An Assessment of Primary School Teachers’ Competences in Implementing the 2013 Revised Curriculum in Zambia: A Case Study of North Western Province

(Conference ID: CFP/666/2018)

Joshua Sakambuta\textsuperscript{1*}, Tresphord Musakanya, Sinda Vungi, Edina Lungu & Richard Magaisa.
, Solwezi College of Education, P.O. Box 110096, Solwezi, North-Western Province, Zambia.
Email: sakambutajoshua@yahoo.com

Corresponding author: Joshua Sakambuta\textsuperscript{2*}, Solwezi College of Education, P.O. Box 110096, Solwezi, North-Western Province, Zambia.

\textbf{STRAND ONE:}

Teacher Professional Development in Africa: Developing Knowledge, Skills, and Values in STEM learning/teaching engagements.

2. Teacher Professional Development for Competency Based Education

\textbf{STRAND TWO:}

\textit{STEM Curriculum Development Implementation and Assessment: From Theory to Innovations.}

2. Pre-service Teacher Development: Abilities, Skills and Values
ABSTRACT

There seemed to be a dart of knowledge by Colleges of Education in Zambia in general and Solwezi College of Education (SOCE) in particular in understanding how their products were fairing and the competence gaps they had in implementing the 2013 revised curriculum. This study assessed primary school teachers’ competences in implementing the revised curriculum in North Western Province of Zambia. The purpose of undertaking this assessment was to identify planning, methodological, assessment and knowledge gaps in teachers’ competencies in implementing the revised curriculum, in order to provide rightful interventions and also to inform practice in the College. These competencies were targeted as they were key effective curriculum implementation strategies. The study targeted former students of SOCE who were serving teachers in the schools within North-Western Province. A randomized cross-sectional survey design was employed. Document analysis, lesson observations, focused group discussions and interviews were used to obtain primary data in the field. Quantitative data were analyzed using Chi-square with the aid of statistical package for Social Sciences at (two tailed) 95 % level of significance. Qualitative data were analyzed according to themes and reported in percentages. Analysis of assessment items (tests) suggested that teachers lacked the competences for structuring acceptable assessment items. The main challenge was the lack of textbooks; particularly for Grades 4 and 7 to support the implementation of the revised curriculum. The main findings were that majority of the teachers did not have the rightful competences for implementing the 2013 revised curriculum. The study concluded that majority of the teachers did not possess the rightful competences, thus recommended that they be retrained in order re-sharpen their competences through continuing profession development (CPD).
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1. Introduction

Major reforms have characterized both the school and teacher education systems since 1964 in Zambia. At the school education level major reforms have been the change from primary and secondary education to basic and high school education in 2000; the change from basic education to primary education and high school to secondary school education in 2013. These changes at the school level of education triggered changes in teacher education as well. At the primary school level of teacher education the Zambia Teacher’s Primary Course (ZPC) was changed to Zambia Basic Education Teacher’s Course (ZBEC), then the Zambia Teacher Education Reform Programme (ZATERP) 1998 to 1999; which also gave way to Zambia Teacher Education Course (ZATEC) in 2000. In 2013 the Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) introduced the 2013 revised curriculum at school level with a pedagogic shift from positivist to constructivist approach of teaching and learning. This methodological paradigm shift and salaries harmonization issues necessitated the revision of the Teacher Education (TED) curriculum in Colleges of Education from ZATEC which was at Primary Teachers’ Certificate to Primary Teachers’ Diploma (PTD) in the same year. The PTD programme provides student teachers with an opportunity to acquire skills, values and positive attitudes useful for facilitating teaching and learning processes in the schools (MoGE, 2013). Its content and pedagogy are linked to the Primary School education curriculum. Student teachers following the PTD are adequately exposed to both the school content and pedagogy of delivering it to prospective learners whilst in college in order to strengthen the teacher training process and enable student teachers effectively implement the revised curriculum in primary schools. Assessment is focused on students showing how much they have acquired in terms of pedagogical knowledge and skills (MoGE, 2013: 2016). These reforms in primary teacher education were meant to respond to the changes in the primary school education curriculum and align primary school teacher training programmes to the school curriculum so that teachers had the necessary competences of teaching in the schools (MoGE, 2013: 2016; MoGE, 1996).

Based on these reforms in both primary school and teacher education curricular coupled with issues of salaries harmonization, the Ministry of General Education (MoGE) (then MESVTEE) phased out the ZATEC in 2013. This resulted in Primary School Teachers’ Colleges of Education countrywide to start providing teacher education at diploma level using the 2013 revised curriculum. In view of this, the Government further directed that all Primary School Teachers with Primary Teacher’s Certificate (PTC) needed to upgrade to PTD. To this effect all the Primary School Colleges of Education in Zambia started upgrading those with PTC to PTD. Solwezi College of Education (SOCE), for instance, has been training and upgrading primary school teachers in Zambia in general and North-western Province in particular since 1977. From the inception of the PTD in 2013, the college has produced 834 teachers in addition to the many teachers it has produced through ZPC, ZBEC, ZATERP and ZATEC most of whom are serving within the province. With the introduction of the 2013 primary school education curriculum all the primary school teachers whether trained during the ZPC, ZBEC, ZATEC or PTD are implanting it in the schools. Despite the large outputs of teachers from SOCE, the college is in dart of knowledge in understanding how its ‘mixture’ of teachers is fairing in teaching the revised curriculum in the schools. Yet such feedback is important
in informing and evaluating education outcomes and practice. Very little has been done to assess the teachers’ competence gaps if any to determine whether or not they have the rightful competences necessary for implementing the 2013 revised curriculum in the primary schools; amidst strong public perception that the teachers are half-baked (MoGE, 2016). There was therefore need to undertake this study to identify the gaps in order to provide rightful interventions. It is against this background and in this context; this comprehensive systematic assessment of teachers’ competencies in implementing the revised curriculum in primary schools in the Province was undertaken by the college. This study mainly focused on assessment of the teachers’ lesson planning, implementation, content and assessment competencies; and identifying the gaps in implementing the 2013 revised curriculum among primary school teachers from SOCE in Primary Schools in North-western Province.

2. Literature Review

This literature review details what has been done and clearly brings out the gaps that should be filled as detailed under the various headings below.

2.1 Zambia Education Curriculum

It is envisaged that the 2013 revised curriculum would equip learners at all levels of education with vital knowledge, skills and values that would be necessary for contributing to the development of society and the economy (MoGE, 2013). To realize this, the 2013 revised curriculum has been linked at all levels, from Early Childhood Education (ECE) to Tertiary Education and Adult Literacy (MoGE, 2013: 2016). The necessary career paths for learners have been provided. This it is assumed will accord learners an opportunity to progress according to their abilities and interests.

The 2013 Zambia Education Curriculum Framework (ZECF) is backed up by the Education Act No. 23 of 2011 which mandates the MoGE to be the custodian of quality education provision by ensuring that all providers adhere to the policy regulations and curriculum (Education Act No. 23 of 2011). Therefore, all learning institutions should have the ZECF and other important curriculum related documents and syllabi. This raises the challenge of access. It is not clear from the ZECF how the learning institutions would access those materials. But even here issues of quality are doubtful as it is not clear from the ZECF how teachers would be adequately trained (oriented) given that even some of those teachers who were trained by the old teacher courses at Certificate level will still have to teach the revised curriculum; also considering that curriculum supporting documents such as textbooks seem not to have been put in place prior to the implementation of the 2013 curriculum at all levels of learning. This could affect teachers’ competencies negatively.

