Effective tutor training as a prerequisite for successful in service teacher training
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Abstract

Since 1998 a new education dispensation has systematically been introduced into South African schools. This new system requires teachers to follow new approaches to planning, teaching and assessment. Teachers have been overwhelmed with all the new jargon and knowledge, and many teachers feel that they are ill prepared for this paradigm shift.

The National Department of Education (NDE) has decided to retrain all teachers. The Gauteng Department of Education (GDE) has decided to contract higher education institutions (HEIs) to do the in service training. To UNISA (an HEI) the biggest challenge has been to identify and train tutors. This study aims to determine whether the initial training of the tutors and their preparation for the in service training of teachers with regard to the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) have prepared them sufficiently for the training of the teachers.

We believe that effective tutor training is essential for successful in service training. In the recommendations, an in service training model is presented to illustrate the above statement.

‘The tutor knew exactly what to do and how to interact with us. The session was perfect, understandable, to the point. BRAVO TO THE TUTOR.’ (Anonymous teacher)

BACKGROUND

Since the advent of a political democracy in South Africa in 1994, a number of changes have taken place in various facets of society, not least in education. Under apartheid, South Africa had 19 different education departments separated according to race, geography and ideology. Lifelong learning through a national curriculum framework (1996) was the first major curriculum statement in democratic South Africa. This National Curriculum Framework was informed

Curriculum 2005 was not implemented without problems. It was criticised by educators, parents, unions and the wider public. A curriculum review committee was commissioned in 2000. In 2002 the review committee chaired by Prof Linda Chisholm published their findings in *A South African curriculum for the twenty-first century: report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005*. The committee supported the curriculum and outcomes-based education in principle. They described Curriculum 2005 as ‘. . . probably the most significant curriculum reform in South African education of the last century. Deliberately intended to simultaneously overturn the legacy of apartheid education and catapult South Africa into the 21st century, it was an innovation that was both bold and revolutionary in the magnitude of its conception’ (National Department of Education 2000, 1). The report also contained the following recommendations:

- streamlining the design features of C2005 by reducing the curriculum design features from eight to three, namely critical and developmental outcomes, learning outcomes and assessment standards simplifying the language (removing jargon)
- clearly linking the curriculum with assessment
- clearly expressing what knowledge, skills, values and attitudes were required of the learners
- promoting the sequence, progression and pace of teaching and learning
- specifying learning outcomes and assessment standards by grade
- clearly outlining the principles and procedures for integration
- improving the quality, availability and usage of learning and support materials (LSMs)
- relaxing the time frames for implementation

(National Department of Education 2000, 18–22)

As the result of these recommendations the *Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS) for Grades R to 12* became policy in 2002. The RNCS is informed by the principles of outcomes-based education, and focuses on learner-centred teaching and the critical outcomes specified by the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). These requirements are formulated in terms of the learning outcomes and assessment standards in the curriculum statement, and explain the outcomes of each of the eight learning areas. The critical outcomes as well as the learning outcomes show that definite changes in teaching and learning are taking place at schools. The focus has shifted to the acquisition of skills instead of specific knowledge.
Teachers are now confronted with a paradigm shift that influences the way they teach and learners learn in the classroom. They feel threatened by all the new challenges and demands they are facing. They feel that they cannot implement the curriculum because they do not have the necessary knowledge and skills to achieve success (Vandeyar and Killen 2003, 119). The Review Committee on C2005 has also indicated that teachers’ inability to implement C2005 effectively causes great concern (National Department of Education 2000, 1–6). This new system requires teachers to adopt new approaches to teaching, learning and assessment in the classroom. Teachers need to change, and when the aim is to bring about change, it is clear that in-service training should be used to assist teachers in effecting the changes (Somers and Skirova 2002, 96). Ho and Yip (2003, 534) also point out that ‘the world in which teachers operate is changing rapidly, especially when entering the 21st century . . . Teachers need new skills and capabilities to respond to a wide range of demands from different perspectives of society, such as economic, social, educational, political, IT, etc. . . . Teachers’ need for in-service education becomes more urgent.’ Considering the demands of the National Curriculum in South Africa, one would agree that these teachers are in urgent need of in-service training.

