

## **An Evaluation of the Teachers Professional Development Programme under Canada Pakistan Basic Education Project**

Tahir Hussain Jafari\*

---

### **Abstract**

The present study was aimed to evaluate the impact of the professional development courses sponsored by Canadian international Development agency (CIDA) through Canada Pakistan Basic Education Project (CPBEP). The study was carried out in the Govt. Colleges of Elementary Teachers, Multan. These institutions were selected for the pilot project by CPBEP for professional growth of the teachers and for the uplift of the overall environment by facilitating, strengthen and providing necessities in the institutions.

The study was designed to assess the quality of training, the effectiveness of the courses, and the impact of courses on teacher's performance. It also finds out the impact of physical resources and to explore the implementation of the skills in teaching learning process. To evaluate the programme, a questionnaire was prepared for teachers who have attended the professional development course in the group of Educational Leadership and Management (ELM) or Computer assisted learning (CAL). All the teachers of CAL and ELM course were the sample of the study. The study revolved around establishing the impact of professional development courses and for this purpose the researcher personally administered all the questionnaires. The total number of study sample was 60 and 58 teachers responded positively.

The results showed that the Quality of training and quality of teaching provided by CPBEP was good and up to the mark. Teacher's opinion was that design, duration, content and workload of the course were suitable and relevant. They were encouraged and received timely feedback. They learned new ideas, skills and improved their teaching delivery. The material provided by CPBEP is useful for the institutions and accessible to all the faculty members. The teachers were agreed that the courses were closely linked with the objectives of the course.

---

\*Senior Subject Specialist, Govt. College for Elementary Teachers, Bosan Road Multan.

## **Introduction**

There is some ambiguity in terms of what we mean by professional development. For instance, sometimes we use the terms in-service, staff development, continuing education, training, and self-improvement interchangeably with professional development with little regard for any conceptual and/or practical differences. To address the challenges of teacher development, new strategies and methods must be explored. The World Education Forum held in Dakar, Senegal (UNESCO, 2002) stressed that information and communication technologies may play important role in teacher development. Capacity building measures adopted by Canada Pakistan Basic Education Project (CPBEP) under Canada International Development Authority (CIDA) in Pakistan is significant. It is providing an opportunity to future and existing teachers with access to enrich information resources, courses, tools, training programs, study tours in Pakistan and abroad (<http://www.unbf.ca/international/whatsnew.htm>, 2008).

It is usually regarded as an attempt on the part of teachers and external consultants to direct professional development efforts towards the identified needs of the school with the major goal of improving the quality of life within the classroom (Hopkins, 1986).

According to World Bank reports, in Pakistan and Bangladesh village adults who meet a minimum educational threshold double as primary school teachers to help with excessive enrollment demands. Teacher education is a part of the process of national political, social and economic development. Training of teachers is an indispensable part and a long-term investment by a country in its own economic prosperity (Sharpes, 1988).

### **CIDA and Govt. of Pakistan**

For over 50 years, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has been the channel for Canada's economic and social development assistance to Pakistan. CIDA works with the Government of Pakistan, the country's civil society and the private sector to respond to local initiatives aimed at reducing poverty in a sustainable manner, particularly towards development objectives that enhance democratic local governance, increase access to effective social services, specifically basic education & health/HIV/AIDS for poor women & girls and promote gender equality. These programming priorities reflect Canada's interest in seeing Pakistan meet its commitment to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), particularly

those related to Poverty reduction, Universal primary education, Gender equality and the empowering of women (<http://www.unbf.ca/international/whatsnew.htm>).

### **Canada – Pakistan Basic Education Project**

The Technical Cooperation Division of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada has been made aware of an opportunity for Canadian Education Experts with the Canada-Pakistan Basic Education Project, funded by CIDA. This initiative is currently being implemented by SEMIOTICS Consultants Ltd., one of the leading innovative research and consultancy firms in Pakistan. SEMIOTICS has a substantial history of working with Canadian organizations and international donors.

