
Curriculum issues in small states^{*}

Steve Packer

The small state is not a new phenomenon. City-states, principalities, island kingdoms and other forms of governance of relatively small communities have been commonplace throughout history. However, in the past thirty years there has been a rapid increase in the number of small, independent nation-states; part of the twentieth-century processes of nationalism and decolonization.

In 1990 there were over sixty states, including territories with internal self-government, with populations below 500,000; thirty-seven with under 100,000. The largest concentrations of such states are in the Caribbean and the South Pacific – regions characterized by clusters of island, developing countries.

National education systems in small states

Each small state has its own, national education system. Tuvalu,¹ in the South Pacific, with a population of just 8,000, has thirteen kindergartens, twelve primary schools (1,105 students

Steve Packer (United Kingdom). *Chief Project Officer in the Education Programme of the Commonwealth Secretariat. He has worked on programmes in support of educational development in small states for the past thirteen years.*

in 1988), one secondary school, a maritime training school and the University of the South Pacific's Tuvalu centre. Small though it is, the system has to be administered, financed and staffed. Curricula have to be designed, materials developed and teachers recruited, trained and retained.

The national aims and objectives for education in small states are couched in very similar terms to those of larger countries. The Republic of Maldives,² with a population of 216,000, describes its need to provide universal primary education, make education more relevant to the local environment, increase the levels of trained manpower for development and improve the quality of education – all familiar themes.

Why then do the education systems of small states deserve special or separate attention? The aspirations of individual citizens and the development objectives of the state are not inherently different from those in large countries. What is of particular interest is how the small nation-state can develop and manage educational services and opportunities given the constraints and the benefits to which national smallness of scale gives rise. In some instances the responses to this challenge of scale are leading to organizational and institutional forms which depart from the theory and practice of education in larger countries.

The advantages of size are the possibilities offered for specialization and economies of scale.

* The views expressed in this paper are those of the author alone.

Small systems are severely constrained in their ability to offer a full range of specialist facilities and options, across the system, and within individual institutions, especially at the upper end of the formal system. It is difficult to offer a range of specialist support services. Ministries cannot encompass the range of specialist units and departments which characterize larger systems. Administrators and managers are multi-functional. Post-secondary institutions are often multi-purpose. Linkages have to be developed to access educational opportunities abroad – a characteristic of all small states, as true for Luxembourg as it is for Dominica and Vanuatu.

It is the nature of the structural, organizational and institutional responses to the limitations and opportunities of smallness of scale that is at the heart of growing international interest in the educational development of small states.³ Currently, a number of exercises are focusing on structural reform in small-state education systems, exploring new models, linkages and co-operative endeavours^{4,5} to increase the range of educational provision and opportunity, for countries which are, and will be, heavily dependent on their human resources for national development.

The national curriculum – national relevance and international credibility

The curriculum – its form, the process by which it is developed and procedures for assessment and certification – presents a set of very difficult issues for small nation-states. On the one hand, there is the search for relevance, identity, local values and national control of what is on offer in the state's education institutions. This requires the development of a curriculum development capacity nationally, in systems short of a wide range of relevant specialist knowledge and skills.

On the other hand, there is the need to develop judicious interdependence with a much wider education network. Small states tend to be vulnerable – economically, politically and culturally. Linkages, understandings and co-operation are important components of the development policy of all small states. If, for example, higher-level learning is to be pursued overseas, what is on offer nationally has to have international validity to enable the student to access international opportunities. If employment is to be sought by Pacific islanders in the rim countries of the Pacific, or in North America by citizens of Caribbean countries, the education received at home needs to have marketable value. The mobility of labour is a fact of life for small developing countries; disliked for the brain drain that ensues, welcomed by individuals when it offers higher standards of living than may be available at home. The chance to send money home in the form of regular remittances is another incentive to be mobile, notably in some South Pacific countries. In this context there are strong arguments to favour close linkages with regional and international systems which may mean locking into curricula and examinations which are essentially external and over which individual small states will have varying degrees of control.