The NDE has decided to retrain all teachers, and the GDE decided to contract higher education institutions (HEIs) to do the in-service teacher training.

DEFINING CONCEPTS

The following concepts used in this article need clarification:

- In this article the term teacher is used to refer to teachers in the classroom, heads of departments, deputy principals and principals who attended the in-service training.
- Mothata, Lemmer, Mda and Pretorius (2000, 174) define tutor ‘as an advisor to students’. Rowntree (1985, 152) says: ‘Instead of acting as the fountain of all wisdom on whom all eyes and ears are turned, (the tutor/facilitator) can become more a provoker of self-discovery and peer-teaching, in which attitudes are liable to change as well as cognitive understanding.’ The term tutor has been used by the NDE and the GDE during the training, and therefore signifies the same as facilitator in this article. Corsini (1999, 362) defines facilitator as a ‘person who helps a group to function better, come to agreements, settle differences’. In this study we use the term tutor to refer to a person who facilitates all teaching and learning during the in-service teacher training on the RNCS.
- In-service training (INSET) is also called personal development, staff development, career development or professional development (Garavan 1998). Professional development is defined as ‘a basic and necessary component of the continuing preparation of teachers, administrators and other staff as they extend their professional or technical knowledge’ (Orlich 1989, 1).
Mashile and Vakalisa (1999, 91) say that reform in education creates a need for specific training in order to implement new programmes, and that in-service training is the way to address this need. In-service training gives teachers the opportunity to discuss their problems with colleagues and to generate solutions to these problems. Cheronini, Zambelli and Boscolo (2002, 274) explain that teachers are professionals, therefore they should be afforded opportunities to reflect on their teaching practices. They should be encouraged to introduce new, effective teaching and learning practices into their classrooms. In-service training offer teachers an opportunity to investigate, analyse and think about real-life contexts, and to come up with practical ideas and solutions.

- According to Fraser (1994, 104) effectiveness ‘... is a measure of the match between stated goals and their achievement’. Erlendsson (2002) says effectiveness is ‘the extent to which objectives are met’. Wojtczak (2002) states that effectiveness is ‘(a) measure of the extent to which a specific intervention, procedure, regimen, or service, when deployed in the field in routine circumstances, does what it intended to do for a specified population’. In this project the envisaged outcome was to train tutors to become knowledgeable, motivated and competent facilitators of the in-service training of large numbers of teachers. Tutors’ facilitation skills were developed to ensure that they would be able to train teachers effectively and to empower them to implement the Revised National Curriculum Statement.

THE RNCS: A PARADIGM SHIFT IN THE CLASSROOM

As we have pointed out earlier, teachers are faced with radical changes in teaching and learning. In addition to the necessary skills, they need knowledge about the aspects below in order to implement the new curriculum successfully in their classrooms:

- **Outcomes-based education.** Outcomes-based education forms the foundation of the new curriculum in South Africa. It aims to enable all learners to achieve their maximum potential by setting outcomes that have to be achieved by the end of a specific process. It is therefore a way of teaching and learning which states beforehand what learners are expected to achieve (Kramer 1999, 1–5; Gauteng Department of Education 2004, 54). Teachers need to move away from the traditional aims-and-objectives approach to an outcomes-based approach, from being a traditional teacher to being a facilitator, and from a content-driven approach to a learner-centred approach.

- **Revised National Curriculum Statement Grades R-9.** The RNCS structure consists of five principles that underpin the curriculum, four OBE principles, eight learning areas, learning outcomes for each learning area, and assessment standards for each learning outcome and learning area statement. The curriculum outlines a new approach to learning programmes, work schedules and lesson plans. It also outlines what it expects from its learners and teachers.
Teachers, for example, have to be qualified, competent and dedicated, and they must fulfil the seven roles outlined in *Norms and Standards for Educators* (2002).

