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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CfBT Education Services, a leading international education services provider, was approached by TMF, the CSR wing of Tech Mahindra Limited to conduct an impact assessment of the quality of English Language training being provided to teachers of CoC schools, which cater to the low income group families. TMF aims to provide good quality education to the poor at par with effective schools in the private and public sectors. The ELTTP project for CoC school teachers in Chennai began in 2013-14. The goal of this programme is to increase the linguistic and pedagogical competence of primary and middle school English language teachers, and to identify those teachers with the potential to become master trainers, thereby enabling Chennai’s English language teaching professionals to become self-reliant in training and development. About 400 teachers were trained and assessed over the four-year period.

Objectives
The primary objective of this Impact Assessment study is to provide information about the quality of English Language Teaching provided in the school when compared against project objectives; to assess the improvement of teachers of ELTTP in their language proficiency (LSRW) and also the pedagogical skills of the teachers as a result of the training; to assess the quality of English proficiency and pedagogy in the centres against best national and international standards. The second objective was to evaluate the implementation of the project, identify their strengths and areas for improvement, and provide suitable recommendations to improve the quality of the project.

Methodology
For the purpose of the study, CfBT developed and contextualized some of the benchmarking tools for schools developed through its international research and applied in various global contexts to suit the TMF’s ELTTP and conducted an assessment during February-March 2017. Further, the study was to provide a qualitative and quantitative assessment and analysis of the processes and results of the project as per project objectives. The techniques of data collection included in-depth interviews with key stakeholders and visits to schools for classroom observations and discussions. The assessment instruments were designed and contextualized to the project. The Assessors visited around 30 schools selected on a random basis and gathered the relevant data pertaining to all the parameters of the study. The Assessors based their judgments on the four point rating scale – Outstanding, Good, Acceptable and Unsatisfactory. The findings revealed that overall the TMF programme is at an acceptable level with few good features and some areas that were unsatisfactory.

Main Findings
The project provided a chance for teachers in CoC schools to up skill themselves and continue learning activities that will be useful in their teaching practices for developing English language skills and self-confidence of students. The communities and students were the ultimate target beneficiaries of the project, albeit indirectly. The teachers tried to attend every class of the training with the support of the CoC and HMs. Through training, the teachers not only acquired skills and knowledge, but also became more self-confident. Through training, teach back, monitoring, assessment and experience exchange between peers, more and more teachers took part in learning activities and tried to implement their learning in the classroom. This means the majority of teachers took a step towards transacting the curriculum in rudimentary English thereby improving quality of their students’ lives.

From the interviews and field visits, the impression gained is that both TMF and Cambridge staff and
local CoC officers have put in a great deal of effort to implement and improve the quality of spoken English of the teachers and educational development in areas where the assessment was conducted. The teachers appreciated TMF’s assistance to their students and hoped for continuation of project activities given the extreme backward nature of their students. However, the drawbacks were that it did not meet all the project objectives; the final goal not being qualifications but the ability to learn and use the skills in the classroom. Overall the number of teachers passing the qualifying assessments was not sufficient and took too long to do so, with many repeating the course.

There is no doubt that TMF is doing yeomen service to the underprivileged children of CoC schools cascaded through their teachers in a very dynamic and innovative manner. As a whole, the project design was flexible enough to accommodate changing situations. However, when evaluated against the project objectives, national and international standards of quality education delivery, it needs to address some very pertinent challenges. The report concludes with specific recommendations. Moving forward, TMF needs to begin with an in-depth review of its systems and processes and develop a Strategic Development Plan for its project and outline the progress achieved. The learnings need to be documented in a more rigorous and systematic manner that allows its leadership to engage in self-reflection and analysis. Further, specific targets will have to be set for it to measure its progress from time to time by involving its stakeholders over the next couple of years.

Main strengths

1. The commitment and dedication of all programme staff and efforts they have put in to improve the English language skills of the CoC teachers
2. The very good image of Tech Mahindra among HMs, CoC officials and teachers and their very good rapport with the heads of schools and CoC officials and teachers
3. The flexibility to adapt to changes as per requirements and instructions from CoC
4. The confidence and ability of most of the teachers to speak in basic English and conduct the classes in simple limited English majority of the time, with a little use of bilingual teaching. Though this programme targeted teachers of English, all subject teachers too are involved and try to teach other subjects in English, despite lack of subject specific vocabulary training
5. The keenness of the trainers who deliver high quality inputs and visit the schools twice to monitor and give feedback.