So there are difficult choices which derive from an unavoidable tension between national relevance and international credibility. Decisions have to be taken as to what should be done locally and what should be derived from overseas. It is a balancing act. The two forces are not necessarily incompatible but ensuring that the balance is right is a major challenge which is far from the preserve of ministries of education alone.

The remainder of this paper examines the challenge of scale and national and international relationships in two major areas: the management of curriculum development; and examination arrangements in small states.

Managing the curriculum is just one area where the challenge is to utilize available expertise in the most effective way possible, conscious of the relatively small pool of expertise on which

it is possible to draw. Choices regarding school examinations – national, regional or international – are affected by a host of factors which include the educational inheritance from colonial times, the availability of examinations from overseas examination boards, the existence of regional examinations and the national capacity to manage internal certification. Political and cultural considerations also play their part in the choices which are made. The paper concludes with a brief set of observations on forms of co-operation and partnership. The examples and the arguments are derived primarily from the experience of the many small states of the Commonwealth,⁶ and especially those in the Caribbean and South Pacific. Whether the experience of countries which continue to have much in common in their education systems can be matched in the non-English-speaking world is a matter for further comparative study.

The process of curriculum development

INTERNAL ARRANGEMENTS

Small states have a limited pool of specialist expertise on which to draw. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that curriculum and subject specialists are difficult to retain in small states, their knowledge and skills opening up employment opportunities in non-educational work at home and abroad. If the curriculum – its development and renewal – is to be a predominantly national preserve, the ways by which scarce expertise is put to maximum use deserves careful analysis. The challenge is to ensure that everyone with the capacity to contribute to curriculum development does so. In the small states of the Commonwealth a variety of approaches are in place.

In a few cases there is no formal curriculum development unit or office, or even an officer within the ministry or department of education designated to take responsibility for

curriculum development activities. When work on the curriculum is required it is done on a project basis, co-ordinated by senior ministry managers and invariably drawing on short-term external, technical assistance. However this is now a relatively unusual situation and one which is associated with the smallest of states. A recent report on education in the British Virgin Islands (population 13,000) points to the need for a capacity for recurrent curriculum development and evaluation and recommends that an education officer should be charged with overseeing curriculum reform in the islands' schools.⁷ A similar report on the future needs of the education system in Tuvalu⁸ argues for the appointment of a curriculum development and co-ordination officer. Even the smallest systems require machinery to advance national curriculum development.

A single officer with responsibilities for curriculum development is a common occurrence in many of the smaller education systems. Montserrat (population 12,000) has a curriculum co-ordinator with the following functions:⁹ Co-ordinating workshops that are curriculum based.

Developing and revising syllabi and curricula for Forms 1, 2 and 3 in the secondary school in collaboration with teachers.

Collaborating with the Education Officer (Primary) in organizing and administering national assessments for primary schools.

Disseminating and implementing the University of the West Indies/United States Agency for International Development primary curriculum.

Taking responsibility for all overseas examinations.

In Dominica (population 81,000) discussions are going on as part of a reorganization of the Ministry of Education and Sports to appoint a co-ordinator who will be responsible for the development, evaluation, production and distribution of curriculum materials for schools and for the administration and supervision of the internal and external assessment of student performance. He/she will supervise research in curriculum development and identify areas of

need for national teacher-training programmes.¹⁰ This is a tall order for a single person. However small the system, the stages that have to be gone through in the process of curriculum renewal or reform are no different to those of a much larger country with a greater curriculum development capacity.

The next stage is to have a curriculum unit or centre with a small team of specialists who do not attempt within their own ranks to cover all aspects of the school curriculum but do have the capacity to articulate policy in respect of the state's curriculum and can manage curriculum development activities at different levels and in some subject areas. This is the direction in which the Gambia (population 822,000) is moving, after attempting to operate a much larger curriculum centre with a complete range of subject specialists. The emphasis will be on subject renewal on a project basis with the small team of specialists managing the activity and drawing on the services of teacher educators and teachers as and when necessary.

