2003-2006)	Outcomes
Introduction	
Lobby management	Yes (it is done by the ex-SGT)
Lobby all staff	Yes (through meetings)
Involvement of different people	
Support from Principal	Yes with funding support He supported the researcher with adequate financial support and verbal empowerment to complete the tough job.
Support from Deputy Principal	Yes and tried to let SGT be involved in the evaluation part through a handbook she organized.
Support from DM	Yes and then helped the co-teaching with class teachers; supported the integration with RE.
Support from Discipline and Guidance Team	Form representatives helped to hold the collaborative planning meetings before lessons and teaching materials distribution and collection.
Support from CC	Verbally concerned, supported integration but never followed up.
Support from MCE coordinator	SGT integrated MCE and the PGE together in a holistic plan.
Support from IT department	Yes



Strategy (2003-2006)	Outcomes
Help from NGO	Got help from an NGO for lesson plan design, teacher training, demonstrations, parent education workshops, groups, and fun day.
Help from Educational Psychologist	She helped to provide some sample lesson plans at the trial stage. (the new school-based EP scheme)
Extra Manpower rendered (like the PGE team)	SGT was free to request reasonable manpower.
Financial Support	Yes
Teacher Training	It was done by SGT and NGO (with QEF project) in forms of workshops, demonstrations by social workers, and co-teaching.
Curriculum Development	
Pilot stage	Started at P1 and P2 level (by ex-SGT in 2003-2004), so the impact was rather small.
Curriculum Design	Done by SGT and NGO together, so there was compromise.
Selection of teaching materials	Done by all staff together in the meetings.
Modification of lesson plans by teachers	Done by SGT because of the failure in School A.
Collaborative planning meeting	Done
Collaborative teaching	Done especially for weak teachers
Evaluation meetings	Done twice per year
Evaluation in words and forms	Done
Use of textbooks	Not yet considered till 2006
Taught by class teachers	All lessons
12 lessons achieved?	Yes
Student profiles	Done for all students
Involved parent education	Done with help from NGO
Integration	
Integration with GS and RE	Failed
Integration with MCE	Yes
Integration with other subjects	None

#### Reflection with the experience in School B

- In school B, compared to the prior experience in school A, everything was done carefully with lower thresholds for everyone. Apparently, the teachers need to be spoon-fed and were quite reliant on the SGT's provision. The financial support given let SGT get help from the NGO, which supported evaluation, collaborative teaching, training, and parent education in the PGE.
- Overall, except for the tight lesson time, everything went smoothly in School B. Till 2006-2007, some teachers even wanted to write the lesson plans themselves, which is good news for continued development of the PGE in School B.