The Canada-Pakistan Basic Education Project seeks to improve the quality and delivery of basic education in Pakistan, especially for the female population, and to increase access to education by the poor. The project is expected to improve governance of education systems focusing on the district level, strengthen capacity at the provincial and district level to manage financial and human resources in education effectively, provide better trained and more effective primary teachers delivering quality education that meets the needs of students in participating districts, especially the needs of female students in marginalized communities (<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/pakistan-e>, 2008).

### **Statement of the Problem**

The present study aims to evaluate the professional development programme for Govt. Colleges of Elementary Teachers of Multan under Canada Pakistan Basic Education Project.

### **Objectives of the study**

The study was designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To assess the quality of training provided by CPBEP
2. To find out the physical resources provided by CPBEP
3. To evaluate the effectiveness of the teachers performance
4. To explore the implementation of the skills in teaching learning process

### **Significance of the study**

The study will be significant in the following terms:

- This may benefit the planners and administrators of education to improve teachers training.
- It may provide feedback to the CPBEP in the context of self- improvement.
- The study may help the educational management to explore the new venues for teacher training institutions.
- It may help teachers to understand the changing roles requirements for the new millennium.
- It may help to understand the sharing of resources, expertise and pooled wisdom through better coordination.
- It may help to understand the optimizing available resources with more efficient allocation.
- It may help to understand the better appraisal and monitoring of the capacity building measures for the faculty development.

### **Delimitations of the study**

Although, a large number of GCETs are working under the control of Punjab Government, however keeping in view the time constraints, the study was delimited to the GCETs (male and female) of district Multan and will appraise the midterm professional development programme of CPBEP.

### **Research Methodology**

The present study was to evaluate the impact of Capacity building measures adopted by Canada Pakistan Basic Education Project (CPBEP) under Canada International Development Authority (CIDA) in the GCETs of Multan. It was aimed to ascertain the future and existing teachers with access to enrich information resources, courses, tools, and training programs, study tours in Pakistan and abroad. The research methodology and procedures adopted for the study was as under:

### **Population**

All the teachers of GCETs of district Multan from Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) and Educational Leadership and Management (ELM) course and the teachers who have visited the foreign countries was the population of the study.

### **Sample**

The size of the population was small so all the members of population, which were 30 in numbers were taken as sample of the study. The sample comprised all the male and female teachers of the GCETs, who have trained by the CPBEP professional development courses.

### **Development of the Tool**

Questionnaire was prepared for collection of data from the teachers of GCETs of district Multan. Expert opinion of the supervisor was asked to improve and finalized the data collection instrument.

The items for the questionnaire were developed keeping in view various aspects of the professional development. At first 40 items were prepared and the final format of questionnaire for the teachers contained 23 statements. The questionnaire was designed on the basis of 5-point Likert's scale.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

The researcher administrated and collected the questionnaire personally. Total 30 questionnaires were distributed among the teachers of GCETs of Multan. The return ratio was quite encouraging as 28 questionnaires were returned.

### **Scoring Procedure**

Each questionnaire comprising of five options with maximum 5 and minimum one mark, the respondents ticked the box as per his/her own choice. The questionnaires so received were tabulated separately for each category. These were marked as per predetermined procedure. The scores were tabulated for convenient statistical treatment.

### **Analysis of Data**

As mentioned earlier, the purpose of the present study was to evaluate the impact of professional development courses conducted by Canada Pakistan Basic Education Project (CPBEP) under Canada International Development Authority (CIDA) in the GCETs of Multan. A questionnaire was developed and distributed among the teachers. The analysis of data is given as under:

**Table 1**  
*Quality of training*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
1	Quality of the training was up to the mark.	SA	06	21.42	4.00
		A	17	60.71	
		UD	04	14.28	
		DA	01	03.57	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.1 shows that 21.42% of the teachers strongly agreed, 60.71% agreed, 14.28% remained undecided, 3.57% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that quality of training was up to the mark. Mean score is 4.00.

**Table 2**  
*Duration of the course*

Sr.No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
2	Duration of the course was suitable.	SA	07	25.00	3.78
		A	11	39.28	
		UD	07	25.00	
		DA	03	10.71	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.2 shows that 25% of the teachers strongly agreed, 39.28% agreed, 25% remained undecided, 10.71% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that duration of the course was suitable. Mean score is 3.78.

