



Final Report of Project

Project No. : 2007/0752

Part A

Project Title: The Basic Law Education Project

Name of Organization/School: Centre for Governance and Citizenship, The Hong Kong Institute of Education

Project Period: From May/ 2009 (month/year) to December/ 2011 (month/year)

Part B

Please read the Guidelines to Completion of Final Report of Quality Education Fund Projects before completing this part of the report.

Please use separate A4-size sheets to provide an overall report with regard to the following aspects:

1. Attainment of objectives
2. Project impact on learning effectiveness, professional development and school development
3. Cost-effectiveness – a self-evaluation against clear indicators and measures
4. Deliverables and modes of dissemination; responses to dissemination
5. Activity list
6. Difficulties encountered and solutions adopted

*Name of Grantee: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

** Final Report of Project prior to the 8th call should be signed by the supervisor of the school/the head of the organization or the one who signed the Quality Education Fund Agreement for allocation of grant on behalf of the organization.*

** Final Report of Project under the 8th and subsequent calls should be submitted via "Electronic Project Management System" (EPMS). Once submitted, these reports are regarded as already endorsed by the supervisor of the school/the head of the organization or the one who signed the Quality Education Fund Agreement for allocation of grant on behalf of the organization.*

Guidelines to Completion of Final Report of Quality Education Fund Projects

Please elaborate the following items in your evaluation of the project. It is expected that the guide would provide a reference to the project leader/team in reflecting on the effectiveness of the project.

1. Attainment of Objectives

The following items should be included in the evaluation of the attainment of each of the project objectives stated in the project proposal (*the information may be presented in a table form in the format of Table 1 in this Annex or in short paragraphs*):

- objective statement
- activities related to the objective
- extent of attainment of the objective
- evidence or indicators of having achieved the objective
- reasons for not being able to achieve the objective, if applicable

2. Project Impact on

The project's effects on the learning effectiveness / professional development / school development should be evaluated, in evidence-based approach, with regard to:

- broadening students'/teachers' horizons
- increasing students'/teachers' sense of achievement
- fostering students' development in their potential and specific abilities
- training students to better meet social demands
- increasing training opportunities for teachers and enhancing their professional development
- improving learning atmosphere
- fostering team spirit and enhancing the overall image of the school
- inducing collaboration with other schools / professional organizations.

3. Cost-effectiveness

Grantees are required to complete the 'Budget Checklist' at Table 2 in this Annex and enclose it as an appendix of this report. Please adopt the classification of budget items in Schedule II of the Agreement.

The project's cost-effectiveness should be evaluated with regard to:

- utilization of available resources (e.g. equipment, human resources of applicant school/ participating school(s))
- unit cost for the direct beneficiaries
- sustainability of the learning programme and materials developed
- expenditure items which require no injection of resources when the project is replicated by other schools (including setup cost of the project, deliverables ready for use)
- alternative approaches for equivalent benefits at less cost

4. Deliverables and Modes of Dissemination

The following items should be included in the evaluation of each of the project deliverables and their value for dissemination (*the information may be presented in a table form in the format of Table 3 in this Annex*):

- description of the deliverable (e.g. type, title, quantity, etc.)
- evaluation of the quality and dissemination value of the deliverable

- the dissemination activities conducted (please state the date, mode, etc.) and the responses of the participants/recipients to such dissemination activities
- the value and feasibility for the deliverable to be widely disseminated by the QEF as well as suggested modes of dissemination.

A brief description of the elements/experiences contributing to the success of the project and feasibility of continuing the project should also be given.

5. Activity List

Particulars of activities conducted during the project period such as types of activities, brief descriptions of the activities, number of participants and feedback from participants should be reported (*the information may be presented in a table form in the format of Table 4 in this Annex or in short paragraphs*).

6. Difficulties Encountered and Solutions Adopted

The information here should explain why the actual project implementation (including the budget, schedule and process) differs from the original plan, if applicable.

Introduction

The Basic Law Education Project had been launched from May 2009 to December 2011. Eight partner schools,

had participated in the Project. The effectiveness of the project would be evaluated in the following sections, namely Attainment of Objectives, Project Impact, Cost-effectiveness, Deliverables and Modes of Dissemination, Activities Organized and Difficulties Encountered and Solutions Adopted.