2.2 Strategies aimed at sharpening Teachers’ Competences

Low learner achievements and poor quality at primary school education in Zambia have been observed and these have been attributed to among other factors half-baked teachers (MoGE 2016). MoGE (then MOE) contends that the outstanding achievement of teacher training colleges is that they have never failed to provide the country with a regular supply of qualified teachers, but have
been handicapped in the accomplishment of their mission by inability to bring the quality of their output to the level they would have desired (MOE (1996). The Teaching Profession Policy notes that in order to foster the quality and effectiveness of the education system, the MOE would promote the quality of individual teachers and of the teaching profession as a whole (MOE, 1996). In this regard a number of teachers’ education programmes have been implemented in the country with specific foci.

2.3 Curriculum Situational Analysis at Primary School and Teacher Education Levels

Since independence in 1964, the MoGE has undertaken three major education policy reforms in its quest to improve the quality of education provided to learners at different levels (MoGE, 2016). The Education Act of 1966 was meant to overhaul the whole education system in order to meet the aspirations of an independent African country (MoGE, 2016; MOE, 1996). The Act paved way to some reforms in Primary and Secondary Education which were aimed at standardizing and diversifying the curriculum, besides relating the content to the needs of the learners. At the primary school level, the Government introduced English Language as a Medium of Instruction from Grades 1 to 7 (MoGE, 2013: 2016). There was also the integration of some learning areas such as Homemcraft, Needlework and Hospitality as Home Economics; Carpentry and Joinery, Metal Work, Leather Work and Bricklaying to Industrial Arts, while Agricultural Science and Natural Science became General Science (MoGE, 2016). In addition Geography and History were integrated and offered as Social Studies (MoGE, 2013: 2016). At Teacher Education level, in 1966, the Government introduced the Zambia Primary Course (ZPC) whose focus was to develop competences in trainee teachers that would enable them teach all primary Grades, Grades 1 to 7. Besides, the ZPC imparted English Language skills to trainee teachers to enable them use English as a Medium of Instruction and communication in all the subjects (MoGE, 2013: 2016). The National In-service Teachers’ College (NISTCOL) played a pivotal role in retraining teachers in the ZPC. Before this reform, Primary School teachers were trained to teach either at Lower Primary or Upper Primary. The two courses were: 2 Year Lower Primary Teacher’s Course (L2) and 2 Year Upper Primary Teacher’s Course (U2) (MoGE, 2013: 2016). The ZPC ran from 1966 – 1990.

The Education Reform of 1977 brought further changes in education system. The Primary school and part of the Junior Secondary School Education (Forms 1 and 2) became basic School Education while the Senior Secondary Education and part of the Junior Secondary (Form 3) became High School Education (MoGE, 2013: 2016). Basic Education was to be completed in nine years; Grades 1 to 9; whereas High School education became a three year course; Grades 10 to 12 (MoGE, 2013: 2016).

At the Teacher Education level, the Zambia Primary Teachers’ Course (ZPC) was renamed Zambia Basic Education Teacher’s Course (ZBEC) in order to link it to the school course (MoGE, 2013: 2016). The curriculum for the ZBEC underpinned the importance of teaching survival and communication skills ((MoGE, 2013: 2016). Practical subjects such as Industrial Arts and Home Economics and Hospitality were revamped and communicative methodology became the main feature in the teaching and learning processes (MoGE, 2013: 2016). These reforms were
implemented in the middle of 1980s (MoGE, 2013: 2016). ZBEC was followed by Field-Based Teacher Training Approach (FIBATTA) (1997); which was implemented only for a term and failed at the implementation stage, then came the Zambia Teacher Education Reform Programme (ZATERP) from 1998 – 1999; which was a DANIDA / GRZ funded programme whose focus was curriculum strength; and was implemented on the assumption that learners had already the content from their secondary school education so they would do only one year in college and another one year in the field and then graduate. ZATERP worked on the principle that practice was better theory learner-centred. One of its strengths was that it was heavily supported with money and teaching and learning materials to support its implementation. ZATERP was piloted in three teacher education colleges namely; SOCE, Kitwe and Mufulira. Based on the National Policy on Education, Educating Our Future of 1996, the teacher Education Department in 2000 reformed the Zambia Basic Education Teacher’s Course to Zambia Teacher Education Course (ZATEC) and this followed a change in Teacher Education Curriculum (MoGE, 2013: 2016). The ZBEC consisted of a large number of separate subjects which had only few links. The subjects competed amongst each other creating both superficiality and overcrowding (MoGE, 2013: 2016). On the other hand ZATEC assumed that children do not view their life experience in neatly compartmentalized segments but rather holistic with no boundaries. In view of this idea, ZATEC adopted a concept of Study Areas in which subjects were grouped according to clearly definable relationships among them (MoGE, 2013: 2016). From 12 traditional subjects that ZBEC offered: English, Mathematics, Science, Home Economics and Hospitality, Physical Education, Spiritual and Moral Education, Education, Zambian Languages, ZATEC integrated them into six Study Areas (Literacy and Languages, Education, Mathematics and Science, Expressive Arts, Technology Studies and Social, Spiritual and Moral Education) (MoGE, 2013: 2016). According to ZATEC, students spent one year in college and the other year in the school. The one year School Experience was meant to give student teachers enough practice in their training and at the same time increase the number of teachers, and subsequently reduce the number of untrained teachers in Basic Schools(MoGE,2013: 2016). ZATEC ran from 2000 to 2013.

In the same year, 2000, the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) also embarked on the school curriculum review starting with the Lower and Middle Basic Education (Grades 1 to 7) (MoGE, 2013:2016). The purpose of this review was to link the school curriculum to Teacher Education (MoGE, 2013:2016). Specifically, the review that commenced in 2000 was meant to re-define the desired learner, the teacher-educator/instructor and the teaching/learning outcomes so as to make education relevant and responsive to the individual and society (MoGE, 2013: 2016). In order to respond to the developmental needs of the nation such as those of becoming a middle income economy by 2030 as well as those of the individual learners a number of plans have been developed. In 2013 the MoGE implemented the revised curriculum whose focus is equipping learners at all levels with vital knowledge, skills and values that are necessary for contributing to the development of the society and the economy so as to attain the nation’s vision 2030. To this effect the 2013 revised curriculum has been linked at all levels, from ECE to tertiary Education and adult literacy. The revised curriculum has also provided the two necessary career paths – vocational
and academic; for learners at secondary school level. It is envisaged that this will accord learners an opportunity to progress according to their abilities and interests. At Teacher Education level, training is provided at diploma level using the revised curriculum. Of all the thirteen main areas of focus of the 2013 ZECF none is on teacher education (training), and so one wonders how teachers’ competencies in the schools could be re-sharpened if the 2013 ZECF is silent about it.

2.3.1 Planning

Planning to teach by teachers is influenced by the availability of relevant documents and resources coupled with good training (Muzumara, 2011). To this end the MoGE has clearly guided through the 2013 ZECF that all learning institutions should have the ZECF and other important related curriculum support materials and documents such as syllabi and textbooks; which shall function as key daily guides and tools to ensure the provision of quality education (MoGE, 2013). The MoGE guides by stating that, it should be noted that the ZECF does not provide detailed descriptions of subject content or desired learning outcomes, it leaves such level of information to the syllabi and in some cases, the Teacher Curriculum Manuals (MoGE, 2013). Critical analysis of the soft copies of the syllabi in circulation and in use in schools suggests that some topics have only one specific outcome, others none and in some cases the knowledge, skills and values (attitudes) sections of content (competencies) have no input at all. This may affect negatively planning by the teachers; especially the inexperienced teachers.