Areas for Development and Recommendations

1. Conduct sufficient research and an objective, scientific needs analysis of the teachers and HMs before reviewing, designing and commencing the next phase of the programme and ensure the development of a sense of ownership among teachers
2. Involve all stakeholders at all stages; train the HMs and CoC officials such as AEOs, BRTs and equip them to monitor the programme, give feedback to teachers and report findings to the implementing agency regularly and frequently. This will ensure active monitoring, enable programme inputs adjustment and help learners know how to improve.
3. Improve attendance in teacher training which is around 50% (171/283 are regular). Address logistical, age related and content related issues. Develop a set of criteria for teacher selection which include attitudes and willingness coupled with provision of training centres closer to their schools.
4. Eschew challenges of weak progress – many teachers repeat the KET course, only a few make it to TKT and quite a number of drop-out.
5. Develop customized content which can be used to transact the curriculum to interest and motivate teachers. Teaching methodology can be made compatible with ABL methodology currently used in schools or work with CoC to develop alternative strategies.
6. It is vital to incorporate some level of individual or group accountability of teachers which has to be built in to the programme in consultation with CoC, using either a carrot or stick policy or a combination of both
7. Integrate principles of andragogy in the training and use an andragogical approach to instructional design
8. Review the duration of the programme which is too long - consider using distance mode alternatives for some part
9. Plan for more on-site support in schools – handhold and guide teachers, use demos, micro-teaching, co-operative /collaborative teaching, mentoring, buddy system, conferencing, etc.
10. Develop systems for monitoring, assessment and data analysis to feed into programme review and design
11. Plan for continuity across grades – for instance if a grade 1 teacher is trained and uses the ELTT approach, the next year when these same cohort of students are in grade 2, they may not get similar inputs as that teacher might not be trained and this gap needs to be addressed
12. Choose a few schools with best teachers and pilot to make for model schools which can be showcased as exemplars for sharing best practices

**BACKGROUND**

In our country India, English is a symbol of people's aspirations for quality in education and a fuller participation in the economic and social life on the national and international level. English is the lingua franca of the world today. Pandit Nehru once said that English acted as the major window for India to the outside world and its closure would spell peril for our future. Today, English is the need of the hour due to the explosion of IT, globalisation and rapid growth of the Indian economy. The visible impact of this present scenario is that English is today being demanded by everyone at the very initial stage of schooling. Recognising the validity of this parental demand, CoC has provided a section of English medium classes in existing Tamil medium schools so parents have a choice in terms of the language of instruction. This move was widely welcomed and the enrolment in English medium sections shot up. However, as all the teachers of the CoC schools recruited were Tamil medium specialists as per the then existing conditions, they found it difficult to transition to English as the language of instruction. Also English is restricted to English lesson classrooms. Often, the English language/subject itself is taught in Tamil or bilingually. Teachers have to play an important role in doing away with this practice.

In accordance with its vision of a larger vertical focussing on education, TMF is working on building the capacity of teachers. In this context, TMF entered into an MoU with the Corporation of Chennai to support English language skill training for CoC teachers from English medium Schools for a period of five years from May 2014 to March 2019. The overarching goal of the project is to support the Corporation of Chennai initiative to develop English language and pedagogy of teachers in English medium Chennai Corporation schools.

Project Objectives:
- To raise the proficiency of English language skills of teachers teaching in the English medium curriculum schools of Chennai Corporation.
To improve the teaching methodologies and resources used in teaching-learning English language through an integrated teacher development programme.

To use evaluation as a quality control mechanism,

To develop master trainers within the CoC system

In order to achieve these aims and objectives, TMF has entered into a partnership with Cambridge English as knowledge partner. Cambridge English in turn works with EBEK Language Laboratories, a Cambridge English exam centre which was engaged as the implementing agency and project partner for training and assessment. Cambridge English Language Assessment, as part of the University of Cambridge, shares its mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning, and research. Cambridge English focuses on English language teaching, learning and assessment.

CoC teachers received training from Cambridge English and EBEK to familiarise them with the English language and improve their teaching methods. EBEK and Cambridge English Language Assessment also worked with them to train them for the Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing tests for certification at various levels.