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Project

1. Attainment of Objectives

The objectives of the Project were to 1) provide trainings to Liberal Studies (LS) teachers of the eight partner schools with necessary knowledge and pedagogy in teaching the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law related topics in the LS curriculum; 2) assist LS teachers in school-based curriculum development; 3) develop and maintain a web-based resource centre containing teaching kits, useful web links and relevant reference materials, etc; 4) construct instruments for measuring a) LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law and b) human rights friendly school ethos. For evaluation of attainment of objectives please refer to Table 1 below.

Table 1: Attainment of Objectives

Objective statement	Activities related to the objective	Extent of attainment of the objective	Evidence or indicators of having achieved the objective	Reasons for not being able to achieve the objective, if applicable
Provide trainings and assist in curriculum development (Objectives 1 and 2)	A. School-based curriculum development	62.4%	Proposed hours: 218 Actual completed: 136 - LSP: 37 - LSK: 8.5 - CCC: 25.5 - SM: 19.5 - CMT: 2 - MC: 15 - TKCH: 17.5 - YCM: 11	It was difficult to arrange for meetings with partner school teachers due to their tight schedules. And many of them did not provide us with as many teaching plans to comment as we originally expected.



	B. Teacher training—workshop for LS teachers	135.4%	Proposed hours: 144 Actual completed: 195 3 (hours per workshop) x 65 (teachers in total for 5 workshops) = 195	N/A
	B. Teacher training—whole school	35%	Proposed hours: 1,200 Actual completed: 420 SM: 3 (hours) x 60 (teachers) = 180 hours MC: 3 (hours) x 60 (teachers) = 180 hours CCC: 1 (hour) x 60 (teachers) = 60 hours	The team had made offer to every partner school for providing workshop for the whole school. Only 3 schools could arrange for the workshop on their staff development day. Other 5 schools could not do so due to other engagements.
	C1. Pre and post project interviews	175%	Proposed hours: 48 Actual completed: 84 - LSP: 12.5 - LSK: 3.5 - CCC: 15 - SM: 12.5 - CMT: 4 - MC: 4 - TKCH: 18.5 - YCM: 10	N/A
	C2. Interviews after each class observations	169.4%	Proposed hours: 36 Actual completed: 61 - LSP: 12 - LSK: 3 - CCC: 9	N/A

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SM: 9 - CMT: 6 - MC: 12 - TKCH: 7 - YCM: 3 	
	D. Sharing sessions in different schools	4.9%	<p>Proposed hours: 144 Actual completed: 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LSP: 0 - LSK: 0 - CCC: 0 - SM: 0 - CMT: 1 - MC: 1 - TKCH: 4 - YCM: 1 	Teachers were too busy to arrange for sharing sessions. And only very few teachers attended. We had sent the individual school reports to them through email.
	E. Seminars for teachers of all partner schools	142.7%	<p>Proposed hours: 144 Actual completed: 205.5</p> <p>Sharing seminar on 24 Apr = 3 (hours) x 46 (participants) = 138 hours</p> <p>Sharing seminar on 03 Dec = 1.5 (hours) x 45 (participants) = 67.5 hours</p>	N/A
	F. Dissemination seminar	22.5%	<p>Proposed hours: 300 Actual completed: Dissemination seminar on 03 Dec = 1.5 (hours) x 45 (participants) = 67.5 hours</p>	The number of participants attending the seminar was not as many as we had expected.
	G. Juvenile court visit (extra)	N/A	<p>Proposed hours: 0 Actual completed: 104.5</p> <p>5.5 (hours) x 19 (participants) = 104.5</p>	N/A
Develop web-based resource centre (Objective 3)		100%	<p>The following materials have been uploaded to the website:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 22 sets of materials from 	N/A



(b) Professional Development

The direct beneficiaries of the Project included LS teachers from all secondary schools. Our team had published a booklet “*Sharing of teaching and learning experiences: Teaching and learning of human rights education and the rule of law education*” (《基本法》教育計劃教與學分享——人權教育和法治教育的教與學) which contained workshop materials, teaching kits, glossary edited by the team, articles written by the team, survey instruments and reference materials etc which were ready for use in class or as reference materials (Please refer to Appendix 35 for the content page of the booklet). The booklet was distributed to all secondary schools. Moreover, the partner school teachers had extra gains from participating in the Project. Through attending our workshops, partner school teachers could learn more about the knowledge and pedagogy of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law, which they found it difficult to learn through other channels. They found the glossary our team prepared on the technical concepts related to the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law in the LS curriculum useful for clarifying their concepts. Teachers also mentioned that they could identify their areas of improvement through the class observations and post-class observation interviews with the team members. They could also be benefited from the comments on their teaching plans and materials by team members. Furthermore, the juvenile court visit activity organized by the team had broadened the participants’ horizon and enhanced their understanding of juvenile court procedure and knowledge relating to juvenile crime. For further details on impact on teachers’ professional development please refer to individual school reports, attached as Appendix 1 to 8.