2.2.1 Lesson implementation

The revised curriculum education guiding principle is centred on the Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) which moves away from Behaviorism to constructivism pedagogies (MoGE, 2013; Plessis, 2002; GRZ, 2007). This approach seeks to link education to real life experiences as it gives learners skills to access, criticize, analyze and particularly apply knowledge (MoGE, 2013). In this approach learners are given practical experiences during the teaching and learning processes that help them gain life skills (MoGE, 2013). This approach has been adopted in response to concerns in the recent past that teaching was not responding to the needs of society (MoGE, 2013). To respond to these concerns School- Based Continuing Profession Development (S-BCPD) programmes are currently been implemented in schools with the help from JAICA (GRZ, 2007; Monk, 1999). It remains to be established whether this really is being implemented in the classroom or not, and also whether the teachers have the rightful competencies to plan their lessons based on outcomes bearing in mind that these are teachers that have been used to the objectives based learning.

2.2.2 Learners assessment

One of the three perspectives from which quality is judged in the OBE system is the outputs from the system (MoGE, 2013). A number of principles must be observed to ensure effective implementation of OBE in the learning institutions. One of them is reflective designing (MoGE, 2013; Plessis, 2002). The starting points for all curriculum design are clearly defined learning experiences that learners are to achieve during the courses or programmes (MoGE, 2013).
Therefore, all instructional decisions should be made by tracking back from the desired end result and identifying the building blocks that will be required to achieve that end. This entails that there should be direct and explicit links between planning, teaching, assessment decisions and outcomes that learners should achieve (MoGE, 2013, Kelly, 1999). For the teachers to be able to assess learners’ achievements holistically they should really be well trained. The hypothesis that should be tested, therefore, is whether or not there is a statistical significant relationship between teacher training and teaching competencies. This study somewhat touches on that.

3. Description of the Study Area

The study was undertaken in North-Western Province one of the ten Provinces of Zambia. The province has an area of 125,826 km² (48,582 square miles) and a human population of 727,044. It is the most sparsely populated province in the country with a population density of 5.80 per square kilometre (CSO, 2010). Most of the population is dependent on agriculture (CSO, 2010). The province has a total number of 11 districts with Solwezi as its provincial capital. Out of the 8,823 primary schools in Zambia, the province has 678, and out of 73,949 primary school teachers in the country North-western has 4,521. Out of the 42,334 number of primary school teachers with diploma in Zambia, North western Province has 1,424 most of whom are graduates from the PTD programme (MoGE, 2017). The province also has one public college of education (Solwezi College of Education). Figure 3.1 shows some of the provinces of Zambia and the districts of NWP where the study was undertaken.

![Figure 3.1. Provinces of and districts in NWP](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North-Western_Province,_Zambia)

3.2 Materials and Methods

This was a case study of competencies of primary school teachers that had graduated from SOCE. A randomized cross-sectional survey of these teachers’ content, lesson planning; implementation and assessment competencies in implementing the revised curriculum was conducted and the competencies assessed using a Standard Assessment Instrument (SAI) (Appendix A). The primary school teachers from SOCE in the schools in the districts of the Province were selected by simple
random sampling. A revised school curriculum has been implemented in the country but assessment of teachers competencies graduating from the colleges of education seemed not to have been done. Geographic access was a key consideration in choosing North-Western Province. All the districts could be reached from Solwezi (which home of SOCE) within a day. Educationally, all the districts are similar. However, some are more rural, and their populations are more geographically spaced thus the schools.

North western province has a total number of 1, 424 teachers in primary schools with a PTD. This number includes most of the teachers from the 834 that had graduated from SOCE. These teachers were targeted since they had undergone training through the PTD revised curriculum with emphasis on knowledge, skills, values and pedagogical competencies by the college. The sample size was 427 Primary School Teachers with PTD from SOCE. These were randomly picked from five out of the 11 districts in the province. The five districts were Kabompo, Solwezi, Mwinilunga, Mufumbwe and Manyinga. These districts were purposively picked on the basis that they had more teachers with PTD from SOCE than the others.

In each one of the sampled districts, five schools which were randomly selected from lists of schools provided by Provincial Education Officer (PEO) were visited (Appendix F). This sample size was calculated on a 1-sample comparison of proportions considering 95 % level of confidence and 80 % Gpower at two-tailed using the SPSS version 20. Given the estimation that the calculated sample-size was 427 and an estimated five teachers per school, five schools were considered adequate to obtain the needed sample. District Education Board Secretaries (DEBSes) in the sampled districts, Head teachers of the sampled schools and the sampled teachers were interviewed. These were purposively picked. Interviews were conducted using structured interview guides (Appendices B, C and D and E). This was done to obtain in-depth data on perceptions of teachers’ content, lesson planning, implementation and assessment competences. Analysis of past Teaching Practice and Final Examination results of former student teachers at SOCE were conducted. Lesson observations and documents (Individual Annual Work Plans, Schemes of Work, Weekly Forecasts, Lesson Plans and Assessment Items) analyses were done using a pre-tested SAI (Appendices A and E) to obtain data on knowledge, lesson planning, implementation and assessment competencies of the teachers. Challenges faced by the teachers and interventions to be provided were explored through interviews and field observations (Appendices B, C and D).

The research team sought permission from the PEO before going to the districts. Trained field research assistants (three) visited each school, sought permission from the head teacher, and obtained verbal consent from the teachers to conduct the survey. The field team arrange interview session at each school with the aid of school management. They briefed each teacher about the study objectives and procedure and obtained individual consent before conducting the assessment. Arrangement for the interviews, document analysis and lesson observations were made. The research assistants completed the assessment instruments, responded to the participants’ questions regarding, and maintained field notes on the data-collection process. Collection of data in the field was done between February and March 2018.
Short-answer responses were reviewed and code lists developed. All the data were edited, compiled and coded before entering them into the computer, using the Epi Info 6 software. The quantitative data from the SAI were analyzed using the ANOVA with the aid of statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20 at 95% confidence level at one tail. Qualitative data on perceptions were analyzed according to themes. Data with common theme were grouped together and reported in percentages and ranges. Quality of data was assured through monitoring, supervision, and checking for the consistency of data. For performing cluster analysis, each school was considered as a unit (containing a group or cluster of teachers) and inference was drawn on these rather than individual teachers. Different results will be obtained from teachers by accumulating results on individual teachers in the respective schools. The test statistical values and the $p$ values of the ANOVA were also presented.

4. Results

The teachers’ competencies were assessed using four benchmarks namely; ability to plan for teaching, deliver lessons and assess pupils’ achievement. Under planning the ability of the teacher to do annual individual work plan, scheme, weekly forecast and lesson plan were considered. These documents on teaching files were assessed for conformity to recommended standards and relevance to syllabus. The second part was lesson delivery (implementation); the ability of the teacher to deliver a subjective lesson planned, enhance learners’ subjective learning and evaluate a lesson were assessed through lesson observations and assessment of teaching files in the sampled schools using the assessment instrument (Appendix A). The last part was on assessment; here the ability of the teachers’ to assess learners was determined through document analysis of set assessment instruments such as test items, home work, marking keys, samples of marked scripts and progress charts. Results from document analyses, lesson observations and interviews on SOCE teachers’ competencies in implementing the 2013 revised curriculum in primary schools based on these three outlined benchmarks are summarized and presented under various headings in the sections below.