**Purpose of the impact assessment**

1) To assess the extent to which TMF’s ELTTP:
   - has delivered capacity enhancement and built the necessary English language skills for teachers
   - has enabled CoC teachers to improve proficiency of English language skills to deliver lessons and transact the curriculum in English
   - has improved the language and learning methodology competencies of Chennai Corporation teachers, in order to improve teaching standards
   - has improved the pedagogical skills of teachers to use best practices for an interactive and participatory approach aligned with the principles of classroom management.

2) To review the lessons learned from the process of project implementation and prepare a comprehensive summary of the results compared with the goals and objectives outlined in the project document.

3) To provide information about the quality of English Language Teacher Training provided in the school when compared against project objectives; to assess the improvement of teachers of ELTTP in their language proficiency (LSRW) and also the pedagogical skills of the teachers as a result of the training.

4) Make recommendations for improving the processes for enhancing the quality of outcomes in the coming year.

**Limitations** - This study is limited by the lack of control group data for a comparative analysis. Further, the extreme shortage of time was a limiting factor. The discussions for the Impact Assessment commenced in the second week of February 2017 and Lesson Observations had to close by 10 March due to onset of revision and final exams – this provided a very short window of time to gather documentation, conduct desk review, design and develop tools customised to the ELTTP and conduct the field visits. However, the CfBT team pushed the envelope and accomplished all activities within the deadlines.

**METHODOLOGY**

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the ELTTP in a holistic manner and to benchmark them against international best practice and standards achieved, CfBT used the standard research methodologies. It conducted the assessment during March 2017. The assessment was carried out
over a period of two weeks by a team of 3 Assessors who were experts and trained in the methodology. The Assessors visited the CoC schools as per a given schedule and observed classroom transactions, interacted with the HMs, teachers and CoC officials as well as the trainers, Cambridge and TMF staff. The teachers were also administered an attitude scale to know their attitude to ELTTP. An evidence based approach to evaluation was followed. The team of Assessors consisted of former heads of institutions and trained international school inspectors who observed classroom processes, conducted interviews with key stakeholders and scrutinised relevant documents. The process involved triangulation of data and evidence gathered from various sources.

The Assessor Team used the following approach:
1. Conducted a desk review of proposal, reports and other documentation submitted
2. Reviewed the course books and materials for KET, PET and TKT
3. Developed the required tools
4. Visited 30 schools selected randomly by CfBT – but covering all media and teacher levels;
5. Interacted with the teacher, the HM using interview schedules and attitude scale for teachers
6. Had a short discussion with 2 CoC officials in schools
7. Observed 40 English speaking classroom sessions
8. Observed 3 teach back training session being conducted by CE-EBEK
9. Observed 3 monitoring visits of the CE trainers
10. Interacted with trainers, CE and TMF staff using interview schedules

**Sampling and Coverage**

Appropriate coverage was done to ensure inclusion of all the varied parameters in the population using the following criteria:

- Primary and Middle levels;
- Tamil, English, Telugu, Urdu and Tamil-English medium schools;
- Majority of the zones of the corporation and
- All levels of teachers – those taking KET, PET and TKT were covered.

A random sample of about 17% of the teachers covering the aforementioned criteria was taken. Currently, out of the total 406 teachers, the ELTTP has 283 teachers on its rolls out of which 171 teachers are actively participating so if we take 283 as N then 17% of the teachers were assessed. If we take 171 as N then it is 28% of teachers the mean of which is 22.5% which is a good sample.
Table 1: Activities and Sample Size for the Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF THE ACTIVITY</th>
<th>NUMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of schools visited</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Lessons observed</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of HMs interviewed</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of teachers interviewed</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of teachers administered Attitude Scale</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of CoC officials interviewed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of TMF officials interviewed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Cambridge staff interviewed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Cambridge trainers interviewed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Cambridge Monitoring visits observed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Cambridge Training sessions (teach back) observed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Cambridge-EBEK Assessments observed (from outside)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of meetings with TMF and Cambridge and CoC</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF FIELD ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to maintain objectivity and to minimise the impact of external assessment on the teaching and learning processes, the teachers were not informed that the Assessors were visiting their schools. The very high number of completed observation formats and Interview schedules submitted by the team of Assessors reflects the sound evidence base. This report consists of evaluations made by the Assessors on the basis of evidence gathered in relation to each significant objective of the ELTTP, taking into account the participants ages and background scaling their expectations accordingly.