(c) School Development

After we had commented on the teaching plans and materials of partner school teachers and receiving their permission, we would uploaded their teaching materials for sharing among partner schools. It created a platform for sharing teaching experience and materials for the teachers and encouraged inter-school collaboration among the partner schools. Moreover, through the meetings and discussions on knowledge and pedagogy of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law with the project team, partner school teachers were encouraged to work together with their fellow colleagues for revising and reflecting on their own teaching plans and those of their colleagues. It promoted a good atmosphere of learning and sharing among teachers. In addition, we also offered seminars and workshops to the partner schools on their staff development day, which allowed all teachers in the school to have a chance to learn more about legal knowledge which might arise in school context. It helped to enhance teachers’ understanding of potential legal liability in school and raise teachers’ awareness and concern about their legal responsibility towards students. The participation of the three partner schools in evaluating their human rights friendly schools ethos helped to identify their weaknesses and promote a rights-respecting atmosphere in their schools. Furthermore, this project helped to promote a culture of action research in school. As there were need assessment, pre-test and post-test interviews and class observations for teachers and pre-test and

			workshops; 2. 36 teaching kits shared by partner schools and the team; 3. Glossary of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law; 4. Booklet published; 5. 57 useful web links; Please refer to http://www.ied.edu.hk/basiclawedu/ for details.	
Construct instruments (Objective 4)	Instrument for measuring LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law	100%	Survey was conducted from May to Oct 2010. Please refer to Appendix 24 and 25 for the technical reports on data analysis.	N/A
	Instrument for evaluating human rights-friendly school ethos	100%	Survey was conducted in 3 partner schools. Please refer to Appendix 26, 27 and 28 for the technical reports.	N/A

2. Project Impact

(a) Learning Effectiveness

Though the direct targets of the present project were not students, they were also indirectly benefited from the improved knowledge and pedagogy of their teachers. The results of the pre-test and post-test questionnaires measuring students' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law manifested that most students had significant improvement in these areas after participating in this project. Though the improvement could not be attributed solely to the influence of the project, students did agree with the positive impact of the project. For details please refer to individual school reports, attached as Appendix 1 to 8.

post-test surveys for students, partner school teachers could experience action research through participating in this project. They may follow the model and establish other similar researches for their schools by themselves in the future. For further details on impact on school development please refer to individual school reports, attached as Appendix 1 to 8.

(d) Other Impact

The impact of the Project did not only confine to schools. It extended to other professional groups which are involved in legal education. For instance, the dissemination seminar attracted member from the Committee on Civic Education of the Bar Association and NGOs including Amnesty International and Human Rights Monitor to participate. They both shared that they had learnt a lot about the difficulties teachers and students had when teaching and studying the law related issues in the LS curriculum and reflected on what assistance NGOs could offer to LS teachers. Moreover, the article we had published in the February Issue of the *Hong Kong Lawyer*, the official journal of the Law Society of Hong Kong in 2012, had also aroused the attention of lawyers to the importance of legal education.

More encouragingly, the press release of the press conference held to disseminate the findings of the survey on LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law (for details of the press conference please refer to Appendixes 29 to 32) had caught attention of the international educators and academics. It facilitated discussions on mainly two issues, which were the debate between universality and particularity of human rights and the pedagogy in teaching human rights and the rule of law. It had provided a valuable opportunity for cooperation between international scholars and comparative studies. For details of their discussions please refer to Appendix 33.

3. Cost-effectiveness

The Project's cost-effectiveness was quite satisfactory. The unit cost for the direct beneficiaries was low. The booklet published by the Project (*Sharing of teaching and learning experiences: Teaching and learning of human rights education and the rule of law education*, 《基本法》教育計劃教與學分享——人權教育和法治教育的教與學) was delivered to all 460 secondary schools in Hong Kong and most of the materials in the website can be downloaded by the public. Assuming there were 5 Liberal Studies teachers in each secondary school, the total number of Liberal Studies teachers, which were the direct beneficiaries of the Project, was 2,300 (460 schools X 5 teachers per school). The unit cost was approximately \$518 (\$1,190,686.78/2,300) (Please refer to Table 2 below for details). The workshop materials, teaching kits, glossary, survey instruments and reference materials etc developed by the Project were sustainable. LS teachers can easily get the materials they need from the booklet and the website. As long as there are no large amendments to the LS syllabus, LS teachers can still use the materials from the booklet. If other schools want to replicate the Project, there would not be any expenditure items which require injection of resources except those miscellaneous ones such as photocopying cost, because all the workshop materials,

teaching kits, glossary, survey instruments and reference materials etc developed by the Project were ready for use.