- **Language in Education Policy** (LiEP). South Africa has 11 official languages, therefore teachers need to understand and know how to implement this policy.
- **HIV/AIDS Policy**. According to this policy, all educators should be able to give guidance on HIV/AIDS.
- **White Paper 6 – Inclusion**. This policy allows more learners with barriers to learning (learners with special education needs) into mainstream education. Again, teachers need to know how to handle and teach these learners.
- **Religion and Education Policy**. Learners need to be informed about all religions in South Africa.
- **Assessment Policy**. The policy has been developed to align outcomes-based assessment practices with the new outcomes-based education. It helps to integrate teaching, learning and assessment into classroom practices. The policy defines assessment as the process of identifying, gathering and interpreting information about a learner’s achievement, as measured against nationally agreed outcomes for a particular phase of learning. It involves four steps: generating and collecting evidence of achievement, evaluating this evidence against the outcomes, recording the findings of this evaluation and using this information to assist the learner’s development and improve the process of learning and teaching’ (National Department of Education 2004). The policy provides guidelines on assessment strategies, assessment tools and the implementation of assessment in the classroom.
- **Manifesto on Values, Education and Democracy**. The manifesto outlines 10 fundamental values that are based on the Constitution and should be reflected in all school-based teaching, learning and practice. It also identifies 16 strategies for developing or enhancing democratic values in young South Africans (National Department of Education 2001).
- **New jargon**. A vast amount of new jargon needs to be learned by teachers. The new terminology includes learning outcome, assessment standards, school-based support team, baseline assessment, learning programme and articulation, etc.

The NDE realised that teachers needed in-service training and proceeded to make the following decisions: the training should take place during school holidays; 40 hours of training would be required; the different education departments should work with higher education institutions; and there should be quality control. The GDE then decided on the following aspects: what training material should be used; when the training would be done; who would attend the training and how they would be informed; and quality assurance. The GDE contracted four different higher education institutions (HIEs) to train teachers on its behalf. It was decided to outsource the training of teachers to these HEIs because
they had the necessary expertise and capacity to train adult learners. HEIs were
given responsibility for the following: identification and training of tutors;
development of material (with the proviso that it be approved by the GDE);
duplication of the approved material; arranging training venues; the actual training;
issuing attendance certificates; and quality assurance. What a challenge this was
for the HEIs!

The training of teachers presented the HEIs with many challenges. The main
challenge faced by UNISA was to identify and train the tutors. UNISA employed
only five lecturers for the foundation phase, but 45 tutors were needed. Moreover,
these tutors had to be familiar with each learning area and its classroom practice,
OBE, and the implementation of the RNCS and the policy documents. The project
leaders decided to contract teachers with knowledge of learning areas and
classroom practice experience, and to train them in OBE, the policy documents and
the implementation of the new curriculum.

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

This study aims to determine whether the initial training of the tutors and their
preparation for the in-service training of teachers with regard to the RNCS have
prepared them sufficiently for their training of the teachers. This article does not
focus on the actual training of teachers, but on the training of the tutors.

We believe that effective tutor training is essential for successful in-service
training. In the next section we will discuss a case study and present an in-service
training model to illustrate the above statement.

CASE STUDY

The case study below focuses on training provided by UNISA in Gauteng Districts
1, 3 and 4.

We started with training in the different phases of the RNCS in 2002. About 12
000 teachers have been trained over the past four years. The following training
process was followed to ensure that the training was effective and meaningful, and
that teachers would be able to implement the new curriculum successfully once the
training had been completed:

- Tutors were selected on the basis of certain criteria.
- A head tutor was appointed for every learning area. He or she acted as leader
  and was responsible for all communication between the project team (UNISA)
  and the tutors.
- Each tutor underwent intensive training in facilitation skills, the relevant policy
documents and training material.
- During the first training sessions, the tutors completed a SWOT analysis. The
  aim was to identify tutors’ individual strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and
threats to enable the facilitator to focus on their shortcomings or needs during the tutor training.

It should now be clear that the thorough training of tutors was a very high priority.

**Quality control**

Several quality control measures were used to ensure that the training would be meaningful and effective. The following measures were used in each training session in the past four years:

- The NDE sent a number of monitors to each training venue. These monitors remained at the venue for the full duration of the training and used specific monitoring instruments to assess the training.
- Monitors from the various districts attended classes for the duration of the training and assessed the training on behalf of the GDE with the aid of their own monitoring instruments.
- UNISA requested each teacher to complete a questionnaire after the training had been completed and used these questionnaires for quality control purposes.
- Each tutor was asked to complete a questionnaire to monitor tutors’ impressions, perceptions, and positive and negative experiences during training.
- The different monitors gave feedback on each learning area at the end of each day. Problems were solved during these feedback sessions.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Research design**

The project and subsequent research formed part of a project that was done in collaboration with the GDE. Since UNISA was one of the higher education institutions contracted by the GDE as service provider, it was not necessary to obtain additional permission for the undertaken research.

