

ICAROAP/ILO-COOPNET/NCC
REGIONAL SEMINAR ON CURRICULUM
DEVELOPMENT FOR COOPERATIVE TRAINING

Colombo, 17 - 28 December 1996.

A Summary Report.

524

**ICAROAP/ILO COOPNET/NCC REGIONAL SEMINAR
ON CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR COOPERATIVE
TRAINING - COLOMBO, SRI LANKA-
17-28 DECEMBER 1996.**

SUMMARY REPORT.

CONTENTS.	PAGE
01. Background	02
02. Objectives	02
03. Strategy	02
04. Target Group	04
05. Physical Arrangements	04
06. Facilitation	05
07. Seminar Proceedings:	
a) Opening	05
b) Country Presentations	05
c) Systematic Approach to Curriculum Designing	08
d) Performance Analysis	08
e) Training/Learning Objectives	09
f) Learning Strategies, and designing	09
g) Evaluation Procedures	09
h) Validation of Curriculum Designs	09
i) Presentation on the ILO COOPNET Project	10
08. Action Planning	10
09. Reflections on The Seminar	11
10. Closing Session	16
11. Conclusions	16
12. Conclusions	



01. Background.

The need to organize training for trainers on curriculum development has been indicated when the ICAROAP undertook a survey of needs for networking in 1994. Many cooperative training institutions participated in the survey stated the lack of training facilities for such a training within the country, although training on learning methods are available.

The early approach to training in curriculum development conducted by the ICAROAP in late Seventies and early Eighties was on pedagogical and school oriented approach rather than catering to the needs for business training. However, there were no training organized in this particular field after 1982, although some models for developing field Education Programmes and member participation have been introduced.

In order to fulfill this need, the ICAROAP included the activity in the 1996 work plan. As the ILO COOPNET Project too is dealing with the same area, a discussion with the Regional Coordinator, Mr. K.K.Taimni, resulted in a collaboration in the activity. The ILO COOPNET Project collaborated with the ICAROAP financially and technically.

The Bangladesh National Cooperative Union (BJSU) undertook to host the activity. but at the eleventh hour declined due to an organizational crisis. When the National cooperative Council of Sri Lanka was approached for support, the NCC willingly undertook to host it. Due these problems the activity was scheduled for latter part of December in spite of the Christmas Holidays.

02. Objectives.

In keeping with the needs expressed by the training organizations, following objectives have been identified for the Seminar:

At the end of the Seminar, the participants should be able to:

- * Share the experiences of participating countries on the techniques of curriculum designing for cooperative training;
- * Analyse the logical steps of the systematic approach to curriculum development;
- * Conduct field studies on the performance analysis of cooperatives, which lead to identify performance gaps and the training needs;
- * Prepare and validate a curriculum design based on the systematic approach.

03. Seminar Strategy.

Earlier, the strategy followed in conducting curriculum development training has been class room oriented and based on case studies and group exercises. This strategy has its own limitations due to the fact that many trainers come from detached academic cooperative training institutions created by the history of cooperatives. Very rarely a cooperative business organization has a full

pledged training department or a training institution related to business. Class room based strategy reinforces the academic approach to developing curriculum which is not sufficiently deal with the performance problems of cooperative business. Therefore, the training activity becomes less cost effective due to the problem of lacking experience by the designers to undertake proper assessment of training needs based on performance gap of job holders. Another issue was the treatment of the design process as a static exercise, but not a continuing process with the organizational change.

In order to set the link between the business and the training component through combined approach to business performance and training processes, a strategy has been adopted to use systematic approach complemented by strategic planning and corporate goals as well as related manpower adjustment and redesigning job descriptions and specifications.

In order to provide a hands on practice dealing with an actual situation, the participants were exposed to undertake designing an actual curriculum supported by academic input and field work. They were required to undertake an actual performance analysis of two cooperatives and go through the process of creating a curriculum through step by step guidance by facilitators. They too had to undertake a validation exercise with the actual stake holders of the cooperatives in which they have undertaken the study.

This strategy held importance, considering the remarks made by the participants at the time of evaluating the curriculum development seminar.

The Seminar had several workshops: Introduction to systematic approach; review of country experiences; performance analysis; identification of training needs; performance and learning objectives; training strategies and designing; evaluation.

This process was supplemented by field work in Kolonnawa and Homagama Multi Purpose Cooperative Societies which are medium Scale cooperatives having about 300 employees each and 30 to 40 branch shops each. These cooperatives provided a good sample of manpower planning possibility too.

The two groups who went to two cooperatives undertook to analyse the overall performance of the cooperatives in terms of strategic plans and financial targets through the information received. As a skill practice they were asked to select three jobs for developing curricula. They were to be from three levels: Managerial, Supervisory, and Operational. Accordingly, the groups were again sub divided into six small groups for designing curricula. Throughout, group based activities were employed.

However, discussions on various individual and group based training methodologies were omitted from the programme, as it was assumed that the participants already possessed such experiences from earlier training. They were to select training strategies and methods and techniques by evaluating them in term of learning plans they were to create. The advertisement sent to training institutions was clear enough to send trainers who have sufficient experience using different training methods.

The programme followed appears as annexure 1.