Table 2: Budget Checklist

Budget Items <i>(Based on Schedule II of Agreement)</i>	Approved Budget (a)	Actual Expense (b)	Change [(b)-(a)]/(a) +/- %
Staff Cost	\$1,203,684.00	\$1,049,517.62	-12.81%
General Expenses	\$128,116.00	\$75,280.26	-41.24%
Equipment	\$8,500.00.00	\$4,930.00	-42.00%
Services	\$186,000.00	\$60,958.90	-67.23%
Total	\$1,526,300.00	\$1,190,686.78	-21.99%

4. Deliverables and Modes of Dissemination

The Project generated several valuable deliverables including the booklet, web-based resource centre, journal articles, reports and instruments and they were disseminated through a number of channels such as seminars and publications. For details please refer to Table 3 below. The knowledge and experience of the team members and consultants contributed largely to the success of the project. They produced reference materials such as teaching kits, glossary and articles relevant to the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law which are useful to LS teachers; they gave professional advice on teachers' curriculum design, teaching plans, teaching kits, pedagogy etc. Another critical element contributing to the success of the project was the enthusiasm of the teachers. They were eager for improving their knowledge and pedagogy through participating in the workshops and seminars, sending their curriculum design, teaching kits and plans for the team to commend, inviting the team to have meetings for lesson planning and class observations. Continuation of the project is feasible and worthwhile if funding is available. More schools and LS teachers can be benefited from workshops, class observations and evaluation of school ethos.



Table 3: Dissemination Value of Project Deliverables

Item description (e.g. type, title, quantity, etc.)	Evaluation of the quality and dissemination value of the item	Dissemination activities conducted (e.g. mode, date, etc.) and responses	Is it worthwhile and feasible for the item to be widely disseminated by the QEF? If yes, please suggest the mode(s) of dissemination.
Sharing seminar	Participants were satisfied with the sharing of the teaching and learning experiences by team members, LS teachers and students. Please refer to Appendix 21 for the survey report.	Held on 24 Apr 2010 from 09:45 to 12:45 at HKIEd Tai Po Campus. Please refer to Appendix 19 for details.	No.
Press conference	The media coverage of the press conference was wide. TVB News and 9 newspapers had reported on the issue. Please refer to Appendix 29 for the newspaper reports.	Held on 9 June 2011 from 11:00 to 12:00 at HKIEd Tai Po Campus. Please refer to Appendix 30, 31 and 32 for the press invitation, fact sheet, and press release respectively.	No.

Seminar on findings of the survey of LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law (extra)	The seminar facilitated knowledge transfer and provided a platform for discussion among academics, student teachers and NGOs.	Held on 27 Sep 2011 from 12:30 to 14:00 at HKIEd Tai Po Campus. Please refer to Appendix 34 for details.	No.
Sharing and dissemination seminar	Participants were satisfied with the sharing of the teaching and learning experiences by team members, LS teachers and students. Please refer to Appendix 22 for the survey report.	Held on 3 Dec 2011 from 9:00 to 12:30 at SCOPE of City University. Please refer to Appendix 20 for details.	No.

<p>Booklet: <i>Sharing of teaching and learning experiences: Teaching and learning of human rights education and the rule of law education</i> 《基本法》教育計劃教與學分享——人權教育和法治教育的教與學 (2,500 copies)</p>	<p>The booklet contains workshop materials, teaching kits, glossary, survey instruments and reference materials etc developed by the team which are useful to LS teachers.</p>	<p>Booklets published by the Project had been distributed to participants in sharing and dissemination seminar held on 3 Dec 2011. They were then mailed to all secondary schools and relevant government departments, tertiary institutions, libraries, NGOs, etc in Dec 2011. Please refer to Appendix 35 for the content page of the booklet.</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Web-based resource centre</p>	<p>The web-based resource centre contains workshop materials, teaching kits, glossary, reference materials and web links etc developed by the team which are useful to LS teachers.</p>	<p>All materials were put on the Project website for download. Please refer to http://www.ied.edu.hk/basiclawedu/ for details.</p>	<p>Yes. QEF may recommend the website to LS teachers, educators teaching relevant courses in tertiary institutions, relevant government departments, and NGOs.</p>