**Table 3**  
*Importance of the course for the personal value*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
3	I learned something that will be of personal value to me.	SA	08	28.57	3.92
		A	11	39.28	
		UD	08	28.57	
		DA	01	03.57	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.3 shows that 28.57% of the teachers strongly agreed, 39.28. % Agreed, 28.57% remained undecided, 3.57% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that they learned something that will be of personal value to them. Mean score is 3.92.

**Table 4***Course design*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
4	Course was not well designed.	SA	02	07.14	3.50
		A	06	21.42	
		UD	05	17.85	
		DA	06	21.42	
		SDA	09	32.14	

Table 4.4 shows that 7.14% of the teachers strongly agreed, 21.42% agreed, 17.85% remained undecided, 21.42% disagreed and 32.14% strongly disagreed the statement that the course work was not well designed. Mean score is 3.50.

**Table 5***Quality of teaching*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
5	The quality of teaching in this course was good.	SA	08	28.57	3.89
		A	12	42.85	
		UD	06	21.42	
		DA	01	03.57	
		SDA	01	03.57	

Table 4.5 shows that 28.57% of the teachers strongly agreed, 42.85% agreed, 21.42% remained undecided, 3.57% disagreed and 3.57% strongly disagreed the statement that the quality of teaching in this course was good. Mean score is 3.89.

**Table 6***New skills*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
6	I learned new ideas and skills in this course.	SA	09	32.14	4.00
		A	12	42.85	
		UD	05	17.85	
		DA	02	07.14	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.6 shows that 32.14% of the teachers strongly agreed, 42.85% agreed, 17.85% remained undecided, 7.14% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that they learned new ideas and skills in this course. Mean score is 3.33.

**Table 7***Academic support*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses		%	Mean Score
7	I was provided academic support during the fieldwork.	SA	07	25.00	3.32
		A	11	39.28	
		UD	04	14.28	
		DA	05	17.85	
		SDA	01	03.57	

Table 4.7 shows that 25% of the teachers strongly agreed, 39.28% agreed, 14.28% remained undecided, 17.85% disagreed and 3.57% strongly disagreed the statement that they were provided academic support during the fieldwork. Mean score is 3.32.

**Table 8***Relationship of fieldwork with the course objectives*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses		%	Mean Score
8	The fieldwork component was not closely linked to the objectives of the course.	SA	01	03.57	3.46
		A	06	21.42	
		UD	06	21.42	
		DA	09	32.14	
		SDA	06	21.42	

Table 4.8 shows that 3.57% of the teachers strongly agreed, 21.42% agreed, 21.42% remained undecided, 32.14% disagreed and 21.42% strongly disagreed the statement that the fieldwork component was not closely linked to the objectives of the course. Mean score is 3.46.

**Table 9***Fieldwork contribution to the practical understanding*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses		%	Mean Score
9	The fieldwork contributed to my understanding of practical issues in educational settings.	SA	07	25.00	3.82
		A	11	39.29	
		UD	08	28.57	
		DA	02	07.14	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.9 shows that 25% of the teachers strongly agreed, 39.29% agreed, 28.57% remained undecided, 7.14% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that the fieldwork contributed to their understanding of practical issues in educational settings. Mean score is 3.17.



**Table 10***Usability of the physical resources*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
10	The provided resource material (computers, printers, photo state machine, fax machine, books are useful for my institution.	SA	07	25.00	3.67
		A	09	32.14	
		UD	08	28.57	
		DA	04	14.28	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.10 shows that 25% of the teachers strongly agreed, 32.14% agreed, 28.57% remained undecided, 14.28% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that the provided resource material are useful for their institution. Mean score is 3.67.

**Table 11***Quality of resources material*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
11	Quality of the resource material was good.	SA	04	14.28	3.67
		A	14	50.00	
		UD	07	25.00	
		DA	03	10.71	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.11 shows that 14.28% of the teachers strongly agreed, 50% agreed, 25% remained undecided, 10.71% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that quality of the resource material was good. Mean score is 3.67.

**Table 12***Course contribution in the development of mastery*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
12	The course assisted me in the development of mastery.	SA	06	21.42	3.96
		A	16	57.14	
		UD	05	17.85	
		DA	01	03.57	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.12 shows that 21.42% of the teachers strongly agreed, 57.14% agreed, 17.85% remained undecided, 3.57% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that the course assisted them in the development of mastery. Mean score is 3.96.