4.1 Results from Document Analyses Perspectives

The findings from analyses of lesson plans, schemes of work, weekly forecasts and individual work plans are summarized and presented below.

4.1.1 Planning- Ability of planning a Lesson

Results on The Ability of teachers to set up lesson outcomes are presented in Figures 4.1.1.1 to 4.1.1.5 below.
4.1.1.1 Ability to set lesson outcomes

Fig. 4.1.1.2 Ability to set Lesson Outcomes

4.1.1.3 Ability to set attainable lesson outcomes

Fig. 4.1.1.4 Ability to set measure. outcomes
School: Chilonda
Grade: 5
Subject: Krivale
Topic: Worldly Knowledge
Subtopic: Write opposite words

Reference: P1 book, page 10

Teaching and Learning Resources: Books, librogram, method: Inquiry, discussion, tabulation, Exposure

Introduction: Discuss the previous work

Learning outcomes:
- Read the given words
- Write words in opposite form
- Read the opposite words

Date: 26 Feb 2010
# Lesson Plan

**Name:** Mrs. Selati M.  
**School:** P隈ela Primary  
**Grade:** 1  
**Subject:** Integrated Science  
**Topic:** The Human Body  
**Lesson:** Heart beat and pulse rate  
**Reference:** Grade 1 pupils book page 6, syllabus 1-1 page 5.

**Specific Outcome:** Pupils should be able to:
- Feel out how the heart beats when resting, running or afraid.
- State how the heart beats when resting.

## Time Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Teaching and Learning Aids</th>
<th>Learning Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Introduction 5 min | * Take learners outside to run.  
* Heart pumps.  
* Sweating. |
| Development 20 min  | * Your pulse is the beat of your heart as it pumps the blood through your body. | * Listen as the teacher is explaining to them. |
4.1.2 Planning – Ability of structuring a Lesson

Results on the ability of teachers to structure a lesson were as presented in Figures 4.1.2.1 to 4.1.2.7 below.

---

**Figure 4.1.2.1 Ability to introduce a lesson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incl of introd. %</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson Plans Analyses on the Teaching Files

**Figure 4.1.2.2 Ability to develop lesson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incl of L/Dev. %</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson Plans Analyses on the Teaching Files
Fig. 4.1.2.3 Ability to conclude & evaluate lessons

Fig. 4.1.2.4 Ability to plan lesson activities

Fig. 4.1.2.5 Sufficient knowledge

Figure 4.1.2.6 Sufficient pedagogical skill
4.1.3 Planning -3 Ability of Considering Pupils

Results on the ability of the teachers to consider pupils in planning were as presented in Figures 4.1.3.1 to 4.1.3.11 below.

Figure 4.1.3.7 Revised curriculum

Figure 4.1.3.1 Considering pupils’ knowledge in planning activities

Figure 4.1.3.2 Considering previous knowledge of pupils...
4.1.4 Overall Evaluation - Ability of planning a lesson

Were the teachers able to plan learner-centred Lessons?

Figure 4.1.3.5 Overall Evaluations
### Schemes of Work

**School:** Sekolah Primary  
**Grade:** 1  
**Subject:** Integrated Science  
**Year:** 2019  
**Term:** 1

#### General Outcome:
1. Demonstrate an understanding of the basic facts about the human body.  
2. Recognise the importance of personal health.  
3. Develop investigative skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Sub-Topic</th>
<th>Specific Outcomes</th>
<th>T/I AIDS</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | The human body | - External parts of the human body | - Identify the external parts of the human body.  
- Discuss the importance of the external parts of the body.  
- Draw and label the external parts of the body.  
- Demonstrate the roles of the external parts of the body. | Chart showing external parts of the body  
Syllabus  
Page 9 |

---

*Paper-ID: CFP/666/2018  www.ijmdr.net*
### Term 1 Maths Schemes of Work 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Outcomes</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SETS</td>
<td>- Describe sets in relation to real life situations</td>
<td>Describe sets in relation to real life situations</td>
<td>- Team work</td>
<td>- Use of appropriate set symbols and diagrams</td>
<td>Lessons taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- State membership of a set using symbols ( \in ) and ( \notin )</td>
<td>- Analysis of elements of a set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers and notation</td>
<td>- Count, read and write numbers up to 1000</td>
<td>Counting numbers up to 1000</td>
<td>- Ordering numbers in tens and hundreds up to 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Count in tens and hundreds up to 1000</td>
<td>- Ordering numbers in tens and hundreds up to 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify place values of digits in given numbers</td>
<td>- Counting in tens and hundreds</td>
<td>Application to real life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mathematics Scheme of Work for Grade 7 (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Specific Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRACTIONS</td>
<td>- Solve problems involving addition and subtraction of fractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTIONS</td>
<td>- Solve problems involving multiplication of fractions e.g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTIONS</td>
<td>- Inverse numbers and vice versa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1.3.6 Samples of Schemes of Work
Figure 4.1.3.7 Samples of Weekly forecasts
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Figure 4.1.3.8 Samples of Lesson Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Activity</th>
<th>Pupil's Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ask learner to read through syllables and words.</td>
<td>Reading through syllables and words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ask each individual learner to read through words.</td>
<td>Individual reading of words.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kahela nona
Kahome linoka
Supa ramono
NAME OF JOB HOLDER: GILLIAN MUUMBA

JOB TITLE - TEACHER

JOB PURPOSE: To teach effectively in order to impart relevant knowledge and skills

PLANNING

PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTABILITY

- Plan appropriately teaching and learning activities to ensure smooth delivery of knowledge and skills

KEY RESULT AREAS

- Schemes of work
- Weekly forecast, lesson plans and teaching and learning activities (full)

TARGETS

- 1. Schemes of work for each subject every term
- Prepare weekly forecast for each subject every week
- Prepare 2-3 lesson plans each day
- Prepare teaching aids where necessary

Teaching

- Teach effectively in order for pupils to acquire relevant knowledge, skills and attitudes
- Follow planned work correctly and strictly
- Use different and relevant methodologies

- Teach at least 3-4 subjects or even all
- Use appropriate teaching and learning aids
### INDIVIDUAL WORK PLAN

**NAME OF JOB Holder:**

**JOB TITLE:** Class Teacher

**JOB PURPOSE:** To teach effectively in order to impact relevant knowledge and skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARLY RESULT AREA</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL ACCOUNTABILITIES</th>
<th>SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plans</td>
<td>- Plan appropriately teaching and learning activities to ensure smooth delivery of knowledge and skills.</td>
<td>- Plan scheme of work. - Write weekly forecast. - Write lesson plans.</td>
<td>34 per lesson 38 per lesson 420 per term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>- Teaches effectively in order for pupils to acquire relevant knowledge, skills, and attitudes.</td>
<td>- Teaching, remedial. - 400 lessons per term. - 800 lessons per term.</td>
<td>2-3 hours per session. 2-3 hours per term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>- Assesses regularly the performance of the pupils in order to determine need and supply appropriate intervention.</td>
<td>- Assessment, home work. - Assessment, end of term test.</td>
<td>3-4 times per term. 4-5 times per term. 5-6 times per year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*29th Jan 2019*

*Paper-ID: CFP/666/2018*
Figure 4.1.3.9 Samples of Individual Annual Work Plans

Figure 4.1.3.10 Samples of Hard Cover Note Books being used as Teaching Files
4.2 Delivering – Ability of Delivering a Lesson

The teachers’ competencies of implementing lessons in class were assessed through lesson observations and the results were as presented in section 4.2.1.