<p>Publication: journal articles</p>	<p><i>Intercultural Education</i> is a prestige journal which draws international readers. The findings from the Project can be shared both with local and international audience to facilitate further research.</p>	<p>An article entitled “Are Liberal Studies teachers ready to prepare human rights respecting students? A portrait of teachers’ attitudes towards human rights” will be published in <i>Intercultural Education</i> in late 2012.</p>	<p>No.</p>
	<p><i>Hong Kong Lawyer</i> is the official journal of the Law Society of Hong Kong. The article helped to raise the awareness of lawyers in Hong Kong to the issue of legal education.</p>	<p>An article entitled “The urgent need to develop rule of law education in Hong Kong was published in the form of a Letter to the Editor in the February Issue of the Hong Kong Lawyer in 2012.</p>	<p>No.</p>



Publication: Survey report on LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law	The report shares the findings of the survey which reveal the weaknesses of the LS teachers. It is useful to the LS teachers and teacher training institutions for identifying areas of improvements. Please refer to Appendix 9 for the survey report.	The Chinese version of the report was included in the booklet.	Yes. QEF may share the reports with LS teachers, teacher training institutions, relevant government departments and NGOs.
Publication: Reports on partner schools	The reports summarize the observations of the partner schools, teachers and students and the provide recommendations to teachers for improving their knowledge and pedagogy.	The reports were shared with the partner school teachers. Please refer to Appendix 1 to 8 for the reports.	No. As the partner schools may not want to share their reports with others because the reports may contain sensitive information.
Instrument for measuring LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law	The report helps to assess LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law and identify areas of improvements.	The questionnaire was included in the booklet. Please refer to Appendix 37 for the questionnaire.	Yes. QEF may recommend the instrument to schools, LS teachers, teacher training institutions, relevant government departments and NGOs.

Instrument for measuring human rights-friendly school ethos	The human rights friendly school ethos checklist helps schools to evaluate their school ethos and identify areas of improvements.	The questionnaire was included in the booklet. Please refer to Appendix 38 for the questionnaire.	Yes. QEF may recommend the instrument to schools, LS teachers, relevant government departments and NGOs.
---	---	---	--

5. Activities Organized

The Project had organized a number of activities to provide training and support to LS teachers and partner schools and to disseminate and share the project findings. For details please refer to Table 4 below.

Table 4: Activity List

Types of activities (e.g. seminar, performance, etc.)	Brief description (e.g. date, theme, venue, etc.)	No. of participants				Feedback from participants
		schools	teachers	students	others (Please specify)	
Seminar for teacher development day	Held on 10 Nov 2009 from 09:00 to 11:30 at Please refer to Appendix 16 for details.	1	Around 60	0	6 (team member)	N/A

Teacher training workshop (1)—human rights	Held on 14 Nov 2009 from 09:00 to 12:00 Please refer to Appendix 9 for details.	7	15	0	6 (team member)	The feedback showed that participants were satisfied with the seminar. Please refer to Appendix 11 for the survey report.
Teaching training workshop (2)—the rule of law	Held on 12 Dec 2009 from 09:00 to 12:00 Please refer to Appendix 9 for details.	5	15	0	9 (team member)	The feedback showed that participants were satisfied with the seminar. Please refer to Appendix 12 for the survey report.
Teaching training workshop (3)—pedagogy	Held on 12 Dec 2009 from 14:00 to 17:00 at Please refer to Appendix 9 for details.	5	13	0	8 (team member)	The feedback showed that participants were satisfied with the seminar. Please refer to Appendix 13 for the survey report.
Sharing seminar	Held on 24 Apr 2010 from 09:45 to 12:45 at Please refer to Appendix 19 for details.	17	23	13	7 (team member)	The feedback showed that participants were satisfied with the seminar. Please refer to Appendix 21 for the survey report.



Juvenile court visit (extra)	Held on 16 Jul 2010 from 09:30 to 13:00 at Kowloon City Magistrate Court Building. Debriefing and workshop held from 14:30 to 16:30. Please refer to Appendix 23 for details.	5	19	0	5 (team member)	N/A
Teacher training workshop (4)-knowledge	Held on 30 Oct 2010 from 09:30 to 12:30 at Please refer to Appendix 10 for details.	6	13	0	5 (team member)	The feedback showed that participants were satisfied with the seminar. Please refer to Appendix 14 for the survey report.
Teacher training workshop (5)-pedagogy	Held on 30 Oct 2010 from 14:00 to 17:00 at Please refer to Appendix 10 for details.	6	9	0	5 (team member)	The feedback showed that participants were satisfied with the seminar. Please refer to Appendix 15 for the survey report.