A quantitative research design and nomothetic approach were deemed most suitable for this empirical survey. This kind of research design maximises objectivity, enables the inclusion of a large group of participating respondents and can facilitate accurate responses (Olivier 2005, 349).

**Research instrument and sample**

Two questionnaires were used to assess the tutors’ effectiveness.

One questionnaire (Questionnaire A) was given to the teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of the whole process, the facilitation and the tutor’s competence. This entailed a quantitative survey that reflected the teachers’ assessment of the efficiency of both the tutor and the facilitation process. Since the data gained in this
way were structured by the researchers, there was also an open-ended question that
gave teachers an opportunity to comment on any aspect of the training. A second
questionnaire (Questionnaire B) was given to the tutors to afford them an
opportunity to comment on their positive and negative experiences. The purpose of
the questionnaires was twofold: firstly it served as a means of quality control and
secondly it determined the effectiveness of tutors. The questionnaires were
completed anonymously.

The same questionnaires were completed at the end of each week of training
since 2002. Since the results for the past four years were all very similar, we
decided to report only on the last training session (July 2005). Only the questions
that focus on the tutor are discussed in this article.

All the teachers who attended the training in July 2005 completed
Questionnaire A. One thousand four hundred and seven (1 407) questionnaires
were completed.

All the tutors for the specific training (a total of 40 tutors) completed
Questionnaire B.

**Discussion of the results**

**Questionnaire A**

**Table 1: Results of questions relating to the tutor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Only just</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Was the tutor well prepared?</td>
<td>N = 1 362</td>
<td>96,8%</td>
<td>N = 41</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did the tutor know the content, skills and values of the learning area?</td>
<td>N = 1 371</td>
<td>97,4%</td>
<td>N = 32</td>
<td>2,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Was the tutor able to guide you to prepare outcomes based integrated</td>
<td>N = 1 375</td>
<td>97,8%</td>
<td>N = 26</td>
<td>1,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning programmes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Was the tutor enthusiastic and a good communicator?</td>
<td>N = 1 382</td>
<td>98,2%</td>
<td>N = 25</td>
<td>1,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Did the tutor involve you in the learning process?</td>
<td>N = 1 381</td>
<td>98,9%</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
<td>1,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Were you able to ask the questions you wanted to ask?</td>
<td>N = 1 386</td>
<td>98,5%</td>
<td>N = 21</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Did the tutor provide answers to your questions?</td>
<td>N = 1 314</td>
<td>93,4%</td>
<td>N = 83</td>
<td>5,9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data in Table 1, teachers who had attended the 40-hour
workshop were mainly satisfied with the tutors’ preparation, their facilitation skills,
their knowledge of the content of learning areas and the help they had given to teachers in preparing outcomes-based learning programmes.

The tutors were perceived as very enthusiastic. They were regarded as good communicators. The tutors used their facilitation skills successfully to engage all teachers in the teaching and learning process. Although teachers were allowed to ask questions (98.5%), it seemed as if some of the tutors were not able to answer these questions to the teachers’ satisfaction. Possible reasons could be that the teachers often asked questions related to very particular needs in their school situation which were not directly linked to the policy, study material or general knowledge of the tutors. However, the majority of teachers still thought tutors were able to answer their questions satisfactorily (93.4%)

The teachers also had an opportunity to comment freely on any positive or negative aspects of the training. Teachers’ comments on tutors were overwhelmingly positive. Some of their comments are quoted below:

“...our tutor helped me to see the light, God bless...”

“Our tutor has a clear understanding of the work, and goes an extra mile in explaining the concepts.”

“I am not afraid of the RNCS any more, our tutor was fantastic.”