In the Solomon Islands (population 304,000) the Curriculum Development Unit is within the School of Education and Cultural Studies of the Solomon Islands College of Higher Education (SICHE). The Unit has specialists in agriculture, home economics, industrial arts, English, mathematics, science and social studies. These specialists work with panels of teachers which meet for annual workshops. Teachers close to the capital, Honiara, meet more regularly. The full-time specialists co-ordinate the panels, assist in writing and editing teaching materials, organize the annual workshops, visit schools to test materials and advise teachers on the use of the materials and the teaching of the subject. All the locally prepared materials are printed at the Unit where the appointment of a full-time Curriculum Development Officer (Production) has been under discussion.¹¹

In some small states the central curriculum capacity is more elaborate and closer to systems prevalent in many larger countries. Brunei-Darussalam (population 243,000), one of the wealthiest small states, is able to afford a Department of Curriculum Development within

the Ministry of Education with four specialized units – the School Curriculum Unit, the Evaluation and Upgrading Unit, the Publications Unit, and the Educational Media and Resource Unit.¹² The functions of the department indicate an intention to fulfil the full range of curriculum development as follows:

To study, plan and prepare curricular programmes for schools in accordance with national education policy.

To prepare and produce books, including textbooks, worksheets, teaching aids, education media programmes and curricular materials such as school syllabi and teachers' guides.

To carry out in the classroom controlled experiments and tests of curricular programmes and materials.

To evaluate and improve curricular programmes and other materials from time to time so as to determine their suitability, and to monitor the quality of curricula materials produced.

To give guidance to teachers in the use of prepared programmes and teaching aids so that the teachers are properly oriented in the use of materials.

To disseminate information relating to innovation and implementation of the curriculum.

To review, evaluate and recommend basic textbooks, supplementary and reference books, as well as other teaching/learning aids for use in schools.

In Malta (population 345,000), the Department of Education within the Ministry of Education organizes the process of curriculum development through its education officers who have responsibility for supervising the teaching of specialist subjects or particular sectors of the school system. Curriculum committees are organized to involve school principals, classroom teachers, and lecturers from the University of Malta's Faculty of Education. The committees select or commission textbooks and advise on pedagogy.¹³

Some countries, including Botswana (population 1,164,000), the Seychelles (population

68,000), and Tonga (population 101,000), have all opted for a relatively large central curriculum development provision. This can prove a rather difficult path to follow. In the late 1980s the Ministry of Education in the Seychelles had ninety-six posts in the curriculum section of the Education and Planning Division of which only thirty-eight were actually filled. In 1990 this section was managed by an Assistant Director with nine specialist units for science, mathematics, English, social science, Creole, physical education, French, family life, creative arts and graphics.

This very brief look at some of the structures which are in place for curriculum development in a sample of small states suggests some commonalities despite the great diversity which exists in respect of wealth, levels of expertise and the organization of ministries of education. In one sense curriculum development is a highly centralized activity. It is controlled by ministries of education and by officers or units within them. And yet these units or centres rarely have the capacity to undertake the full range of tasks which curriculum development demands. In consequence the process has to involve a wider educational community and especially the teachers, who are at the sharp end of the system. As Konai Thaman¹⁴ has noted in respect of the island countries of the South Pacific: 'the curriculum development process has fallen squarely on the shoulders of practising teachers. Their active role in designing and producing curriculum materials and implementing them has not only been encouraged, but in some countries demanded by education authorities.'

On the one hand, this offers an interesting prospect, for it allows those who teach children the chance to be closely involved in the overall design of what is on offer in their schools. This is a potential benefit of smallness of scale; the chance for a sizeable cross-section of the education community to be designers and creators as well as translators. It is perhaps no accident that the idea of national educational consultations and conferences (recent examples include the Gambia, Maldives and Saint Lucia), involving educators, parents and wider community inter-

ests, should find favour in small states. Specialist compartmentalization is difficult in small systems; all those with something to offer need to be encouraged to participate in a range of tasks which in large systems tend to become the preserve of the specialist.