04. Target Group.

The Seminar was aimed at senior trainers of the cooperative training institutions or the training departments of cooperative organizations who have had experience in participatory training methods and learning concepts, but did not have much experience in designing curricula. However, due to organizational problems faced by some institutions, we could not get a completely homogeneous group, but majority of them fit into the specifications. Following is the breakdown of various categories of participants:

- Participants who have had previous experience of Systematic approach to curriculum Development:	01
- Participants who have had some experience of curriculum development:	06
- Participants who have had experience in different methods of training:	14
- Participants who were new to the different training methods:	09

The situation of the participants has affected the areas of determining training strategies and methodologies, but, the group work in different jobs was able to provide an opportunity of learning from each other.

Another aspect was the number of participants. At the beginning, the expectation was 18 participants having equal number of male and female participants as per the notification. However, the demand was higher. Therefore, the number increased to 25 out of which 9 were females.

The list of participants appears in Annexure 2.

05. Physical Arrangements.

The Seminar was conducted at Hotel Holiday Inn, where the accommodation was also organized. The participants felt comfortable, although there had been certain complaints on the food being spicy.

The transport arrangements were made for field studies in two groups. In addition, a trip was arranged for the sight seeing in and around Kandy on 19th being a Sunday. As there was the Christmas day intervened on 25 December, special Christmas evening had to be arranged, respecting Christian participants who missed their important event with their families and friends. Their participation during this time showed the importance of the subject and the urgent need.

The NCC organized a reception and a dinner for the participants.

06. Facilitation.

As the Seminar was long enough and the time schedule for all days was from 09.00 hrs. to 17.30 hrs. the facilitation had to be divided.

Country presentations were chaired by selected participants themselves. Mr. Herath from the ICARAOAP facilitated the workshops on introduction to systematic approach for curriculum development, performance analysis, job analysis, need analysis and field assignments, action planning as well as validation. Dr. Sedere, an external consultant hired for the purpose, (who worked at University of Peradeniya, World Bank Project on Education in Bangladesh, and at present Regional Director for Planned International) facilitated the workshops on need analysis, training objectives, training strategies, session planning, and evaluation methods. Mr. K.K. Taimni, Regional Coordinator, ILO COOPNET Project, who arrived on 23 December, made a presentation on the Project and his experiences on the systematic approach to curriculum designing.

Mr. Madduma Banda, Director (Education and Training) NCC made arrangements to obtain performance reports of the two cooperatives and got them translated into English. He also helped in the preparation of materials.

Mr. Vinod Kumar, Consultant to The ILO on Small and Medium term Enterprises, Sri Lanka participated as an observer.

The presentations and the practical work on various technical areas were supplemented with learning materials extracted from several manuals by ILO Training Centre in Turin, FAO, and ICARAOAP, as well as extracts from authorities such as Bloom, Mager, IK Davis, etc. In regard to the career development issues, models of training systems, performance analysis, materials from on going SCC/NCC Project on Cooperative Training and former Teacher Training project have been used.

07. Proceedings of The Seminar.

a) Opening:

The Seminar was declared opened by Mr. S. Vithanage, Additional Secretary to The Ministry of Cooperatives. The gathering was addressed by Mr. G. Hettiarachchi, Commissioner of Cooperative Development, Mr. P. Hewagama, Vice President of the National Cooperative Council of Sri Lanka, Mr. B. Ostergard, Director, ILO, Colombo, and Mr. W.U. Herath, Regional Advisor, HRD, ICARAOAP.

b) Country Presentations:

Each country presented the country situation of the cooperative training system in general, and the approaches to curriculum development in particular. Some of the highlights in summary are as following:

India:

- India has an elaborate network of cooperative training institutions covering all the states and the national level.
- These institutions conduct long term as well as short term training programmes.
- The courses are designed at the request of the cooperative organizations.
- The methods used are: discussion, case studies, role plays, field visits and audio visuals.

China:

- The national cooperative training centre is under the All China Supply and Marketing Federation working specially on the training of members in various farming methods.
- training activities are designed on the basis of the requests made to the Institute.

Indonesia:

- Indonesia has cooperative training institutions in both sectors- government and cooperative sectors.
- Lapenkop, which is under the DEKOPIN, the national level cooperative organization mainly engages in member education and training of trainers.
- The Lapenkop has its own net work within the cooperative movement for the implementation of training activities.
- Lapenkop provides curriculum designing for member education activities.

Iran:

- Central Organization for Rural Cooperatives in Iran undertakes training of staff and members by itself.
- The focus of training is to coordinate the activities between the CORC and the member cooperatives and undertake research on organizational development.
- The regular training programmes conducted by the CORC are: training for chief executives of cooperatives, accountants, board of directors, sales staff, store keepers, and new cooperatives.
- The methods applied in training are: lectures, debates, discussion, symposium, distance learning, and field visits.
- The courses are developed by the CORC.

Republic of Korea:

- Training programmes in Korea are classified into two categories: Training for staff; and training for farmers.
- The NACF has one central training institute and five provincial training institutes, three leaders training institutes and agricultural junior college.
- The focus on farmers training is the spiritual vitalization and farm technology, while staff training has a bias towards management training.
- A recent development is to form learners groups among farmers.
- The training is provided in the class rooms as well as in the work place.

Myanmar:

- A policy has been in force since 1970 to recruit only trained staff for cooperatives.
- The cooperative schools have special emphasis on the theory and practice of cooperation, business management and economics.
- Curriculum development is undertaken by the trainers.
- Apart from the popular lecture method, group discussions, role plays, case studies, demonstrations, business games combined with written materials are used by the trainers.
- Pre course and post course evaluations are used.
- There is a national level policy making board for taking decisions on training programmes.