**Questionnaire B**

Table 2: Results of the tutor questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Only just</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did the tutor training prepare you for your role as facilitator? (Facilitation skills)</td>
<td>N = 40 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Did the tutor training prepare you to engage with the policies?</td>
<td>N = 38 95%</td>
<td>N = 2 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Was the tutor training in the learning area material sufficient? (Training by authors)</td>
<td>N = 32 80%</td>
<td>N = 6 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 2 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Did your head tutor assist you sufficiently in planning and preparing your learning area presentation?</td>
<td>N = 38 95%</td>
<td>N = 2 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 2 show that all tutors (100%) regarded their training in facilitation skills as sufficient, and thought that their training had helped them to facilitate the successful training of the teachers. This corresponds with the positive feedback from the teachers’ questionnaire (Table 1) and open question.

Only two tutors (or 5%) were uncertain about their knowledge of policy documents after the training had been concluded. Since the aim of the questionnaire had also been to identify areas where further tutor training was
required, all tutors were required to attend another training session on the implementation of policy documents. Teachers are not normally required to deal with policy documents and policy issues at school, therefore this aspect received extra attention during tutor training.

Only eight tutors (20%) criticised the training on learning area material. They felt that more should have been done and that the structure of the training should have been explained. They also pointed out errors in the training material. The criticism was mainly directed towards two specific learning areas. This tutor training was offered by the developers of the learning area material.

The tutors were very pleased with the guidance they had been given by the head tutors (95%). Some of their comments are quoted below:

“She was very supportive and helpful.”
“. . . supported us and guided us . . .”
“Excellent head tutor. Always shared his knowledge with the group!”
“. . . did more than was expected . . .”

The tutors also commented on the training during the 40-hour week. They commented on the teacher’s initial negative attitude, which changed over time and became more positive. The change in attitude contributed to better cooperation, and teachers engaged with the material and shared their knowledge and expertise with one another. One of the tutors wrote the following:

Teachers came unwillingly and negative, but their attitude changed within the first few hours. They contributed and shared from their own experiences, and left the session positive and with a lot of appreciation for the training.

Tutors also commented on the organising done by the UNISA project team before and during the contact sessions. They remarked that the training had equipped them with the knowledge and skills to motivate and change teachers’ attitudes, and helped them to gain knowledge and skills to implement the RNCS with confidence.

Most of the tutors enjoyed and appreciated the opportunity to be part of this in-service training, and felt that they had gained knowledge, skills and self-confidence in the process.

It is clear that sufficient training in facilitation skills and core knowledge of the learning area material are both crucial aspects for effective facilitation in the classroom.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

In the light of our experience over the past four years and the results of our empirical research, we make the following recommendations:

– Tutors should be selected according to certain selection criteria.
– Tutors need to be trained intensively.
– They need facilitation skills to enable them to train and motivate adult learners.
– Tutors require the knowledge and skills to implement OBE and the RNCS in the classroom during the training.
– They should have a sound knowledge of the policy documents, and in addition they need to demonstrate that they know how to implement the policy documents.
– They require experience in the specific learning area and phase, and they need to have a sound knowledge of classroom practice.
– They should use the new jargon with confidence.
– They need to be well prepared when they enter the classroom.

To implement the recommendations successfully, we have developed an in-service training model. This model focuses on the tutor. We have developed and used this model with great success during the past four years. An average of 98 per cent of all the teachers (12 000) were satisfied with the tutors and the training in general. Of the 2 per cent who were negative, 0,5 per cent were negative because they had attended OBE courses in the past and felt they did not gain from another session. The others (1,5%) indicated that they needed more training and suggested that the training be extended because they needed more information.

Next the in-service training model is discussed briefly.
This model can be used with confidence for any in-service training programme, and it can easily be adapted to suit the particular needs of other programmes.
STEP 1
The point of departure of an effective in-service training model is the selection of tutors according to set criteria. The most important criterion is that prospective tutors should be teachers. They should be employed as teachers and they should be learning area specialists (knowledgeable about their phase and learning area). At first we were not allowed to train teachers as tutors, but in time we convinced the GDE and the NDE of the importance and effectiveness of this criterion.