**Table 13***Improvement in the delivery of teaching*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
13	After completion of the course, I have improved my delivery.	SA	08	28.57	4.10
		A	16	57.14	
		UD	03	10.71	
		DA	01	03.57	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.13 shows that 28.57% of the teachers strongly agreed, 57.14% agreed, 10.71% remained undecided, 3.57% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that after completion the course they have improved their delivery. Mean score is 4.10.

**Table 14***Teacher's opinion about the workshops and the courses*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
14	The course and workshops were wastage of time and money.	SA	02	07.14	3.67
		A	03	10.71	
		UD	07	25.00	
		DA	06	21.42	
		SDA	10	35.71	

Table 4.14 shows that 7.14% of the teachers strongly agreed, 10.71% agreed, 25% remained undecided, 21.42% disagreed and 35.71% strongly disagreed the statement that the course and workshops were wastage of time. Mean score is 3.67.

**Table 15***Opinion about the foreign tours*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
15	Study tours abroad are fulfilling the objectives.	SA	08	28.57	3.75
		A	09	32.14	
		UD	08	28.57	
		DA	02	07.14	
		SDA	01	03.57	

Table 4.15 shows that 28.57% of the teachers strongly agreed, 32.14% agreed, 28.57% remained undecided, 7.14% disagreed and 3.57% strongly disagreed the statement that the study tours abroad are fulfilling the objectives. Mean score is 3.75.

**Table 16***Access to the resources*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
16	Resources are accessible to all the faculty members in the institution.	SA	05	17.85	3.60
		A	11	39.28	
		UD	09	32.14	
		DA	02	07.14	
		SDA	01	03.57	

Table 4.16 shows that 17.85% of the teachers strongly agreed, 39.28% agreed, 32.14% remained undecided, 7.14% disagreed and 3.57% strongly disagreed the statement that the resources are accessible to all the faculty members in the institution. Mean score is 3.60.

**Table 17***Content of the course*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
17	Content of the course was irrelevant.	SA	00	00.00	3.82
		A	06	21.42	
		UD	03	10.71	
		DA	09	32.14	
		SDA	10	35.71	

Table 4.17 shows that 0% of the teachers strongly agreed, 21.42% agreed, 10.71% remained undecided, and 32.14% disagreed and 35.71% strongly disagreed the statement that the content of the course was irrelevant. Mean score is 3.82.

**Table 18***Working conditions*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
18	I was encouraged to work cooperatively with my colleagues.	SA	07	25.00	3.96
		A	14	50.00	
		UD	06	21.42	
		DA	01	03.57	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.18 shows that 25% of the teachers strongly agreed, 50% agreed, 21.42% remained undecided, 3.57% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that they were encouraged to work cooperatively with their colleagues. Mean score is 3.96.

**Table 19***Opinion about the reflective practice*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
19	Reflective practice was encouraged during the course.	SA	08	28.57	4.17
		A	17	60.71	
		UD	03	10.71	
		DA	00	00.00	
		SDA	00	00.00	

Table 4.19 shows that 28.57% of the teachers strongly agreed, 60.71% agreed, 10.71% remained undecided, 0% disagreed and 0% strongly disagreed the statement that the reflective practice was encouraged during the course. Mean score is 4.17.

**Table 20***Workload of the course*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
20	The workload was not appropriate for the course.	SA	04	14.28	2.71
		A	07	25.00	
		UD	11	39.28	
		DA	05	17.80	
		SDA	01	03.57	

Table 4.20 shows that 14.28% of the teachers strongly agreed, 25% agreed, 39.28% remained undecided, 17.80% disagreed and 3.57% strongly disagreed the statement that the workload was not appropriate for the course. Mean score is 2.71.

**Table 21***Attitude of the course coordinators*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score	
21	I was treated fairly during the course.	SA	09	32.14	3.78
		A	10	35.70	
		UD	05	17.80	
		DA	02	07.14	
		SDA	02	07.14	

Table 4.21 shows that 32.14% of the teachers strongly agreed, 35.7% agreed, 17.80% remained undecided, 7.14% disagreed and 7.14% strongly disagreed the statement that they were treated fairly during the course. Mean score is 3.78.

