

6.2. Implementation and Delivery

Figure 1 presents a typology of Project delivery models adopted by the seven participating jurisdictions. It also indicates where deliverers have been involved in the development of the content and pedagogies used. The darker green boxes in the Delivery columns indicate thoroughgoing adherence to a particular delivery mode while the lighter green boxes identify some engagement with a particular delivery mode. The darker green boxes in the Developmental Input columns indicate structured and systematic developmental input on the part of deliverers into program content and/or pedagogy, the lighter green boxes occasional, incidental or light input.

Figure 1. The Pillowcase Project Delivery and Development Models

	Staff/Volunteer-led Model		Team-led Model		Teacher-led Model	
	Delivery	Developmental Input	Delivery	Developmental Input	Delivery	Developmental Input
USA	Staff and volunteers				Some teacher-led initiatives	Teachers very much involved in Phase 1 curriculum development
Australia	Staff and volunteers					
Hong Kong	Mainly delivered by staff but also with volunteer delivery	Input into content and pedagogy at training sessions				
Mexico			University staff volunteers working with teachers			
Peru			Local volunteers working with teachers	Significant volunteer contribution to content/pedagogy		
UK					Teacher-led delivery after initial mixed teacher/direct delivery	Some teacher input into content and pedagogy
Vietnam	Staff and volunteers					

In the originating country, the United States of America, the Red Cross staff and volunteer delivery model has, until recently, been used throughout. The first regional pilots of teacher-led delivery have now been set in train. Australia chose to follow the staff and volunteer delivery model given the pilot nature of the Project, the easier measurability of results and the oft-repeated requests from teachers for Red Cross to do something in their schools. Teacher-led delivery is under contemplation as a possible future development. Hong Kong and Vietnam also adhered to the staff and volunteer delivery route. At the other end of the spectrum the UK Project team opted for exclusively teacher-led delivery after some initial and limited delivery by Red Cross educators. The teacher-led approach was seen as a 'scalable model'. Straddling the divide between

staff/volunteer delivery and teacher-led delivery are the Mexican and Peruvian Project teams that have designed team-led delivery approaches. In Mexico volunteer instructors from a partner university department join hands with host schoolteachers to deliver the Project. In Peru local volunteers working with local teachers deliver Project sessions, with some input from parents. In the two South American countries, structured input by volunteers into program content and learning activities employed is built into the Project development process. The only other example of such structured input is Hong Kong where volunteers in training have been regularly invited to feed ideas into course content. Elsewhere, volunteers, teachers and other stakeholders have fed ideas informally into the wash of program development and monitoring by Project teams but not through an intentionally structured feed-in mechanism.

There are upsides and downsides to all delivery models. Delivery by trained Red Cross staff and volunteers offers some guarantee of consistent content and evenness of delivery quality to schools. Delivery by trained Red Cross staff and volunteers also helps ensure a high profile for the Red Cross in schools, promotional potential that might be diminished through teacher delivery. On the other hand, teacher delivery allows for the flair, élan and inventiveness of the experienced and classroom-savvy teacher to be brought to bear and increases the likelihood that the lesson will be followed up on and reinforced in different curriculum areas. Such ingenuity enabled the international Project links pursued by teachers to become such an interesting and innovative feature of the United Kingdom experience. On the downside, however, is evidence from both Australia and the United Kingdom that, while they experienced a reasonable response rate, teachers are rather less than enamored with filling in evaluation forms, what a member of the British Pillowcase Project team calls their 'form intolerance', and that the teacher-led approach might suffer more in that regard as against having a staff member or volunteer tutor take away from school already completed feedback forms and questionnaires - with consequent impact upon the evaluation validity. Over time, there is also the danger of teacher fall-away from an exclusively teacher-delivered approach given the overcrowded curriculum and the multiple pressures on teacher time and energies. The question then arises, as discussed towards the close of the United Kingdom case study (pp.57-8), of how to periodically re-galvanize teacher commitment. The Mexican and Peruvian approach of teaming volunteers with teachers is potentially well placed to offset possible downsides of either exclusively staff/volunteer delivery or exclusively teacher-led delivery but it is not yet fully tested and may prove over-ambitious. Behind the staff/volunteer delivery model, the teacher-led model and the team-led models are particular conceptions of scalability and sustainability, an issue to which we will return later.

Recommendation 2: *The co-existence of alternative delivery models should be conveyed as a positive, with the potential pros and cons of different models laid out to enable national societies interested in adopting The Pillowcase Project to determine their own way forward; experimentation with hybridized delivery approaches should be especially welcomed and their scalability potential assessed.*

The original time allotted for The Pillowcase Project session in the United States (40-60 minutes) became an issue in some piloting jurisdictions. In Australia presentation time was extended to 60-80 minutes so as to free up space for quality interaction with students. The Hong Kong Pillowcase Project team came to see 60 minutes as the minimum time slot - a period of time that given the exigencies of school life reduced to 45 minutes causing staff and volunteers to condense and jettison what was planned. Volunteers in Hong Kong reported feeling sometimes overwhelmed by time pressures; also that pressure of time curtailed possibilities for child-centered learning. Their thinking is to negotiate longer school sessions significantly ahead of time so that available post-exam extra-curricular time can be exploited. In Peru the program has been timed at 45 minutes but 90 minutes is used if the time is available. The British Red Cross opted for two 40-minute sessions or one 80-minute session but encouraged teachers to utilize more time if they wished to widen and deepen learning (the average time used by teachers being, in fact, 122 minutes). The interface between time available and the child-centeredness of the learning will be returned to later.

Recommendation 3: *There is a case for designing and making available a range of standard Pillowcase Project programs calibrated to different spans of time (say, 60, 80, 100 and 120 minutes), the longer the time the greater the width and depth of the learning experience and also the learning objectives; the range of programs to include split-sessions, to be used, wherever viable, to give space for student internalization of learning and student home/peer sharing in the interim period.*

Scheduling of Project delivery proved problematic in both Australia and the United Kingdom occasioned by delays in pillowcase procurement.