4.2.1 Delivering – Ability to Delivering Lesson Plan
Results from lesson observations on the ability of teachers to deliver lessons were as presented in Figures 4.2.1.1 to 4.2.1.7 below.
Figure 4.2.1.1 Ability to explain outcomes

Figure 4.2.1.2 Ability to conduct introduction

Figure 4.2.1.3 Ability to implement the planned lesson
Did the teacher attempt to confirm a particular concept or values or skill in the process of teaching?

Figure 4.2.1.4 Ability to confirm concepts

Was the conclusion conducted as planned?

Figure 4.2.1.5 Ability to conclude lesson planned

Was there a time of evaluating the lesson to confirm whether the pupils had learnt?

Figure 4.2.1.6 Ability to evaluate learners’ learning

Was the lesson content correct?

Figure 4.2.1.7 Correctness of content
4.2.2 Delivering- Ability of Enhancing Pupils Subjective Learning

Lesson observation results on the ability of the teachers to enhance pupils’ subjective learning in the lesson lessons observed are presented in Figures 4.2.2.1 to 4.2.2.3 below.

![Figure 4.2.2.1 Group work for pupils in the lesson](chart)

*Figure 4.2.2.1 Group work for pupils in the lesson*
Figure 4.2.2.2 Pupils Working in Groups

Was the pupils’ group activity well organized?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizatio n of Pupils’ Group Activit ies %</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>60,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson Observations

Was the pupils’ group activity relevant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relev anc y of Pupils Group Activit ies %</td>
<td>20,8</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>60,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson Observations

Figure 4.2.2.3 Organizing group activities

Figure 4.2.2.4 Relevancy of group activities
Were the teaching and learning aids adequate for the group activity?

![Adequacy of teaching and learning aids](image)

Figure 4.2.2.5 Adequacy of teaching aids for group activities

![Samples of Teaching and Learning Resources](image)

Figure 4.2.2.6 Samples of Teaching and Learning Resources
4.3 Evaluation- Ability of Evaluating the Lesson
Lesson plans analyses of the ability of teachers to evaluate the lesson are presented in Figures 4.3.1 to 4.3.4 below.

Was the teacher able to evaluate a lesson in detail?
Figure 4.3.1 Ability to evaluate lessons

Figure 4.3.2 Scope of lesson evaluations

Figure 4.3.3 Aspects in evaluations
To ask each individual learner create a set and mention the number of members in a set.

To give an exercise to the learners: $\{1, 2, 3\}$ & $\{4\}$

Creating sets and mentioning the number of members.

Individual work:

- To do the exercise in their books individually.
- Writing numbers from 11-30.
CONCLUSION: Quickly go through the lesson.

HOMEWORK: Learners to draw things used to clean their bodies to keep them clean.

EVALUATION: The lesson was taught and learners were able to name the objects we gave and happy to see pictures of a toothbrush.
Figure 4.3.4 Samples of Lesson Evaluations

Was there suggestion of improvement in the evaluation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement %</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3.5 Suggestion on improvement in evaluations
4.1.2 Overall evaluations of lessons delivered

The overall evaluation of the teachers’ lesson delivery abilities were as presented in Figure 4.3.6 below.

Were the teachers able to plan lessons which enabled pupils to learn subjectively?

![Graph showing overall evaluations of lessons delivered]

**Figure 4.3.6 Overall evaluations of lessons delivered**
Figure 4.3.7 Some Lessons Observed
4.4 ASSESSMENT - Ability of assessing Learners
Results from document analyses on teachers’ ability to assess learners’ achievement are presented in Figures 4.4.1 to 4.4.6 below.

4.4.1 Assessment – Ability of setting up a test, home work or class exercise
Results from analyses of test items set by teachers are as presented in Figures 4.4.1 to 4.4.6 below.
Figure 4.4.1 Ability of assessing pupils

Figure 4.4.2 Ability to give feedback to pupils

Figure 4.4.3 Ability to revise assessment work

Figure 4.4.4 Pupils' progression
END OF TERM 3 TEST
GRADE ONE

1 [□□□□□] = □

2 [□□□□□] = □

3 [□□□□□] = □

4 4 3 2 1 = □□□□

5 3 4 5 6 = □□□□

Year: 2017
Term: Three
Grade: One

Republic of Zambia
Ministry of General Education

8-8-11, 2017
Figure 4.4.5 Samples of Assessment Items
4.4 ASSESSMENT - Ability of assessing Learners

The results on the Overall Evaluation Assessment abilities of the teachers are presented in Figure 4.4.7 below.

Was the teacher able to assess pupils' achievements?
4.5 Interview Results on Head teachers, District Education Board Secretaries and Teachers’ Perspectives

The following sections present interview results with teachers, Head teachers and the District Education Board Secretaries. These are detailed below under various headings.

4.5.1 Interview Results on Head teachers’ Perspectives

The Head teachers’ perspectives on teachers’ competencies were mostly obtained through interviews. The results were as presented under various headings detailed below.

**How many teachers have Primary Teachers’ Diploma at this school?**

Most of the schools under this study had sufficient number of teachers from SOCE. About 213 teachers were diploma holders.

**Do you think that these teachers have the rightful competencies for implementing the revised curriculum in the schools in the district?**

All the head teachers (100 %) interviewed claimed the teachers from SOCE were very good and possessed the rightful competencies for implementing the revised curriculum in the schools. The head teachers attributed that to the good training teachers underwent while at the college.
How would you rate the teachers’ competencies in the list below? (Please use either: very good, good or poor)

The head teachers rating of the teachers competencies were as shown in Figure 4.42.

![Rating of teachers' competencies by Head teachers](image)

**Figure 4.5.1.1 Rating of teachers’ competencies by Head teachers**

Have the teachers received any training on the 2013 revised curriculum in the school/district?

Out of all the head teachers interviewed 36 % claimed that teachers had been trained on the 2013 revised curriculum while 64 % claimed teachers had not been trained.

What are the main challenges the teachers are facing in implementing the revised curriculum?

All the head teachers (100 %) interviewed claimed that there were no textbooks to support the implementation of the revised curriculum in the schools at most grades with grades 4 and 7 being the worst affected. They also claimed that some of the textbooks supplied for use in implementing the revised curriculum by CDC such as MK were shallow in content and the content in these books did not match the revised curriculum. They wondered how Government could have procured them. Due to the slow pace at which Government was supplying the books to schools, they relied on old books. The other major challenge according to all the head teachers was the lack of hard copies of the revised syllabi in the schools. They all claimed that despite managing to access the soft copies of syllabi from the internet at a cost which they had also difficulties in printing out due to lack of ICT facilities most of those documents still remain in soft copies as they had no capacity to print them (Figure 4.5.1.2 ). Due to this challenge teachers were planning using textbooks not the approved syllabi. The 2013 ZECF states “it is should therefore, be noted that the ZECF does not provide detailed descriptions of subject content or desired learning outcomes. It leaves such level of
information to the syllabi and in some cases, the teacher curriculum manuals” (MoGE, 2013:1). This study found that schools had not been supplied with these important documents.

Figure 4.5.1.2 Head teacher explaining how difficult it was for the school in a remote area to print hard copies of syllabi

4.5.2 Interview Results on District Education Board Secretaries (DEBS) Perspectives

The District Education Board Secretaries (DEBS) perspectives on teachers’ competencies were mostly obtained through interviews. The results were as presented under various headings detailed below.