Philippines:

- MASS-SPECC Training Centre undertakes needs analysis for member cooperatives and curriculum designing.
- A research team is used for data collection, analysis, and report writing for developing curricula.
- A structured approach is used for curriculum designing.
- The common training programmes conducted are: participatory action research, Coop. pre member education, coop member refresher course, personal institutional value analysis, coop directors training, coop trainers training, strategic development planning, coop financing, financial management, basic cooperative management, leadership training, human resource system formulation, coop industry analysis etc.

Sri Lanka:

- Sri Lanka has a elaborate network of training institutes at the district level, provincial and national levels.
- The cooperative training system is integrated with the career development of cooperative employees.
- The curriculum designing is undertaken by a group of trainers using the systematic approach.
- There is a logical step by step training for operational, supervisory and managerial; level employees.
- There is a separate training institute for cooperative leaders.
- The training is combined with consultancy services.
- Credit cooperative movement has created a separate training institute which undertakes various training programmes for members and the leaders as well as staff of cooperative societies.

Thailand:

- The Cooperative League of Thailand (CLT) provides technical training covering management, credit, accounts etc. for board of directors.
- Cooperative staff training is a priority for CLT.
- Women and youth training activities are also undertaken.
- The cooperative promotion dept. has its own training institutes which caters to the needs of the officers as well as cooperative members.

c) Introduction to Systematic Approach for Curriculum Development.

The facilitator presented basic definitions of education, training, development, system, systems approach, and systematic approach in order to have a common understanding of the concepts. Systems theory was discussed in relation to management and training.

d) Performance Analysis:

The relationship between the performance of cooperatives and the training was discussed in relation to corporate planning process, goals, human resource planning, career planning and development of employees. Some models have been discussed with illustrations.

Another aspect discussed was the reactive and proactive routes for training designs. The present approaches of the traditional training institutions were matched and discussed.

The performance of a cooperative organization was defined in terms of organizational analysis, work behaviour analysis and job performers capability analysis. The steps to be undertaken for analysis were discussed. The identified needs have been grouped into organizational development needs and the training needs. For this purpose a matrix was used for classification.

The working formats have been given to the participants for discussion. The facilitator led a discussion on the steps of analysing performance results through the financial and other statements of the cooperatives and through observations and the interviews with the relevant personnel. Participants engaged in a discussion as to what strategies they could adopt to filter the information they receive.

During the next stage, participants undertook one day field work in two cooperative societies for performance analysis. Nine job holders and few board members as well as customers were also interviewed. The data collected was compared with the written documents of the cooperatives.

The workshop continued on the following day with analysing data using some work sheets designed for the purpose.

In addition, the participants had to undertake an exercise to prepare job descriptions and the specifications of 6 selected job holders as the duty lists provided by the cooperatives were incomplete.

During the next stage, the performance gaps were classified into important and unimportant categories for eliminating the marginal functions which do not affect the performance achievements in terms of targets under the strategic plans.

During the final stage, new performance objectives for selected job holders were prepared by the groups who interviewed personnel in cooperatives.

e) Training/Learning Objectives:

The facilitator undertook a discussion on the classification of learning objectives into three categories: cognitive, affective and psycho motor. He discussed as to how to convert performance objectives into training objectives. Main objectives were divided into specific objectives. The participants then undertook a group exercise on the process taking one job and few selected performance objectives due to the time constraint.

The groups presented their reports at a plenary and the objectives were refined after feed back. Measurement criterion for determining good objectives were used in the process. Participants had to undertake background reading overnight for the purpose.

f) Learning Strategies and Designing:

During the next workshop, the participants selected the contents for training and learning and also classified them into three categories of importance. During the discussions, three domains in relation to three types of objectives have been highlighted.

When the content determination was over, the possible learning strategies were discussed. They can come into the categories of on the job as well as off the job training. Some of the models discussed were: criterion reference instruction, programmed learning, distance learning.

When the learning strategies were discussed, the possible training/learning methods that can be engaged were described by the facilitator. This had to cut short due to the shortage of time.

Another area missed was the preparation of proper training guides with proper formats and content in them.

g) Evaluation Procedures:

The facilitator initiated a discussion on the types of evaluation on the trainees and training programmes. The conversion of training objectives into measurable terms and the measurement tools that can be used for the purpose have been discussed. However, there was hardly any time to undertake a comprehensive group work on the evaluation procedures for the training designs the participants created.

h) Validation of curriculum designs:

Participants undertook a validation exercise on the training designs they have created based on the studies in the cooperatives in the presence of the actual job holders and their supervisors. The chairpersons and the two general managers along with job holders and the supervisors of the two cooperatives gave their feed back on the presentations.

The presentations included revised job descriptions, reports on the performance problems and deficiencies, training objectives and training designs.

Participants have indicated that this is the first time they been experiencing the involvement of job holders and the others in the actual cooperative business organization in such an exercise.

i) Presentation on The ILO COOPNET Project and its experience on Curriculum Development:

Mr. K.K.Taimni, The Project Coordinator presented the background and the context in which the ILO COOPNET Project was formulated. He gave a profile of activities of the Project and the materials and publications produced. He indicated that the focus of the Project has got expanded to incorporate COOP REFORM activities during the second stage and the area too has been expanded to cover India, Indonesia, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, China, Thailand and Vietnam. He gave a clear explanation on the joint activities carried out with the ICA and other cooperative colleges and cooperative organizations.