**Assessment Procedure**

Each Assessor spent about 65% of time on observing classroom processes, while the remaining time was utilised to interact with the HMs, the teachers and a very few CoC officials, where possible.
Terminology Used

To maintain consistency throughout the assessment the following terms are used with reference to the indicators with the following definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All:</td>
<td>100% or very close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost All:</td>
<td>90% and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most:</td>
<td>More than 75% quarters but less than 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority:</td>
<td>More than 50% but less than 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority:</td>
<td>More than 15% but less than 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few:</td>
<td>Up to about 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 2 shows the four point rating scale that was used by the Assessors to make judgements regarding all the quality indicators as defined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOUR POINT SCALE</th>
<th>JUDGEMENT RATING</th>
<th>DEFINITION OF EACH POINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>OUTSTANDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GOOD The expected level for effective schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACCEPTABLE The minimum level of acceptability that all key aspects of performance and practice should meet or exceed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UNSATISFACTORY Quality not yet at the level acceptable for effective schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Impact Assessment Team has used the following approach:

1. Desk review of proposal, reports, study material and other documentation submitted to the team
2. Visited 30 schools selected randomly –as per aforementioned criteria
3. Observations– lesson observations of ELTTP teachers; interactions where the ELTTP been implemented; interacted with the teachers, the HMs and the CoC officials - AEO of zone 8 in CPS NSK Nagar and BRT of zone 5 in CMS MMDA-1
4. Discussions with TMF staff, Cambridge project staff, trainers
5. Observed 3 training sessions given by Cambridge to ELTTP teachers
6. Observed 3 monitoring visits by Cambridge trainers
7. Observed one assessment for teachers

MAIN FINDINGS

Review of Cambridge Methodology for ELTTP

Launched in 2013, the pilot project of ELTTP delivered its first objective, a benchmarking assessment of existing English language competencies of CoC Teachers. The assessment first measured the skills
of 100 teachers (all teachers’ names provided by CoC with no known criteria.) from 79 primary schools across the city, using the Cambridge English Placement Test. The same teachers then undertook a short (48-hour) preparation course before taking either Cambridge English: Key (KET) or Cambridge English: Preliminary (PET) (administered by Cambridge University Press). Results showed that the best teachers made a significant improvement in their skills after taking the short programme. However, closer analysis revealed that listening and speaking skills were relatively weak compared to reading and writing. This knowledge is being used to modify the learning course for subsequent programmes. The benchmarking pilot was considered a success by both Chennai Corporation and the Tech Mahindra Foundation. As a result, Cambridge English was asked to repeat the project and to extend its scope in terms of the numbers assessed. From 2013 onwards, Cambridge conducted the benchmark test for the teachers – CEPT, comprising of simple reading and listening skills only. Based on this they were divided into 3 batches – below A1 [or A0 (A zero) as it is informally called]; A1 and A2; B1 and B2. They were provided two types of training as below:

1. Language Training (LT) – begins in August; for 11 weeks @ 5 hours per week separately for each of the 3 groups. They use the Touchstone book for this – Touchstone 1 for below A1; Touchstone 2 for A1 and A2; Touchstone 3 & 4 for B1 and B2. At the end of 11 weeks, they sit for assessment - below A1 or A0 take KET; A1 and A2 + B1 and B2 take PET.

2. Teaching Methodology (TM) – With a small break after LT, TM begins in Dec-Jan using TKT book and the A1 &A2 group gets 7 weeks @ 5 hours per week of training and they are not assessed. The B1&B2 group gets 10 weeks of training @ 5 hours per week and takes TKT module 3 only as end assessment. (TKT Module 1 is language teaching-learning; Module 2 is lesson planning and Module 3 is classroom management – this is the shortest) All assessments are as per Cambridge’s fixed calendar.

The Key English Test is the easiest of the Cambridge exams. It is for those who have a basic knowledge of reading, writing, speaking and listening. It is at Difficulty level: A2 elementary. The course combines language development with systematic and thorough exam preparation and practice.

A Cambridge English Preliminary qualification shows that one can:

- read simple textbooks and articles in English
- write letters and emails on everyday subjects
- take meeting notes
- show awareness of opinions and mood in spoken and written English

1. However these skills are not relevant to the target teachers as their main need is transacting the curriculum in English in their classrooms.

These English LT are useful and teachers have made a beginning in using English in the classroom. However, this more due to the efforts of the trainers rather than the content of the books which the teachers feel is of a very high standard and not suitable for their level.