Do you think that these teachers have the rightful competencies for implementing the revised curriculum in the schools in the district?

Out of all (100 %) the District Education Board Secretaries (DEBSes) who were interviewed 60 % claimed teachers possessed the rightful competencies for implementing the revised curriculum in the schools in the district while 40 % had mixed perceptions; of some possessing the competencies while others did not. The 60 % who claimed teachers possessed the rightful competencies attributed that mostly to the correct training teachers received at the college as well as the SBCPDs.

In your opinion how would you rate the teachers’ competencies in the list below? (Please use either: good, very good or poor).

The District Education Board Secretaries’ (DEBS) rating of the teachers competencies were as shown in Figure 4.5.2.1 below.
Figure 4.5.2.1 Rating of Teachers Competencies by DEBSes

Have the teachers received any training on the revised curriculum in the district?

All the DEBS interviewed claimed that teachers had been trained on how to implement the revised curriculum in the schools in the districts.

What are the main challenges the teachers are facing in implementing the revised curriculum

All the DEBS interviewed claimed that the slow pace and unsystematic manner in which textbooks to support the implementation of the new curriculum were being supplied to the districts, the lack of textbooks for the revised curriculum for grades 4 and 7 to support teaching and learning of the revised curriculum and the lack of hard copies of syllabi and shallow content and mismatch of content with the syllabi of most of the text books especially MK books that have so far have been supplied to the schools were serious challenges which they faced.
4.5.3 *Interview Results on Primary Teachers’ Perspectives*

Do you think that you have the rightful competencies useful for implementing the revised curriculum after obtaining your PTD?

Out of all the primary school teachers interviewed 92 % claimed they possessed the rightful competencies useful for implementing the revised curriculum while 8 % claimed they did not.

Do you think that you were adequately prepared to interpret the syllabus and also to scheme, lesson plan, implement and assess during your course of training at college?

Out of all the primary school teachers interviewed 87.2 % claimed they were adequately prepared to interpret the syllabus, scheme, lesson plan, implement and assess learners during their teacher training at the college while the other 12.8 % claimed they were not.
How would you rate your competencies in the list below? (Please use either: very good, good, average or poor).

The Primary school Teachers’ rating of their competencies was as shown in Figure 4.5.3.1 below.

![Figure 4.5.3.1 Rating of Teachers Competencies by Teachers](image)

Have you received any further training after leaving college in the school/district?

Out of all the primary school teachers interviewed, 93.6 % claimed that they had received further training after leaving college in the school/district while 6.4 % claimed they had not. Of those who had received training 48 % claimed it was on the implementation of the revised curriculum while 52 % claimed it was on other educational aspects such as THRASS and not the revised curriculum.

What are the main challenges you are facing in implementing the revised curriculum in the school?

All (100 %) the teachers who were interviewed claimed that the main challenges included the slow pace and unsystematic manner in which textbooks to support the implementation of the new curriculum were being supplied to the districts; literary no textbooks for the revised curriculum for grades 4 and 7 had been supplied so far to support teaching and learning using the revised curriculum. The teachers also claimed they had no hard copies of syllabi for their planning, and also that the books which had been supplied so far were of shallow content and had mismatch of content with the syllabi especially MK books that have so far being supplied to the schools through the district.

4.6 Teaching Practice Results Analyses for the period 2015 -2017
Analyses of TP results for the periods 2015 to 2017 were conducted and the results are presented in Figures 4.6.1 to 4.6.3 below.

**Figure 4.6.1 TP Results Analyses 2015**

**Figure 4.6.2 TP Results Analyses 2016**

**Figure 4.6.3 TP Results Analyses 2017**

4.7 Final Examination Results Analysis 2016 - 2017

Also Analyses of Examination results for the periods 2015 to 2017 were conducted and the results are presented in Figures 4.7.1 to 4.7.2 below.
4.5 Statistical Analysis on key stakeholders’ perspectives

Statistical analysis results on key stakeholders’ perceptions of teachers’ competencies in implementing the revised curriculum are summarized and presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.5.1 Chi-square Analysis Results on Perceptions of teachers’ competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Tail Type</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.33462167*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Two tailed</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No significant difference

Head teachers, District Education Board Secretaries and teachers’ perceptions of teachers’ competencies were the same.

5 Discussion of Results

The results from Document analyses, lesson observations and interviews with key informants are briefly discussed under various headings below.
5.1 Planning Competencies of Teachers

Most individual work plans were of correct format; 40% of the individual annual work plans were correctly done while 60% were incorrectly done. The 60% which were incorrectly done had incorrect information under key result area, principal accountabilities, schedule of activities and targets were incorrect for these 60% (Figure 4.1.3.9). This suggests that majority of the teachers did not know how to write the individual work plans. Out of all the schemes of work, weekly forecasts and lesson plans analyzed only 14.4% were in line with the 2013 revised curriculum, 16% were average while 69.6% were not. The 14.4% that were in line with the 2013 revised curriculum included knowledge, skills and values components under content (competences); these were lacking in most of the plans. This suggests that majority of the teachers were still planning in the old way. This could be because majority of the teachers had not been oriented on how to implement the curriculum and had not been provided with the curriculum support materials such as syllabi, textbooks and teacher curriculum manuals recommended by the 2013 ZECF (MoGE, 2013). If majority of the teachers could not plan according the 2013 revised curriculum one wonders how learners at this level of education would be equipped with vital knowledge, skills and values that are necessary for contributing to the development of society and the economy envisaged by 2013 revised curriculum (MoGE, 2013). This could be a source of concern for all the educators at this level. Out of all the lesson plans analyzed 63.2% had outcomes clearly stated, 33.6% were average while 3.2% were not clear (Figure 4.1.1.2). Also out of all the lesson plans analyzed 0.8% had outcomes inappropriate for grade level, 25.6% were average while 73.6% were appropriate for pupils grade level (Figure 4.1.1.3). Out of all the lesson plans analyzed 1.6% of the stated lesson outcomes were not attainable, 28% were average while 70.4% were attainable; 44.8% of the outcomes stated were not measurable, 19.2% were average while 36% were measurable (Figure 4.1.1.4). This suggests that teachers were incapable of setting specific measurable achievable realistic and time-bound outcomes (Figure 4.1.1.5). According to Education Act No. 23 of 2011, the MoGE is the custodian of quality education provision and will ensure that all providers adhere to the policy and regulations on curriculum but the findings this study in the area of planning suggest that this assurance was weak. In terms of structuring the lesson, 88% of the lesson plans had good introduction, 11.2% had average introduction while 0.8% had no introduction at all (Figure 4.1.2.1); 84.8% had detailed lesson development, 14.4% while 0.8% had no lesson development (Figure 4.1.2.2); 77.6% had good lesson conclusion, 20% average and 2.4% did not have any conclusion (Figure 4.1.2.3). However most of the lesson plans analyzed showed that majority of the teachers were able to structure a lesson very well. Most lesson plans showed evidence of considering pupils previous knowledge and were based on sufficient pedagogical skills and subject matter except for only 2.4% of the lesson plans that were short of these qualities (Figures 4.1.3.1; 4.1.3.2; 4.1.3.3). The lesson plans also included the teaching and learning aids (Figure 4.1.3.4). Out of all the lesson plans analyzed only 8% were planned for subjective learning of pupils, 74.4% were planned with certain level of considering pupils, 4% were planned insufficiently while 0.8% of the plans were unacceptable level (Figure 4.1.3.5). These results suggest majority of the teachers
had the rightful planning competencies but despite planning according to the old curriculum. The 10% of the teachers planned according to the revised curriculum.