However, the benefits have to be weighed against some constraints. For what is being asked of the teachers (and the teacher educators) is both some reconceptualization of their roles and functions and an acknowledgement by governments that this is part of the expected range of some teacher's duties. When the panels of teachers meet in Malta and the Solomon Islands, in Dominica and Montserrat, the work they undertake is in addition to their normal teaching duties. This has implications which have to be fully addressed for teacher training, for the remuneration of teachers and for the management of teacher time.

A second factor to note is the role played by those who have been given central responsibility for curriculum development. The curriculum specialists in Malta, the Solomon Islands and Montserrat are multi-functional. Here is the curriculum developer, the adviser, the trainer and the assessor rolled into one. Indeed in some cases where those with curriculum responsibilities have other administrative duties, the curriculum function is not the only one in the job specification (if it exists). It is characteristic of small states that people have to be flexible and turn their hands to many tasks. Those involved with curriculum development are no different from anyone else in this respect.

EXTERNAL CONNECTIONS

While the general trend in small states, as elsewhere in the developing world, has been towards increased national control over the school curriculum, external linkages and connections remain an important consideration in most countries. There are a number of reasons for this. Shortages of expertise within national systems, lack of financial resources to implement curriculum change, limited facilities to produce

textbooks and other learning resources, and the need to lock into regional and international examination systems, together lead to a complex of external arrangements. The management of these connections is a major preoccupation for ministries of education in most small states.

Technical assistance to help with the development of national curricula takes various forms. While co-operation between small states is developing rapidly, especially through the vehicle of regional universities (in the Caribbean and the South Pacific), regional examination bodies (e.g. the Caribbean Examinations Council and the South Pacific Board for Educational Assessment) and regional organizations, including UNESCO offices in the South Pacific and the Caribbean, it is still the case that much external advice and support comes from developed countries through institutional links, special advisers recruited by bilateral aid agencies or as part of major education projects and programmes such as those funded by the World Bank in the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

While this external support is invariably sought and requested by small states, it can present difficulties. Specialists from larger countries may not be adept at understanding both the constraints and potential benefits of curriculum development in small states. If they are used to support mechanisms found in larger systems – resource centres, sophisticated reprographic and printing facilities, a critical mass of specialized subject expertise – then advising and supporting small states may be problematic unless there is a willingness to be pragmatic and flexible, recognizing the benefits to be derived from working with a small, relatively closely knit education community. For example, the question of a counterpart is problematic as it is in most forms of external assistance for small states. The theory of the counterpart is fine; in practice it may be totally unrealistic in systems where educators and administrators fulfil a variety of functions. Instead of insisting on counterparts, the art and the science of the external adviser is to work within existing structures and mechanisms rather than seeking to impose ways of working which are impractical.

There is a growing movement towards ministries and institutions developing linkages with particular institutions in developed countries, notably Canadian institutions in the Caribbean and Australian institutions in the South Pacific. This has the potential benefit of an overseas institution coming to know a country and its education policies, programmes and personnel extremely well and thereby being better able to respond sensitively and practically in meeting national priorities. Conversely, if, as has happened in some instances, the external institution becomes the dominant partner in the process, national control over curriculum development will be weakened. There is the further danger that the developed country institution may itself be dependent on bilateral aid funds, the continuing availability of which may be uncertain.

A special problem for small states is the production of textbooks and other materials for use in schools. If the material required is highly country-specific, a print run may be relatively small and the unit costs high. For commercial publishers small markets are not an attractive proposition. This may force small states to use texts produced overseas, moulding and adapting national syllabi to use externally produced materials. While some international publishers have prepared texts for regional markets, such as Longman and Macmillan in the Caribbean, publishing titles for individual countries is not an attractive proposition except where some parts of a book, such as an atlas, have a small national component, with the major part of the text being of use in a number of countries.