He elaborated the activities on the development of training systems and capacity building of training institutions.

Coming back to the curriculum designing, he explained the process of systems approach to curriculum development with illustrations. Quoting from the previous workshops, he gave an alternative strategy of conducting the design exercise in a class room situation using case studies. Brief discussion followed.

08. Action Planning.

Towards the end of the Seminar the participants engaged in a action planning exercise using the experience from the Seminar. Summaries of the projects they would undertake in the future are as following:

<u>Name.</u>	<u>Project.</u>
01. KV Renuka Jeewanthi	Develop the HRD Unit by developing curricula scientifically.
02. Jaime P. Elemento	Training 20 trainers on curriculum development in 2 Universities.
03. KS Weerasena	Design a curriculum on productivity improvement in coops.
04. BH Pushpa Iranganee	Conducting a training programme on curriculum designing for trainers in cooperatives.
05. Daw Khyn Sann Yi	Prepare a curriculum for a graduate course.
06. K Elumalai	Conduct a programme on curriculum development
07. KG Bandula	Development of curriculum for cooperative employees.
08. Gumie D Pinkihan	Revising the existing designs using the experience
09. Mashaalah Ayazi	Prepare a curriculum for training of Board of Directors.
10. Lila Tohid	Prepare a curriculum for Board members of Women Cooperatives.
11. Paranjit Sharma	Prepare a curriculum design using the systematic approach.
12. Yuzri Suhud	Development of a training module for coop members.

13. U Myo Nyunt	Development of curriculum for management training course and a members education programme.
14. Julienne Marie L Dalangey	Trainers Training in curriculum development.
15. Hosseini Hossein	Training design for personnel of CORC network.
16. Medha Dubashi	Prepare a curriculum for training of women on coop practices.
17. Go Hynn Kim	Application of Systematic approach for new trainers training.
18. Wang Guozhong	To design a new curriculum for the trainees of the college.
19. Zhou Jialai	Develop a set of trainers on modern technology of curriculum designing.
20. Foura D Trisnasih	Prepare curricula for training members, facilitators, directors.
21. Ormuch Kunpai	Curriculum evaluation of the present courses.
22. Boon Piyachan	Curriculum training course for training officers of coops.

09. Reflections on the Seminar.

At the end of the Seminar, the participants evaluated the experience on a format supplied which all aspects of strategy, relevance, validity and content etc. (See annexure 3.) The summary is as following:

01. Do you think that the objectives of the Seminar have been achieved?

-Fully	09
-To a Greater Extent	08
-To a Certain Extent	06
-Not Achieved	00

Remarks:

- Very good curriculum development programme we have done. So, we got more exposure during my work.
- But too much lecture. Sometimes boring.
- We are from many kinds of training institutions- non formal and informal. It is better if every participant gives the real curriculum from their country.
- Some learning activities were not taken up due to time constraint.
- The programme contents were O.K. but the heterogeneity of the group and experience and selection of faculty hindered accomplishment of objectives. The efforts lacked cohesiveness.

02. What is your assessment about the strategy adopted to conduct the Seminar?

- Most appropriate	14
- Appropriate	09
- Not appropriate	00

Remarks:

- Strategy would have been appropriate in jobs similar to our organization.
- It was a good effort, but the trainees were not much aware of the exercises they were to follow. They should have been given opportunity to go back to the field situation and interview again, before final exercise and presentation. Nevertheless it was a good thinking to have a practical approach.
- Time for performance evaluation is taken into consideration for the purpose of curriculum. It is one method. There are other methods also we use for curriculum designing. Needy areas should be rightly understood.
- Most appropriate specially discussions(resource persons).
- Reading materials are very important for me.

03. Are the contents of the presentations relevant to curriculum designing and up to date?

- Very relevant and up to date	13
- Partly relevant and up to date	10
- Not relevant	00

Remarks:

- But too much lecture
- Contents based on specific objectives were not thoroughly discussed due to time constraints.
- Learning domains were thoroughly analysed.
- It has been very informative.
- We only prepared objectives and specific objectives. But it is required to prepare which type of methodology to be used.

04. What is your assessment of the facilitation of the Seminar?

- Excellent	10
- Good	12
- Fair	01

Remarks:

- It is flawless and every thing we need have been provided.
- The faculty selected for coverage of the contents could be the best, but the manner the contents covered were haphazard, un cohesive, lacked purpose. Perhaps that was the reason the objectives were not fully achieved. Time anticipation should have been made in advance.
- Proper consultations were requires. The lectures were given as they were not very required.
- Learning needs were met.
- I noted excellent because of the mastery of the subject matter. On the other hand, I rated good, because such mastery were not maximized due to time constraint.
- Don't be too fast talking. There is language trouble.
- Excellent. I got more experience from this programme.
- Since all the speakers are talented and have mastery on subject, bot on facilitating skills- more on visual aids usage is good- since the facilitator has used one or two methods, get more of the topics on methodologies.

- Some of the discussions are too theoretical.