**Table 22***Feedback*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score
22	I received useful and timely feedback during the course.	SA 08	28.57	3.92
		A 15	53.57	
		UD 02	07.14	
		DA 01	03.57	
		SDA 02	07.14	

Table 4.22 shows that 28.57% of the teachers strongly agreed, 53.57% agreed, 7.14% remained undecided, 3.57% disagreed and 7.14% strongly disagreed the statement that they received useful and timely feedback during the course. Mean score is 3.92.

**Table 23***Opinion about the encouragement to participate*

Sr. No	Statement	Responses	%	Mean Score
23	I was encouraged to actively participate in the course.	SA 07	25.00	3.92
		A 15	53.57	
		UD 04	14.28	
		DA 01	03.57	
		SDA 01	03.57	

Table 4.23 shows that 25% of the teachers strongly agreed, 53.57% agreed, 14.28% remained undecided, 3.57% disagreed and 3.57% strongly disagreed the statement that they were encouraged to actively participate in the course. Mean score is 3.92.

**Conclusions**

1. A great majority of the teachers were of the opinion that Quality of training and quality of teaching provided by CPBEP was good and up to the mark.
2. Majority of the teachers were of the opinion that duration, design, content and workload of the course was suitable and relevant.
3. A great majority of the teachers were of the opinion that they were encouraged to work cooperatively and the reflective practice was also encouraged. They received useful and timely feedback and were encouraged to actively participate in the course.
4. Majority of the teacher's were of the opinion that the workshop and courses were useful.

5. A great majority of the teacher's were of the opinion that they learned new ideas and skills, course assisted them in the development of mastery and they have improved their teaching delivery.
6. Majority of the teacher's were of the opinion that they learned new skills, new knowledge and the course was closely linked with the objectives of the course.
7. Majority of the teachers were of the opinion that the materials provided by CPBEP were useful for their institutions and quality of the material was good and these resources were accessible to all the faculty members.

### **Recommendations**

On the basis of findings and conclusions following recommendations are made:

1. The course work should design according to the needs of the teachers for their professional development.
2. The fieldwork component should be closely linked to the objectives of professional development courses.
3. Continuous professional development courses are essential for the teacher's professional growth and competencies and should be arranged at all levels.
4. A fresh inducted teacher or administrator before joining should be given a chance to attend a professional development course.
5. A comprehensive research should be conducted with a larger population, larger sample and more variables.

### **References**

- Bredeson, P. V. (2002), *Designs for learning: A new architecture for professional development in schools*, Thousand Oaks CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Bredeson, P. V. and Johansson, O. (2000), "The school principal's role in teacher professional development." *Journal of In-Service Education*.
- Canada's Commitment,(2008), Retrieved on September 14, 2008 <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/pakistan-e>.

- Casey, A. & Tobin, T. J. (2002), "Review of Professional Development Literature., Adult Education Quarterly", Retrieved November 27, 2008 from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/reports/enhancement/review.htm>
- CPBEP, (2008), Retrieved on September 14, 2008 from <http://www.unbf.ca/international/whatsnew.htm>
- TARGA Report, (2007), Draft Task and Resource Gap Analysis in TARGA
- Hopkins, D. (1986), In Service Training and Educational Development: An International Survey, London: Croom Helm Ltd.
- Marceau, G. (2003), "Professional Development in Adult Basic Education, New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education", Retrieved November 27, 2008 from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/reports/enhancement/review.htm>
- Sharpes, D. K. (1988), International Perspectives on Teacher Education, London: Routledge.
- Smiley, M. A. (1996). "From bureaucratic control to building human capital: The importance of teacher learning in education reform." Educational Researcher.
- Sparks, D. & Hirsch, S. (1997), A vision for staff development. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum development.
- UNESCO, (2002), The World Education Forum, Dakar: Senegal.
- Wlodkowski, R. J. (2003), New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, New York: Bacon
- <http://www.americanprofessor.org/documentation/2008/ciampainserra.doc> Retrieved November 29, 2008
- <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/professionaldevelopment> Retrieved November 22, 2008