Some countries have addressed this problem imaginatively. In the Solomon Islands, with external financial assistance, the Curriculum Development Unit, to which reference was made above, has printed all locally devised materials in its production centre using offset litho or duplicators. This does not result in materials which compare in presentation and style with major commercial publishers but it does mean that materials conceived to meet the specific needs of local schools can be produced, tested and revised to suit local requirements.

Regional co-operation in support of book production is being explored in both the South Pacific and the Caribbean. Fergus,¹⁵ writing on this topic recently in relation to the Eastern Caribbean, has argued that there are: 'sound educational as well as economic reasons why these states [countries of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States] should produce school texts and ancillary materials. The culture is the authentic source of curriculum and it is important that children learn from books which are culturally oriented, particularly given the residual colonial cultural freight which these states carry. Caribbean writers and publishers must be involved and this only makes sense if the work is undertaken co-operatively.'

Caribbean Community (CARICOM) ministers of education debated the desirability of a regional educational publishing project at their Eighth Standing Committee Meeting in Port of Spain, Trinidad, in 1990. Some countries would like to see the immediate establishment of a regional co-ordinating body to produce and distribute educational materials. Others are more wary, expressing concern at the loss of quality if low-cost methods are used, doubts about entering into competition with overseas publishers and uncertainty about copyright under regional arrangements. The ministers endorsed a pilot programme to be run in association with the University of the West Indies.

In the South Pacific, the regional university through its Institute of Education is associated with the Oceania Literacy Development Programme which is sponsored by aid agencies. One component of the programme is to help the production of books for children to read in their first languages and in English and French. This is done in a number of ways, including support for writing workshops and the preparation of hand-made books; developing lists of books published in South Pacific languages for widespread circulation; developing contacts with publishers in New Zealand with an interest in publishing for the South Pacific; and supporting the planned UNESCO Educational Publishing Project which was formulated at a seminar at the University of the South Pacific in 1987.

Clearly, co-operative ventures of this type have considerable potential for increasing the availability and relevance of educational materials for use in the schools of states constrained in their ability to produce resources nationally. However, books from major developed country publishers will remain important, especially for countries that follow secondary-school examination syllabi set by outside examination boards. In this context the task for those undertaking national curriculum development is to cast their nets widely in order to select materials which serve their students best: to use national materials where these can be produced locally; to work co-operatively in the development of regional resources; and to access other commercially produced materials which most closely fit national requirements.

For small states, then, the management of curriculum development requires mastery of a complex set of relationships – internal and external. Within the country the challenge is to draw on as wide a range of support as possible in the ongoing process of curriculum change. Externally, the challenge is to draw on resources, expertise and materials in ways which are supportive of national needs and objectives without becoming dependent on external systems. This is a major task, particularly when it is remembered that the central curriculum development capacity may be relatively modest in size, with staff expected to exercise a range of functions and roles.

Examinations

Small states exhibit an array of examination arrangements. While assessment in the primary and junior secondary cycles is invariably a national concern (although occasionally the smallest countries may seek assistance: for example, Tuvalu utilizes the Fiji Junior Secondary examination) there are a variety of models at the secondary level of schooling, reflecting choices

made in respect of national, regional and outside examinations.

Some countries, especially those which for geographical or political reasons are not part of regional groupings, retain close links with outside examination boards. The Bahamas, Mauritius and Maldives utilize the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate in the United Kingdom, as they did in pre-independence days.

The benefits of this arrangement are the international credibility of the examination and the availability of a well-established service which relieves a country of having to develop a national mechanism for which it may not have the human and financial resources. In the case of Cambridge there is a long history of discussing special option papers with individual countries. New Zealand used to do the same with its South Pacific Options until these were phased out in the late 1980s. This arrangement does mean that ultimately a country is dependent on an external system with all the constraints to which this gives rise. Currently there is disquiet in some states about the impact of major changes in the United Kingdom school curricula and its examination procedures, and the effect of these on examinations overseas. While assurances have been given that the Syndicate will continue to provide an examination service in discussion with individual states, there remains a measure of uncertainty with which small states are familiar in many aspects of their existence.