05. Was the duration of the Seminar appropriate?

- | | |
|--------------|----|
| - Just right | 20 |
| - Too Short | 02 |
| - Too long | 01 |

Remarks:

- Too long for the whole training but short duration for some topics like job analysis and evaluation. If you could design one training for monitoring and evaluation or evaluation only.
- To come up with a standard evaluation form.
- Just right, but I like to get experience to prepare modules.
- The topics of the Seminar are too much.
- Integrating an exercise in a actual exposure to coops and relating it to the training technology needs ample time. I recommend to make it 15 days.
- Criterion evaluation methods etc. are very important.
- The time management was not appropriate. Duration could have been O.K. if both trainers and participants level of understanding synchronized and anticipated.
- As it is a new experience for me, I will need more time to adopt myself to become more familiar with these kind of programmes. I need more time to learn and study the reading materials I have received.

06. How much of the experiences is likely to be put into practice by you on your return to work?

- | | |
|------------------|----|
| - Fully | 06 |
| - Most of it | 14 |
| - Limited amount | 02 |
| - None | 02 |

* One abstained.

Remarks:

- I am only one of the supporting staff. So it will depend on mostly on the interest of the authorities in my country.
- It is a very good programme. It will help to prepare a good curriculum.
- It is a learning very adaptable.
- I plan to re echo this type of training to our affiliates in Mindanao, Philippines.
- Most of it because I work on this in my training centre.
- Most of it, but it will take me more exercise and more exposure on this before I can fully put into practice.

07. Were there any important aspects of curriculum designing emerging rom the Seminar? If any name them.

- Yes. Interviewing the job holders and designing curriculum.

- Planning, Designing, Execution, Monitoring and Evaluation.
- By interviewing job holders and identifying gaps.
- Job descriptions/analysis
- Job performance deficiency analysis
- Job tasks/revising performance objectives
- Training objectives/contents/methods/learning resources.
- Actual exposure to coops and trainees presence during presentations.
- Yes, development of job descriptions, specifications, analysis and formulation of training objectives, evaluation.
- Performance and needs analysis are important aspects of curriculum designing.
- Only performance evaluation method is taken for consideration. Other methods to be considered. The MPCs do not have strategic plans, hence performance was not recorded.
- Preparing job descriptions and finding performance gaps in a practical situation.
- Yes. logical sequencing in designing a curriculum.
- Before, we do curriculum designing based mostly on tailor made ones. But now we can improve on curriculum designing by making use of the new approaches we have learnt during the Seminar.

08. Were there any discussions included which were not essential to the Seminar? Name them.

- All the discussions are essential to the Seminar.
- All discussions are essential.
- Programme learning
- There was not much impetus on methodology participants followed in groups. Rather discussion of testing etc. was just irrelevant.
- All the discussions are most useful and relevant.
- All discussions were essential.
- All discussions were essential.
- If there were, it was very remote.
- Everything was essential.
- None. All focused on the scheduled activities.
- Some of the discussions are too theoretical.

09. How much were new ideas and methodologies presented and discussed during the Seminar?

- | | |
|------------------|----|
| - Completely new | 03 |
| - Many are new | 11 |
| - Some are new | 07 |
| - Nothing new | 01 |

* One abstained.

Remarks:

- The speakers had used their own methods, but it is not new to me since I had experienced those methods (lecture, workshops) but for the conduct of field study on performance analysis is a good method but it takes more time.

- Many are new, so, I can use these new ideas and methodologies in my own training programmes and at the training centre.
- Particularly on training objectives relating it to training contents.
- Comprehensive learning of training objectives.

10. How was the accommodation and venue of the Seminar?

- Very good
- It was excellent
- Excellent.
- good.
- Except food, rest were excellent.
- Good. but food was not very good.
- Excellent. Local support from NCC was very good.
- O.K.
- Very good.
- Good.
- Except food, the rest was excellent.
- Excellent.
- Excellent.
- Excellent. Congratulations to Mr. Herath and Mr. Nair for such accommodation. to say it excellent and thank you to NCC Mr. Banda and all officers and support staff-0 and thanks to ILO.
- Hotel- nice and good. Food (meal-lunch) not good. It is O.K. if the hotel not like Holiday Inn, but for food it is very important for health.
- Good.
- Hotel- very good; Food-fair; because different taste with my local food.
- Good.
- It is excellent.
- Very good.
- Good, but changing lecture rooms daily not welcome.
- Everything are good.

11. Any other remarks for improving the Seminar in the Future?

- Supply of study materials at least before the start of the class room exercises. It is better the course material are kept ready and handed over to the participants at the time of the enrolment.
- To use more visual aids to attract attention and for persons to learn other visual aids in conducting a training.
- On evaluation- for ICA to make another programme for evaluation since this is an interesting topic and evaluation is needed in any project undertaken.
- The speakers on training management are excellent talented and kind. Thank you and god bless you all.
- We hope follow up programme ICA is designing nearly for 1997.
- The big trouble besides the language is the background of participants. As far as I know to consist of several backgrounds, I think it is better if all of participants have the same background. For instance, all of participants have the trainer background.

- The participants have same background. e.g. all of them are trainers, education specialists, lecturers.
- If you plan to undertake another batch of training, please don't forget to invite me. may be it will be held in another country.
- Time management
- Using the curriculum strategies from other countries.
- More visits to cooperative societies.
- Supply of programme curriculum material before the start of the seminar.
- This should be continued, but there should be good coordinations.
- Group profile be assessed before training;
- Duration be fixed according to the level of the participants.
- Selection of faculty be need based not knowledge based.
- The study visit could follow after the main concepts and techniques are covered, so that while interviewing the relevant questions may be investigated.