STEP 2
The first training consists of facilitation skills training. Tutors are equipped with hands-on activity-based training to empower them to train adult learners, and enable them to handle and motivate negative teachers who do not want to attend training sessions during holidays. These facilitation practices must also be reflected in the OBE classroom, in other words the teachers must apply these in their classroom practice. If teachers are taught in this manner and experience OBE methods first-hand, they can apply them when they return to their own classrooms.

STEP 3
The second training session focuses on the policy documents that underpin the National Curriculum Statement. Teachers do not often deal with these policy documents. In the past the GDE/NDE monitors criticised the fact that teachers knew very little about policies and the implementation and integration of policy documents. During the second training session we sensitise tutors to the different policy documents and they engage with the documents through hands-on activities.

STEP 4
After the first year, we realised that we should appoint head tutors in each learning area to take responsibility for the group involved in that particular learning area. We introduced this concept and these tutors received additional training. The NDE realised how important these head tutors were and asked other HEIs to follow suit. The NDE then provided extra training for all head tutors appointed by the different institutions.

STEP 5
All tutors are trained by the writers or developers of the learning area material to be used during the training of the teachers.

STEP 6
After their training has been completed, the head tutors and their groups start their learning area preparation. During these preparation sessions they discuss activities to be used, make transparencies and complete their training files. In this way they ensure uniformity in their preparation and the standard of training is set. Each group decides how many times they need to meet before the actual training starts.

STEP 7
During the actual week of training each tutor is allocated 30 to 40 teachers in a classroom. During their tea and lunch breaks the tutors sit together to discuss and solve problems, share information and make sure they keep the same pace. These discussions provide tutors with some security, because their needs or concerns are addressed in a safe environment. After each day they have time to meet with GDE and NDE monitors to reflect on the day’s proceedings. Any uncertainties, problems and additional information are dealt with during these meetings, and adjustments to material or other recommendations are disseminated for application the next day. These sessions are conducted in a spirit of cooperation and goodwill – no one is criticised and the atmosphere remains positive. It is also important that the project group (UNISA) is visible all the time. The tutors need to know that they are never on their own.

STEP 8
After the training has been completed, each teacher is asked to complete a questionnaire (Questionnaire A). The questionnaire focuses on the tutor, the study material and the programme. The information gathered with the aid of the questionnaire is used by UNISA for quality control purposes. We also use this information for the future selection and appointment of tutors. Negative responses to tutors are limited to one or two tutors who have not coped satisfactorily.

Figure 1: A tutor training model for effective in-service teacher training
CONCLUSION

The in-service training model implemented during the training enables tutors to meet the requirements listed below. All tutors should

- be able to inspire and motivate teachers (adult learners)
- be knowledgeable about policy documents and facilitation strategies
- be equipped with the necessary knowledge of the RNCS and be able to transfer this knowledge to teachers
- be able to utilise a variety of education techniques and strategies to involve teachers in exploring and applying knowledge
- be able to unlock teachers’ knowledge and skills
- be able to demonstrate facilitation and OBE techniques to teachers
- be able to communicate with teachers effectively and efficiently
- be able to monitor teachers’ progress to ensure that general and specific outcomes are achieved
- introduce effective, accurate assessment tools to teachers, and assist them in developing and implementing these tools
- manage and control classes efficiently at all times
- develop problem-solving skills
- be able to stimulate teachers’ creativity, communication, cross-curricular thinking, decision-making and higher order thought processes


In-service training gives teachers the opportunity to discuss their problems with colleagues and to find solutions to these problems. As Cheronini et al. (2002, 274) point out, teachers are professionals – they should be encouraged to reflect upon their teaching practices and to implement new, effective teaching and learning practices. The in-service training discussed here offers teachers the opportunity to investigate real-life contexts. During the training they are required to think about these contexts, to analyse them and to reach practical solutions that can be implemented in their classrooms.

This article has dealt with the question whether the initial training of tutors and their preparation for the in-service training of teachers with regard to the RNCS have prepared them sufficiently for the training of the teachers. We can answer the question with confidence: we believe that effective tutor training is essential for successful in-service training.

The study reported in this article focused only on the role and success of tutors in the in-service training of teachers with regard to the RNCS. However, it would be useful to measure the success of the training once the teachers start to implement the curriculum.
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