Interviews and focused group discussions with teachers suggested that the teachers were good as most of them claimed to have the rightful competencies for implementing the revised curriculum despite planning in the old way. This was not convincingly evident in their planning, lesson implementation and assessments. Interviews with District Education Board Secretaries and School Head teachers suggested that the teachers from the college were very good and had the rightful competencies useful for implementing the revised curriculum, but doubted their assessment competencies. Also they claimed that the teachers had been oriented on how to implement the curriculum.

5.2 Ability of Delivering (Implementing) a Planned Lesson

Overall analyses of lessons conducted suggested that 2.4% were conducted with 100% pupils having subjective learning, 47.2% were conducted with 50% of the pupils having subjective learning, 27.2 were conducted with more than 50% of the pupils having subjective learning, 22.4% conducted with less than 50% of the pupils having subjective learning while 0.8% were conducted but no pupils showed subjective learning (Figure 4.3.6). These results suggest is that majority of the teachers were not able to deliver learner-centred lessons. According to the guiding principles of outcome-based education recommended by the 2013 ZECF (MoGE, 2013) the teachers lesson delivery abilities were weak in methodology and content. The results from lessons observations in class showed that majority of the teachers conducted the introduction, lesson development and conclusion parts as planned in their lesson plans (Figures 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.2; 4.2.1.3; 4.2.1.6). It was also evident from lesson observations that majority of the teachers made an effort to confirm certain concepts, values, knowledge and skills to the pupils during the lessons. There was also time in the lesson for the teachers to confirm whether or not the pupils had learnt through class exercises (Figure). Most of the content presented in the lessons was found to be correct and pupils’ group activities were in most lessons well planned and executed by the teachers and helped to enhance learning of pupils (Figure 4.2.2.2). The teaching and learning aids were adequate and relevant in most of the lessons observed (Figure 4.2.2.4). Pupils were given chance to make presentations in class after the group activities in most of the lessons that were observed (Figure 4.2.2.5). This suggests that teachers possessed the rightful lesson delivery competences. However, indications from lesson observations suggested that most of the teachers were unable to implement good learner-centered lessons.

5.3 Ability of Assessing Pupils’ Learning Achievements

Out of all the assessment items analyzed such as tests, class exercises and home works 12% were unacceptable standard or level, 8% were insufficiently, 1.6% was planned without considering level of pupils, 75.2% were planned with certain level of considering pupils while 3.2% were planned for subjective learning of pupils. These results suggest the assessment competencies of most of the teachers were very weak. Most assessment items did not conform to the dictates of...
Bloom’s Taxonomy. Results from analyses of assessment items such as tests suggested that teachers lacked the competencies for structuring acceptable standard assessment items such tests (Figure 4.4.5).

5.4 Meta-Analysis of Teaching Practice (TP) and Examination Results in Context of Results of the Study
TP results show that 60% of the students scored at least a merit (B+) (very good) while examination results indicate that 60% of the students scored B (good) results of this study found that 60% of the teachers were good. Comparisons of the results of this study with the TP and examination results suggest that teachers’ scores were higher during TP than during examination and when they were permanently employed. While TP Analyses results (Figures 4.6.1; 4.6.2; 4.6.3) suggest that teachers’ competences were very good the results of this study and those of Examination suggest the contrary (Figures 4.7.1; 4.7.2). The TP results may be confounded.

5.5 Gaps and Implications of the Study
The major gaps found were the weak planning and assessment competencies of the teachers evidenced by analyses of individual work plans, schemes of work, weekly forecasts and lesson plans. Most of the schools had no hard copies of syllabi for the revised curriculum in the schools which was presenting serious challenges to planning by the teachers (Figure 4.5.1.2). Even with the soft copies of syllabi the teachers had accessed through internet sources, these had certain topics with no specific outcomes, knowledge, skills and values outlined which made planning by teachers still extremely difficult. Meanwhile the 2013 ZECF clearly states that all learning institutions should have the ZECF and other important curriculum related documents and syllabi which will function as key daily guides and tools to ensure the provision of quality education (ZECF, 2013) but these were not available in hard copies in the schools. It is also not clear from the 2013 ZECF how the schools were to access these documents. Most of the teachers had not been oriented let alone trained on how to go about implementing the revised curriculum in the districts studied and the ZECF is silent on this.

The implications in relation to the gaps therefore could be that SOCE should focus its training to desk students on planning, implementation and assessments based on the revised curriculum and should procure syllabi for its trainee teachers so that they are acquainted to it. MoGE/CDC should urgently supply hard copies of syllabi and address the issue of MK books that had been raised. The head teachers and DEBS should strengthen monitoring and supervision of continuing professional development activities in their schools and districts and focus these on the revised curriculum. Teachers could be trained on the revised curriculum by MoGE through Teachers Colleges using Resource Centres in the districts.

6.0 Conclusion and Recommendations
The main aim of this study was to assess primary school teachers from SOCE competences in implementing the 2013 primary school education revised curriculum. The teachers’ competences
were assessed through document analyses, lesson observations and interviews. The main findings of the study were that 14.4% of the teachers were able to plan according to the 2013 revised curriculum. The schemes of work, weekly forecasts and lesson plans that were not in line with the revised curriculum lacked the knowledge, skills and values (attitudes) components which the 2013 revised curriculum is emphasizing. The study found that although 63.2% of the lesson plans had lesson outcomes clearly stated 44.8% of those outcomes were not measurable. Majority of the teachers were unable to set up specific measurable attainable realistic time-bound lesson outcomes; despite being able to structure a lesson very well, majority of the teachers were unable to deliver good learner-centred lessons, unable to do detailed lesson evaluations and were unable to set good test items. The teachers’ assessment skills were also very weak. Based on these results, the study recommends re-training for the teachers in order to re-sharpen their planning, lesson delivery and assessment competencies to align them with the demands of the 2013 revised curriculum. This
could be achieved through the college (SOCE) or/and other key stakeholders such as Teachers’ District Resource Centres or Zones through continuing profession development (CPD) programmes. There is also urgent need for speed supply of hard copies of the syllabi (revised curriculum) and relevant textbooks to schools by the Ministry of General Education and CDC so that teachers have something to plan from. The Mk books frequently being questioned and referred to by all the participants throughout this study needed to be reviewed by CDC and the Ministry of General Education. SOCE should strengthen planning, lesson delivery and assessment skills to students on the desk so that they are fully prepared.
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APPENDIX A: Assessment Instrument for Teachers’ Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Teacher:</th>
<th>District:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>School:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Subject observed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS No.:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic of Lesson:</td>
<td>Grade:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART A: Planning- Ability of planning a Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Evaluation (P)</th>
<th>[ ] Plan was unacceptable level.</th>
<th>[ ] planned insufficiently.</th>
<th>[ ] planned without considering pupils.</th>
<th>[ ] planned with certain level of considering pupils.</th>
<th>[ ] planned for subjective learning of pupils.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Planning – 1 Ability of setting up Lesson outcomes

- P1-1: Were the lesson outcomes clearly stated in the lesson plan? NO AVG YES
- p-1-2: Were the stated outcomes appropriate for pupils’ grade level of learning? NO AVG YES
- p-1-3: Were the stated outcomes attainable by the pupils in the lesson? NO AVG YES
- p-1-4: Were the stated outcomes measurable? NO AVG YES