10. Closing Session.

Mr. Elimento speaking on behalf of the participants, thanked the facilitators for providing them with new technology for curriculum development. He stated that this is the first time they were able to link curriculum with actual business situation and assess the needs. He also thanked the ILO for all the support provided. He made a special tribute to the NCC staff for their hospitality and assistance.

Mr. R.B. Rajaguru, Former Regional Director, ICAROAP, who was specially invited made a valedictory speech at the closing session. He emphasised the need to introduce new technology for cooperative training in the light of the on going market changes, and the need to prepare managers in the cooperatives to work independently without getting into the sickness of dependency syndrome.

Mr. Ostegard, the country director of the ILO, congratulated the participants for completing a successful seminar and wished them well on their way back home.

The participants were awarded with certificates by the President of the NCC.

11. Conclusion.

The Seminar on Curriculum tried to introduce a new approach to train trainers on the competency for curriculum designing taking an actual situation on the job basis, combined with the theoretical input. Many have appreciated the strategy and learnt the skill and build up confidence to work on it. However, from the feed back receive, it appears that some trainers believe that they do not need to know the performance analysis area, and rather respond to the needs expressed by the organizations. If the organizations do have a proper management audit and training departments, they will be able to handle the area of performance analysis and identifying gaps by themselves, but unfortunately, it is not the case in the Region. Driven by a dilemma to make training effective and result oriented, the trainers have deal with the performance of cooperatives closely if they are to develop a need based curriculum.

Some participants expressed the need to discuss more on evaluation methods, which is an essential feature of a curriculum. This aspect could not be handled in depth at the Seminar due to time constraint. It is therefore necessary to organize a separate 2-3 day workshop on the evaluation methods, once the participants have finalised the curricula they have undertaken in the action planning session. Otherwise, it can be an extended activity with another seminar on curriculum development accommodating previous participants for that workshop only.

The comments made by participants on early distribution of reading material are valid and has to be kept in mind during next seminars. There had been an organizational problem to get them in time.

Being the first Seminar on these aspects, it is true that some areas such as drafting proper session guides with predetermined formats and the evaluation aspects have not been adequately covered. This has to be rectified in the next programme.

Although some participants have expressed the need to go into training methodologies in detail, it may not be possible to run a training on these subjects. Rather, we could introduce a session on how to select training methods based on an identified training strategy, by using the research literature on the properties of various methodologies. Even if the trainees in this programme aspect that many such methods to be used in the Seminar itself, it is necessary to consider the cognitive aspect of the subject combined with skill practice rather than engage in inappropriate techniques for the sake of techniques. The Seminar used the criterion reference method in a slightly modified form in order to ensure the participants will individually get proper understanding of concepts and get skill practice. However, it may be necessary to see whether some modifications are necessary in order to make the programme more interesting.

Heterogeneity of the participants group could not be avoided in spite of the conditions laid down in the notice, in order to provide some countries opportunities to participate in the field so that at least they will try follow up when they get back. Some countries such as Iran do not have separate training institutions too. In the future programmes, this aspect has to be closely considered.

**ICA/ILO COOPNET/NCC Regional Seminar
on Curriculum Development for Co-operative Training
Colombo, Sri Lanka
17-28 December, 1996**

1. OBJECTIVES

At the end of the Seminar, the participants should be able to:

- i. Share the experiences of participating countries on the techniques of curriculum design for co-operative training;
- ii. Analyse the logical steps of the systematic approach to curriculum development;
- iii. Conduct field studies on the Performance Analysis of Co-operatives, which lead to identifying gaps in training;
- iv. Prepare Curriculum Designs based on the systematic approach.

2. PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

China
India
Indonesia
Iran
Rep. of Korea
Myanmar
Philippines
Sri Lanka

3. FACILITATION

Facilitators from:

- ICA ROAP
- ILO COOPNET
- PLANNERS INTERNATIONAL

4. PROGRAMME

Attached.

ICA ROAP/ILO COOPNET REGIONAL SEMINAR
ON CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN CO-OPERATIVES
Hotel Holiday Inn, Colombo 02, Sri Lanka
17-28 December, 1996

SCHEDULE OF PROGRAMME

16 Dec.	Arrival
17 Dec.	08.30-09.00 Registration
	09.00-10.00 Inauguration
	10.00-10.30 Tea Break
	10.30-13.00 Country Presentations
	13.00-14.30 Lunch
	14.30-16.00 Country Presentations continued
	16.00-16.30 Tea Break
	16.30-17.30 Country Presentations continued
18 Dec.	09.00-10.30 Corporate Planning and Human Resource Development
	10.30-11.00 Tea Break
	11.00-13.00 Introduction to Systematic Approach to Curriculum Development
	13.00-14.00 Lunch
	14.00-15.30 Discussion on Performance Analysis
	15.30-16.00 Tea Break
	16.00-17.30 Performance Analysis continued
19 Dec.	Visit to Co-operatives for Practical Assignments (in different groups) - To depart hotel at 08.30 hrs.

