

Firstly, I am annoyed that the government are reluctant to co-operate with teachers, with regard to the money needed to teach children. Teaching requires a lot of resources and many new materials, and I don't see why children's potential has to be repressed, through lack of capital (as well as the teacher!). Why many people revile teachers, merely through the amount of holidays offered, as well as short working hours, I don't know. They forget that no doubt much of a teacher's time is spent at meetings, at planning lessons, assessing, evaluating and marking children's work. It is a vocation which thus demands a somewhat dedicated, unselfish response. Teachers work (or should work) quite hard, and it is certainly not a routine job where that kind of employment money is put at a higher premium.

It is annoying that there is a constant lack of capital to resolve problems like falling rolls, staff cuts, resources, and strike action. Perhaps if the teachers were regularly examined - through various in-service schemes, and more attention and priority given to the development of each child's ability there would be more money expended in the right areas.

It's nice to know that more training is given to teachers and concentration is placed on developing various skills of teachers, e.g. integration. Perhaps in the future it won't be 50% of teachers which are supposedly proven to be 'inadequate' throughout the whole country.

I like the open-plan methods adopted in primary schools - no doubt it must give plenty of scope for the children to develop their interests through the senses, and through freedom of movement.

I don't like the new comprehensive systems brought out. I think the system could cause deterioration of standards - i.e. created through discipline, streaming examinations, and even options. I think maybe it depends to what extent should each child's education be considered, and would the ability of more capable children be repressed or undermined. Are equal opportunities offered?