Planning – 2 Ability of structuring a Lesson

- P2-1: Was there an introduction in the lesson plan? NO AVG YES
- P2-2: Was there a lesson development part in the lesson plan? NO AVG YES
- P2-3: Were there conclusion and evaluation parts in the lesson plan? NO AVG YES
- p-2-4: Were the activities in lesson development part planned to achieve the lesson outcomes? NO AVG YES
- P2-5: Was the lesson planned based on sufficient subject matter knowledge? NO AVG YES
- p-2-6: Was the lesson planned based on sufficient pedagogical skill? NO AVG YES
- P2-7: Was the lesson planned in line with the revised curriculum? NO AVG YES

Planning -3 Ability of Considering Pupils

- P3-1: Were activities for pupils in the lesson planned? NO AVG YES
- p-3-2: Did the teacher plan the lesson considering the previous knowledge of pupils? NO AVG YES
- p-3-3: Were teaching materials prepared to support learning by pupils? NO AVG YES
- p-3-4: Were teaching materials adequate to support learning by pupils? NO AVG YES

PART B: Delivering – Ability to Delivering a Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the teacher able to plan a lesson which enabled pupils to learn subjectively?</th>
<th>[ ] conducted but no pupils</th>
<th>[ ] conducted with less than 50</th>
<th>[ ] conducted with 50 % of</th>
<th>[ ] conducted with more than</th>
<th>[ ] conducted with 100% of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

showed subjective learning.  
% of the pupils having subjective learning.  
pupils having subjective learning.  
50% of pupils having subjective learning.  
pupils having subjective learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivered – 1 Ability of Delivering Lesson Plan</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-1-1 Were the lesson outcomes explained during the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1-2 Was the introduction conducted as planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1-3 Was the development conducted as planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1-4 Did the teacher attempt to confirm a particular concept or values or skill in the process of teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1-5 Was there a time of evaluating the lesson to confirm whether the pupils had learnt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1-6 Was the conclusion conducted as planned?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1-7 Was the lesson content correct?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivering- 2 Ability of Enhancing Pupils Subjective Learning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-2-1 Was there a group activity for pupils in the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2-2 Was the pupils’ group activity well organized?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2-3 Was the pupils’ group activity relevant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2-4 Were the teaching and learning aids adequate for the group activity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2-5 Was there a presentation from the pupils in the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2-6 Did the activity enhance pupils’ knowledge, skills and values in the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART C: Evaluation- 1 Ability of Evaluating the Lesson</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-3-1 Were the lessons evaluated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3-2 Was the evaluation detailed and informative?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3-3 Were teaching materials, methods, etc. included in the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3-4 Was there suggestion of improvement in the evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the teacher able to assess pupils’ achievements?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Evaluation (A)</td>
<td>[ ] Assessment items were unacceptable level.</td>
<td>[ ] Assessment items were insufficiently.</td>
<td>[ ] Assessment items were planned without considering pupils.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART D: Assessment – 1 Ability of setting up a test, home work, assignment or class exercise</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1-1 Was there class exercise, test, home work, assignment in the lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1-2 Were the class exercise/home work/assignment/test well set?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1-3 Was the marking done and feedback given to pupils in good time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1-4 Were the assessment works revised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1-5 Did the assessments show pupils good progression?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW GUIDE ON PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF COMPETENCIES

Respondent Name: ---------------------------

Position: ................................................................. Date: ...........

Station: ----------------------------- District:.................................

1. Do you think that you have the rightful competencies useful for implementing the revised curriculum after obtaining your PTD?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. Do you think that you were adequately prepared to interpret the syllabus and also to scheme, lesson plan, implement and assess during your course of training at college?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. How would you rate your competencies in the list below? (Please use either: very good, good or poor).

   Annual Individual Work Plan [ ]
   Scheming [ ]
   Weekly forecast [ ]
   Lesson planning [ ]
   Lesson Implementation [ ]
   Lesson Evaluation [ ]
   Pupils Assessment [ ]

4. Please briefly explain what is very good, good or poor on each item you have commented on in the list?

   --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5. Have you received any further training after leaving college in the school/district?
6. If yes please specify.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7. What are the main challenges you are facing in implementing the revised curriculum in the school?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE ON PRIMARY SCHOOL HEAD TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS’ COMPETENCIES

Respondent Name: ---------------------------------------------

Position: .......................................................... Date: ............

Station: --------------------------------- District:..............................

1. How many teachers have Primary Teachers’ Diploma at this school?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. Do you think that these teachers have the rightful competencies for implementing the revised curriculum in the schools in the district?

   Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. To what would you attribute this to?

   Training [ ] SBCPD [ ]

4. How would you rate the teachers’ competencies in the list below? (Please use either: very good, good or poor).

   Annual Individual Work Plan [ ]
   Scheming [ ]
   Weekly forecast [ ]
   Lesson planning [ ]
   Lesson Implementation [ ]
   Lesson Evaluation [ ]
   Pupils Assessment [ ]

5. Please briefly explain what is very good, good or poor on each item you have commented on in the list.
6. Have the teachers received any further training after leaving college in the school/district?

   YES [ ]     No [ ]

7. If yes please specify.

8. What are the main challenges the teachers are facing in implementing the revised curriculum?

---

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW GUIDE ON DISTRICT EDUCATION STANDARDS OFFICERS’ PERCEPTIONS ON TEACHERS’ COMPETENCIES

Respondent Name: --------------------------
Position: .............................................. Date: ...........
District:----------------------------------------------

1. How many teachers have Primary Teachers’ Diploma in the district?

2. Do you think that these teachers have the rightful competencies for implementing the revised curriculum in the schools in the district?

   Yes [ ]     No [ ]

3. To what would you attribute this to?

   Training [ ]     SBCPD [ ]

4. In your opinion how would you rate the teachers’ competencies in the list below? (Please use either: good, very good or poor).

   Annual Individual Work Plan [ ]
   Scheming [ ]
   Weekly forecast [ ]
   Lesson planning [ ]
   Lesson Implementation [ ]
   Lesson Evaluation [ ]
   Pupils Assessment [ ]
5. Please briefly explain what is very good, good or poor on each item you have commented on in the list?

6. Have the teachers received any further training after leaving college in the district?

   YES [ ]   No [ ]

7. If yes please specify.

8. What are the main challenges the teachers are facing in implementing the revised curriculum?

APPENDIX E: DOCUMENT ANALYSIS GUIDE
Assessment and analysis of teaching documents (to be used hand in hand with lesson assessment instrument, appendix A)

1. LESSON PLANS
   Format of lesson plans
   A. General information
      Topic:---------------------------------------------
      Lesson:-------------------------------------------
      Rationale:-----------------------------------------
      References:----------------------------------------
      Teaching and learning aids:------------------------
      Specific outcomes/objectives:----------------------
   B. Lesson Progress
      Introduction:--------------------------------------
      Lesson development:-------------------------------
      Conclusion:---------------------------------------
      Lesson evaluation:-------------------------------
      Note: attach samples of lesson plans---------------

2. SCHEMES OF WORK
   A. Format of schemes of work
      Topic:
      ---------------------------------------------
      Content:
      ---------------------------------------------

Outcomes:

Content: knowledge; skills and value/attitudes

References:

WEEKLY FORECASTS

A. Format of weekly forecasts

3. ASSESSMENT TESTS

A. Formats of Test items