20 Dec.	09.00-10.30	Job Descriptions and Specifications
	10.30-11.00	Tea Break
	11.00-13.00	Practical assignments on Job Analysis
	13.00-14.00	Lunch
	14.00-15.30	Practical Assignments continued
	15.30-16.00	Tea Break
	14.00-15.30	Practical Assignments continued
21 Dec.	09.00-10.30	Identifying Training Needstion to curriculum analysis
	10.30-11.00	Tea Break
	11.00-13.00	Need Analysis
	13.00-14.00	Lunch
	14.00-15.30	Writing Performance and Training/Learning Objectives.
	15.30-16.00	Tea Break
	16.00-17.30	Target Group Analysis
22 Dec.		Study tour for the participants.
23 Dec.	09.00-10.30	Selecting appropriate training/learning strategies
	10.30-11.00	Tea Break
	11.00-13.00	Selecting appropriate training methods and techniques.
	13.00-14.00	Lunch
	14.00-15.30	Selecting training methods and techniques continued
	15.30-16.00	Tea Break
	16.00-17.30	Preparation of session plans and guides

- 24 Dec. 09.00-10.30 Preparation of Sessions Plans and guides continued
- 10.30-11.00 Tea Break
- 11.00-13.00 Preparation of Sessions Plans and guides continued
- 13.00-14.00 Lunch
- 14.00-15.30 Developing trainers evaluation criteria/measures
- 15.30-16.00 Tea Break
- 16.00-17.30 Developing evaluation criteria continued.
- 25 Dec. Holiday.
- 26 Dec. 09.00-10.30 Practical work on training evaluation criteria/measures
- 10.30-11.00 Tea Break
- 11.00-13.00 Practical work on trainees evaluation criteria/measures continued
- 13.00-14.00 Lunch
- 14.00-15.30 Formative Validation
- 15.30-16.00 Tea Break
- 16.00-17.30 Discussion on Summative Validation
- 27 Dec. 09.00-10.30 Presentation of practical assignments to reference groups from co-operatives
- 10.30-11.00 Tea Break
- 11.00-13.00 Presentation continued
- 13.00-14.00 Lunch
- 14.00-15.30 Presentation continued
- 15.30-16.00 Tea Break
- 16.00-17.30 Evaluation of the Presentations

28 Dec. 09.00-10.30 Revision of curriculum designs and discussions
10.30-11.00 Tea Break
11.00-13.00 Reflections on the Seminar and Closing.
13.00-14.00 Lunch
Afternoon free

29 Dec. Departure to home countries.

List of Participants of the ICA/ILO Coopnet Seminar
on Curriculum Development for Co-operative Training
17-28 December, 1996, Colombo, Sri Lanka

Details of participants, their organisations, home and office
addresses with telephone numbers

1. Mr. Zhou Jialai
Department of Economics
Anhui Institute of Finance and Trade
No.243, Hongye Road, Bengbu City
Anhui, China
Tel. (0552)3111062, China 233041

2. Mr. Wang Ghu Zong
Trade Department
Shanxi Finance & Economic College
Taiyuan, China
Tel. (0351)4084064

Home: Wuchen Street
Middle School of Shanxi University
Taiyuan, China
0351-7956236

3. Mr. So-Hyun Kim
National Agricultural Co-op Federation
75, 1-ka, Chungjeong-ro, Jung-ku
Seoul, Rep. Of Korea
Tel. (82)2-397-5233

Home: Songpa-ku, Munjung-dong
Munjung Apt. 1-104
Seoul, Korea
Tel. (82)2-4000498

4. Mr. Jeong Ho Ha
National Agricultural Co-op Federation
75, 1-ka, Chungjeong-ro, Jung-ku
Seoul, Rep. Of Korea
Tel. (82)2-397-5233

Home: Mido Apt, 705-704, Banpo-Dong, Seocho-ku
Seoul, Rep. Of Korea.

5. Dr. (Ms.) Medha Dubhashi
Associate Professor
Vaikunth Mehta National Institute of Co-op Management
University Road
Pune 411 007, Maharashtra, India.

6. Dr. Elumalai
Professor
Vaikunth Mehta National Institute of Co-op Management
University Road
Pune 411 007, India
Tel. (91)212-327974

Home: Residential Complex Plot B
VAMNICOM, Pune 411 007, India
Tel. (91)212-327734

7. Mr. Paramjit Sharma
Principal
Institute of Co-operative Management
6, Mussorie Road
Rajpur 248 009, Dehradun, India
Tel.(91)135-684272

Home: 4, Mussorie Road
Rajpur 248009, Dehradun, India
Tel.(91)135-684274

8. Mr. Jaime P. Elemento
MASS-SPEC Co-operative Development Center
TIANO/PACANA Street, Cagayan de Oro City
Philippines
Tel.(63)8822-726514
Fax:(63)8822-725762

9. Ms. Ghumie D. Pinkihan
Girlscouts Office
Bulanao, Tabuk
Kalinga 3800, Philippines

Home: Kalinga Diner
National Highway
Poblacion, Tabuk, Kalinga 3800, Philippines.

10. M. Julienne M. L.Dalangey
Northern Luzon Federation of Co-ops
and Development Center (NORLU)
12, Bokawakan Road, Baguio City, Philippines
Tel. 0442-4662/444-2733

Home: 87, SLU/SVP Housing Project
New Site Bakakeng
Baguio City, Philippines.