For small states in relatively close geographical proximity, other options are possible. In the Caribbean, the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC), founded in 1972, illustrates a regional approach. It was established specifically to ensure that children in the Caribbean could sit locally set examinations and follow syllabi developed by Caribbean educators instead of those prepared by overseas boards. Where an individual country would have great difficulty in competing with overseas boards, a collective regional response makes it manageable, even though the funding of CXC by Caribbean governments remains problematic.

The Council was charged, and has been

successful, with securing recognition of its awards not only within the region, at the University of the West Indies, but also in North America where continuing educational opportunities are attractive to many West Indian students.

Its creation has had the added advantage of involving a wide range of teachers and other Caribbean educators in working collaboratively on the development of new syllabi and materials and developing assessment skills.

In the South Pacific, a region more culturally diverse and geographically scattered, regional arrangements have until recently taken a much looser form. The South Pacific Board for Educational Assessment (SPBEA) was formally established in 1980. It came into being to assist member countries (now the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, the Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu and Western Samoa) to develop assessment procedures leading towards national certificates. It does this from its base in Fiji through offering technical services in the form of attachments, training workshops and advisory support at the request of individual member governments. The Board has been instrumental in establishing school certificate examinations in Kiribati, Tuvalu and Western Samoa.

For the past four years the Board has also administered the Pacific Senior Secondary Certificate Examination (PSSC). Until 1987, New Zealand offered School Certificate and Universities Entrance Examinations. As these examinations were phased out, some Board countries asked the SPBEA to develop a new Form 6 examination. By so doing the SPBEA has become an examining authority, administering, examining and awarding the PSSC in Kiribati, the Solomon Islands, Tonga and Western Samoa. It is currently undertaking this with a total staff of thirteen people. If, as seems likely, the general trend towards a regional examination authority becomes more pronounced, then the SPBEA will have to be strengthened – a strong recommendation in a recent ten-year review of the Board. At present, 75 per cent of regular contributions to the SPBEA are paid by Australia and New Zealand. If the Board is genu-

inely to meet the need of its Pacific Island member countries it too may have to make a bigger investment in its work.

The choice of examination clearly relates closely to the national curriculum. If examinations are a mix of the national, the regional and the outside (and in a very few instances, Tonga for example, all three) the curriculum development process at the national level requires a careful sequencing of courses if external examinations at the end of schooling are not to have repercussions on the whole curriculum.

One of the reasons which South Pacific countries advanced for not opting for a South Pacific Examining Board to develop and conduct regional examinations from the University of the South Pacific in the early 1970s was their opposition to university admission requirements having such repercussions on the national curriculum. However, unless examinations are entirely national – which is not a practical proposition for small states at the present time – it is difficult to avoid the cause-and-effect relationship. Regional arrangements and country options offer some measure of local control. Again it is a balancing act whereby the small state needs to exert as much influence as possible on examining authorities to ensure that national needs are met, while recognizing that some compromise is inevitable if the country is to have access to internationally recognized certification.

Partnerships

Human resource development, and the significant contribution which is made by the school system in its support, is of critical importance for small states. If the smallest countries in the world are to find and develop a niche in the world economic community, as well as strengthening the quality of social, political and cultural life, it will be through long-term investment in people. This fact is widely acknowledged¹⁶ but it is proving more difficult to translate inten-

tions into educational reality, especially given the scarcity of resources for expansion and qualitative improvement. Strategies to maximize scarce resources and draw on the strengths of relatively small and self-contained educational communities are thus receiving close attention in many small states.

What this brief exploration of curriculum development and examinations in small states suggests is that partnerships, national and international, must be exploited. This is so, first, because it is an effective way to use scarce resources. The burden of national curriculum and examination development cannot be shouldered alone by the professional few in a ministry office or unit. The process is impossible without the involvement of a wider professional community, including the teacher. Equally, the greater the participation of a broad spectrum of society, educational and otherwise, the more likely it is that well-founded and sustainable change will follow. And, as a number of small states are demonstrating, this is a manageable process which may be easier to facilitate and sustain than in larger, more populous countries.