Modules 1 to 3 of TKT were investigated in the present study. Module 1 tests the knowledge of the terms and concepts of English language teaching and it focuses on the factors underpinning the learning of English. Module 2 tests the knowledge and skills necessary for lesson planning. This module also covers knowledge about assessment and resource use. Module 3 tests knowledge of what happens in the classroom during language learning, the teacher’s role in classroom management as well as methods used to manage and make the most of interactions in the classroom. However, the ELTTP does not provide Modules 1 and 2 to the participants. They are


Taken from TKT handbook for teachers: www.cambridgeenglish.org/images/22188-tkt-kal-handbook.pdf
provided Module 3 only which is more of a classroom management input which seems redundant or superfluous as all the teachers are well experienced. During interactions with teachers, almost all said that they preferred more inputs on lesson planning, activities for the classroom and classroom English. The TKT focuses more on the specialized language and abstracted concepts of ELT than on the actual application of ELT concepts in lesson preparation and delivery. TKT assessment takes the form of a multiple choice test, which have all the inherent drawbacks such as the risk of learners guessing their way through the exam; not being adaptable to measuring certain learning outcomes, such as the student’s ability to articulate explanations, display thought processes produce original ideas or provide examples.

Overall the materials and course books are of high quality and good standards with the seal of CE’s undisputable expertise and experience in the field of English Language acquisition and teaching. However, they are way beyond the capability of the majority of the target audience. The USP of the KET, PET and TKT (Teaching Knowledge Test) is that they are internationally recognized qualifications. All candidates receive an award from the University of Cambridge ESOL for completion with their grading. This qualification can enhance the teachers’ job prospects as it demonstrates that they have a certain level of knowledge of up-to-date ELT issues. But this is not relevant to the target audience as they have secure jobs and are not willing to change jobs or relocate.

The ELTTP approach with the KET, PET, TKT levels is interesting and being followed by the school teachers as evidenced by the use of basic English while teaching and use of TLM, questioning and eliciting. However, in terms of its Causative Framework and underlying theory, the assessors did not find an explicit model which showed the key interventions, the outcomes expected, the contextual variables, possible mediating factors and specific outputs and impacts.

Overall the focus seems to be on the assessment and hence the programme ends up ‘teaching to the test’ which is not conducive to language acquisition. Teachers have a negative attitude towards the test and most of them repeat the course till they can achieve expected outcomes. The very fact that only 11 out of nearly 600 teachers (since inception in 2013) who have been a part of this programme could reach Band 2 and 3 in TKT is a clear indication of the overly high standard of the exam and the inability of the training inputs to help teachers achieve the intended outcomes. The teachers shared that they are not exposed to the test items and tools used and it causes them anxiety, particularly listening as the accent is too foreign and not comprehensible to them.

The Benchmarking Test revealed the following results for Oct 2015 and 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>October 2015</th>
<th>October 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Below A1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assessment data analysis was presented for all the years, all the teachers including all levels of teachers and courses along with teacher details in one single spreadsheet which was not conducive for analysis. Overall, grades for each teacher were presented and it was not fully contributing to a skill-wise analysis for LSRW. On the whole, at least a majority of teachers had to repeat the course and a minority for more than one year.

The graph below is an analysis of the assessment data. It is clear that there has been a marginal improvement in the percentage of teachers moving up from KET to PET - up from 19% in 2015 to 29% in 2016 and a corresponding dip in the KET percentage. However this is only a minority of teachers who are in PET. This is not enough as progress is slow and most of the teachers have sat for the KET twice or thrice, in effect taking twice and thrice the amount of time to clear the test and move up.

Assessment objectives of CoC and CE must be aligned – starting from the terminology used. CoC uses ‘evaluation’ which means the process of observing and measuring a thing for the purpose of judging it and of determining its “value,” either by comparison to similar things, or to a standard. While CoC’s objective is to use evaluation as a quality control mechanism, it appears that CE’s end is assessment leading to certification and it is driven by existing strategies which might not match the project or the needs of the learners –
“Assessment - The ‘Basic User’ group will undertake a language assessment for their level (Cambridge English Key: KET). The ‘Independent User’ group will undertake a language assessment for their level (Cambridge English Preliminary: PET) plus a teaching methodology assessment (Cambridge English Teaching Knowledge Test: TKT).”

There is little evidence of assessment data analysis feeding into the review of ELTTP curriculum, training methodology and materials leading to a change in these aspects of the programme. Additionally, data recording and analysis systems need to be reviewed and streamlined to enable proper use of the data. Teacher wise targets can be set as per their abilities and measured not only in terms of acquisition but also in terms of implementation.