11. Mr. Boon Piyachan
Co-operative League of Thailand
13, Pichai Road, Dusit
Bangkok 10300, Thailand
Tel. (66)2-699-3259/Fax: (66)2-241-1013

Home: 12/28, Roomsook1, Sukhabhibarn 3
Bueng Goom District
Bangkok 10240, Thailand
Tel. (66)2-3734885
12. Ms. Ornuch Kunpai
Co-operative League of Thailand
13, Pichai Road, Dusit
Bangkok 10300, Thailand
Tel. (66)2-699-3259/Fax: (66)2-241-1013

Home: 103/50, Phetkasem Road, Luksong
Nongkam
Bangkok 10160, Thailand
Tel. (66)2-454-2215
13. Ms. Foura D. Trisnasih
LAPENKOP DEKOPIN
Wisma INKUD, Jl.Kol.Ahmad Syam No.10
Jatinangor, Bandung 40600, Indonesia
Tel: (62)22-798-361; Fax: (66)22-798-362

Home: J. Kuningan Raya No.35
Bandung 40291, Indonesia
Tel.: (66)22-705561
15. Mr. Yuzri Suhud
LAPENKOP DEKOPIN
Wisma INKUD, Jl.Kol.Ahmad Syam No.10
Jatinangor, Bandung 40600, Indonesia
Tel: (62)22-798-361; Fax: (66)22-798-362

Home: Perumahan Pair Jati
Block E-IX, No.6, Ujungberun6
Bandung 40611, Indonesia
Tel.: (66)22-7810672
16. Mr. Hossen Hosseini
Central Organization for Rural Co-operatives of Iran
753, Valli-e-asr Avenue
Tehran, Iran
Tel. 895459

17. Mr. Mashallah Ayazi
Central Organization for Rural Co-operatives of Iran
753, Valli-e-asr Avenue
Tehran, Iran
Tel.891385/892396/890011-17

Home: Ghaytarieh Ketabi Street #29
Tehran, Iran
Tel.2230736

18. Ms. Layla Tohid
Women's Co-operative Unit
Central Organization for Rural Co-operatives of Iran
753, Valli-e-asr Avenue
Tehran, Iran
Tel. 890336

Home: Shahrak Gharb Salamate
Ghonoubi, 16 Metry Awal #20
Tehran, Iran
Tel: 8079281

19. U. Myo Nyunt
Staff Officer, Co-operative Department
Director General's Office
Ministry of Co-operatives
Yangon, Myanmar
Tel: (95)1-258618; Fax: (95)1-283063

Home: 719, Khina Shwewa Street
45 Ward
Dagon New Township
North Yangon, Myanmar

20. Daw Khyn Sann Yi
Superintendent
Co-operative Department
Director General's Office
Ministry of Co-operatives
Yangon, Myanmar
Tel.(95)1-250618; Fax No.(95)1-283063
(95)1-250623 (Edu.Division)

Home: 302, Building No.2
Anawratha Housing Complex
Botahtaung Pagoda Road
Pazundaung
Yangon, Myanmar

21. Mr. P. Bandula
Lecturer, Co-operative Development Center
National Co-operative Council of Sri Lanka
147, Pettegalawatta
Galle, Sri Lanka
Tel. (94) 9-23198
- Home: Mahagedarawatta
Happawana, Wanchanela
Galle, Sri Lanka
22. Ms. Pushpa Inranganie Batagoda
Lecturer, Co-operative Regional Development Center
147, Pettigalawatta
Galle, Sri Lanka
Tel. (94) 9-23198
- Home: 'Sridhara', Walpala
Imaduwa, Sri Lanka
23. Ms. Jeewanthi Renuka
Lecturer
Sanasa Education Campus
Paragammana, Hettimulla
Sri Lanka
Tel. (94) 35-2869
- Home: No. 8, Gunanda Road
Talawakelle, Sri Lanka
24. Mr. K.S. Werasena
Consultant
Sri Lanka Institute of Co-operative Management
127, Grandpass Road
Colombo 14, Sri Lanka
25. Mr. Ranjit G. Jayatissa
Assistant Regional Manager
People's Bank
Regional Office (Colombo-Outer)
Nugegoda, Colombo, Sri Lanka
Tel. (94) 1-854189/825101
- Home: 7/11/C, Kapuwatta
Kapuwaita Road
Gangodawila, Nugegoda
Colombo, Sri Lanka
Tel. (94) 1-856890

**REFLECTIONS
ON THE
ICA ROAP/ILO-COOPNET/NCC REGIONAL SEMINAR ON
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR CO-OPERATIVE TRAINING
17-28 December, 1996 - Colombo, Sri Lanka**

01. Do you think that the objectives of the Seminar have been achieved?

Fully/To a Greater extent/To a Certain Extent/Not Achieved.

Any remarks:

02. What is your assessment about the strategy adopted to conduct the seminar? (Linking job performance in organizations with competency level of job holders; combining co-operative field work with reference groups from co-operatives for internal validation; using tools for group work with reading material)

Most appropriate/Appropriate/Not appropriate.

Any remarks:

03. Are the contents of the presentations relevant to curriculum designing and up-to-date?

Very relevant and up-to-date/Partly relevant and up-to-date/Not relevant.

Any remarks:

04. What is your assessment on facilitation of the Seminar?

Excellent/Good/Fair/Poor.

Any Remarks:

05. Was the duration of the Seminar appropriate?

Just Right/Too short/Too long

Any remarks:

06. How much of the experiences is likely to be put into practice by you on return to work?

Fully/Most of it/Limited amount/None.

Any remarks:

07. Were there any important aspects of curriculum designing from the Seminar? If any, name them?

08. Was there any discussions included which was not essential to the Seminar?
Name them.

09. How much were new ideas and methodologies presented and discussed during the seminar?

Completely new/many are new/some are new/nothing new.

Remarks:

10. How was the accommodation and venue of the Seminar?

11. Any other remarks for further improving the seminar in future?