Second, there is value in small states drawing on external experience and practice. Over the past twenty years there has been a significant growth in co-operative arrangements among and between small states – formal and informal – especially in the Caribbean and the South Pacific. Ideas, materials, expertise, courses, syllabi and examinations are moving more and more freely between states in these regions; a trend partly facilitated by improvements in information technology but more substantially through a pragmatic recognition of the value of joint endeavours. It is also the case that small states are no different to larger countries in wanting to be part of the wider international, educational community. They wish to access opportunities and select from those experiences, materials and sources of expertise which are best able to serve their own national needs.

To maximize the value of these partnerships – in-country, with other small states, and internationally – provides a major challenge for politicians and managers serving the education

systems of small states. External relationships are not mere adjuncts to national policy and practice; they are significant components of the national education system, meeting needs which by virtue of smallness of scale cannot be met nationally. Getting the balance right in the national/external equation is a critical question for all small states. ■

Notes

1. The Tuvalu system is in the process of moving towards the introduction of junior secondary schools, replacing community training centres at the end of the primary cycle. This will place significant curriculum development demands on a small system.
2. In 1985 the Republic of Maldives prepared a ten-year educational and human resource development plan (1985-95). In its report to the World Conference on Education for All, Maldives noted that the implementation of the plan has been seriously constrained by lack of sufficient financial and qualified human resources to keep up with the rapid expansion and diversification of the system.
3. See, for example, Kazim Bacchus and Colin Brock (eds.), *The Challenge of Scale*, London, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1987. The Commonwealth Secretariat has organized a series of activities on this theme, the meeting in Mauritius in 1985 on Educational Development in Small States being of particular significance. The UNESCO International Congress on Planning and Management of Educational Development in Mexico City (1990) organized a special round table on small states.
4. Ministries of education in the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) have set up a task force to look at educational and structural reform in their systems of education. The task force was to report in October 1991.
5. The World Bank is engaged in the preparation of a policy paper on higher education policy in the South Pacific.
6. Of the fifty member states of the Commonwealth, twenty-eight have a population of under 1.5 million; twenty under 500,000.
7. The First Five-Year Development Plan for Education (1990), prepared by external consultants, argues that the objective of making secondary education available for all can only be met if changes are made to the curriculum in primary schools and the lower forms of secondary schools. Curriculum development will be a major priority for 1990-95.
8. An international review of the manpower, education and training needs of Tuvalu (1988) recommended a holistic view of the curriculum across the system which would require a curriculum renewal programme for three to four years.
9. Referred to in a case-study of Montserrat by Fergus and Thomas, in Mark Bray (ed.), *Ministries of Education in Small States: Case Studies of Organization and Management*, London, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1991.
10. A recommendation in Dominica's Education Sector Plan for Educational Development 1989-94.
11. Referred to in a case-study of the Solomon Islands by Ramo, in Bray (ed.), *Ministries of Education . . .*, op. cit.
12. Referred to in a case-study of Brunei-Darussalam by Lim Jock Jin and C. J. Nuttman, in Bray (ed.), *Ministries of Education . . .*, op. cit.
13. Referred to in a case-study of Malta by Charles J. Farrugia and Paul A. Attard, in Bray (ed.), *Ministries of Education . . .*, op. cit.
14. Quoted in Konai Thaman, 'Curriculum Development in Pacific Island Countries with Specific Reference to Tonga', in *The Challenge of Scale*, op. cit., which argues for a broad-based approach to curriculum development ensuring that there are incentive systems, professional and material, for teachers and others involved in materials development.
15. Quoted in Howard A. Fergus, 'Relevance and Scale in Educational Development in some Micro States of the Eastern Caribbean', paper presented at the 35th Annual Meeting of the North American Comparative and International Education Society, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1991.
16. Caribbean Heads of Government, meeting in Port of Spain in March 1991, issued a special declaration on human resource development in recognition of its critical importance for the development prospects of the region.