Seminar for teacher development day for Methodist College	Held on 05 Jan 2011 from 14:00 to 17:00 at Please refer to Appendix 17 for details.	1	Around 60	0	6 (team member)	N/A
Seminar for teacher development day for Cheng Chek Chee Secondary School	Held on 07 May 2011 from 09:00 to 10:00 at Please refer to Appendix 18 for details.	1	Around 60	0	2 (team member)	N/A
Press Conference (extra)	Held on 9 June 2011 from 11:00 to 12:00 at Please refer to Appendix 30, 31 and 32 for the press invitation, fact sheet and press release respectively.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	The media coverage of the press conference was wide. TVB News and 9 newspapers had reported on the issue. Please refer to Appendix 29 for the newspaper reports.

Seminar on findings of the survey of LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law (extra)	Held on 27 Sep 2011 from 12:30 to 14:00 at HKIEd Tai Po Campus. Please refer to Appendix 34 for details.	2	7	15	1 (NGO); 2 (team member)	N/A
Sharing and dissemination seminar	Held on 3 Dec 2011 from 9:00 to 12:30 at SCOPE of City University. Please refer to Appendix 20 for details.	6	6	33	5 (NGO) 1 (Bar Association) 3 (consultant) 6 (team member)	The feedback showed that participants were satisfied with the seminar. Please refer to Appendix 22 for details.

6. Difficulties Encountered and Solutions Adopted

The most difficult problem the team had encountered was the scheduling of class observations and other activities with the partner schools. As the teachers, especially the teachers of partner schools in the second phase, were too occupied, arranging class observations with them was difficult. Two of the partner schools in the second phase could only manage to arrange for class observations in April 2011, which was only 2 months before the end of the original project period (30 June 2011). Therefore, we were forced to ask for extension of project to 31 December 2011 which QEF kindly approved. The same reason could explain the inability to fulfill some of our proposed targets such as meetings for school-based curriculum development and teacher training for the whole school. In respect of this, we had switched the communication methods from meetings in person to communications through emails and phone calls if the teachers could not arrange for meetings. Moreover, after conducting the need assessment with partner schools, we learnt that their needs were slightly different from what we originally proposed. For instance, they preferred having more training workshops and class observations than meetings for school-based curriculum development. Therefore, we flexibly varied our plan a bit and provided the services that teachers needed the most. That could explain why we had put greater efforts into some activities such as teacher training workshops and class observations and less efforts into activities like meetings for school-based curriculum development than we had originally proposed.

Conclusion

To sum up, the Basic Law Education Project was a cost-effective and influential project. It has provided the LS teachers with a wide range of materials and activities including the booklet, web-based resource centre, workshops and seminars etc for enhancing their knowledge and pedagogy in teaching the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law related topics in the LS curriculum. Partner schools were also benefited from workshops on staff development day, evaluation of human rights friendly school ethos and the experience of action research. The findings of the surveys on LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law and the human rights friendly school ethos and the construction of the instruments had arouse attention from the media, academics and NGOs both locally and internationally.

If further funding is available, it is worthwhile to replicate and further develop the Project. First of all, more partner schools can be invited to join the Project so that the schools and the teachers can benefit from the training workshops, assistance in school-based curriculum development, feedback on class observations and teaching plans and evaluation of school ethos etc. The survey on LS teachers' attitudes towards and knowledge of the Basic Law, human rights and the rule of law can also be replicated for improving the instrument. In addition, the survey can even be extended to other populations, such as other groups of educators, students, people working for NGOs, social workers, and even government officials as human rights and the rule of law are the core values of Hong Kong. Thus it is important that people have a supportive attitudes and adequate knowledge of these two core values. Furthermore, if the Project has a chance to be continued, NGOs and other relevant associations such as the Bar Associations and the Law Society of Hong Kong can be involved. The Bar Associations and the Law Society of Hong Kong can offer seminars on legal knowledge to teachers and students and NGOs can offer seminars on issues they focus on which are relevant to human rights and the rule of law additionally provide relevant service-learning activities. International researchers can also be brought into the picture for comparative studies in order to learn from each other and find out the best practice.