Overall, the ELTTP has a well-defined phase wise structure as below:

Teacher Trainings
ELTTP prepares teachers through trainings and provides relevant course materials to them in the form of books and CDs. Each teacher gets at least one class a week.

The data for number of teachers is –

---

3From Cambridge English proposal to Tech Mahindra Foundation, supporting the Corporation of Chennai initiative to enhance the pedagogy skills of Grade 1/2 teachers, November 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. on roll</th>
<th>No. dropped</th>
<th>Reason for dropping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>21 (beginning of the academic year)</td>
<td>Lack of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2016 | 283         | 183* (beginning of the academic year) (To be 123) | • Continuous absenteeism  
• Lack of progress in end assessment (failed in two cycles)  
• Above 50 years of age |

* All figures provided by CE

Out of the 283 teachers currently on rolls, 171, i.e. 60% are regular and active in the programme.

The graph below shows the teacher population:

Teachers are from the 10 zones of CoC, as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers are primary and middle school teachers handling classes from grades 1 to 7. On an average there are 2 to 3 teachers from each school; maximum being 9 from a single school. They are
from 4 types of mediums of instruction – Tamil, English, Tamil+English, Urdu and Telugu. The teachers usually move along with their classes from grades 1 to 5.

Training is conducted in the venue provided free of cost by CoC though no teacher from there is part of the project. The facilities are good, in an independent block with set of 4-5 large AC rooms, good quality furniture, suitable for training (round tables, swivel chairs, WBS, data show projectors, screen, ICT for lab sessions, systems upgraded by TMF, etc). Trainers are free lancers contracted for this project.

The Programme Co-ordinator at Cambridge also regularly supports the teachers through regular visits to the training centre and occasional visit to schools. She takes care of all the admin work as well as ensuring that all facilities are provided. As the point person, she has a good rapport with the teachers and ensures smooth functioning of the trainings.

The trainers are the heart of the programme and the key game changers and are instrumental in translating the plans from paper to the classroom. All the trainers are well qualified, experienced and have a good rapport with the participants. They are sincere, dedicated and extremely committed to their work; the learners seem to know them well and the teachers requested that their frequency of visits to the schools must be increased. They felt that the three day training from master trainers was effective and useful. The monitoring visits of trainers included 3 for LT and 2 for TM. The trainers felt that the course content and delivery was too highly structured and regulated which was restricting and left no room for innovation or meeting the needs of the teachers. The transfer of learning was not fully effective as the real classroom situation is very different from the highly rarefied atmosphere of the training. The training does not address issues of multi-grade teaching or combined teaching for two different mediums of instruction.

Most of the trainers are qualified and well versed with pedagogy but not on andragogy. They have limited understanding of the idea of adult learning or the principles thereof. The programme would be benefitted if the trainers are trained and the content and process of training is tweaked to suit the needs of adult learners. The Malcolm Knowles’ theory of the andragogical model or Jane Vella’s (1994) twelve principles for effective adult learning could be referred to for further insights.

Second is the nature of training itself. Training should be based on needs of the target audience. By its very nature, training implies equipping a specific group of teachers with specific skills, strategies, knowledge and resources to help them address specific problems in a specific teaching-learning context. That is, everything is specific in teacher training. Only specific training packages can address specific teaching-learning problems. The specificity in training calls for involvement of the target teachers in framing the training package.

During the observation of training, there was active participation, which points out that teachers believe that the sessions are helpful. A teach-back demo session was going on and included peer feedback in one training session and trainer feedback in all sessions. The assessor could not observe if any feedback was taken from teachers – such documents were not provided either. It is recommended to evaluate training effectiveness so it sheds light on:

- How well the training programme met the learner’s needs and objectives
- What knowledge and skills it has imparted to learners
- What desirable change it has brought in the learners’ performance
What benefits it has yielded
How to make future training programmes contextual

There are methods like Kirkpatrick’s Training Evaluation Model, Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning Domains and Keller’s ARCS Model. Models suggested here can be used depending on the available resources, size of the training programme and culture. Complex and critical training programmes need to choose elaborate tools and have a wider approach to evaluate each programme at various stages. Only then can the evaluation become effective and accurate.

The assessor took oral feedback from 15 teachers who attended the demo session. They indicated that they found the programme useful. They mentioned that the programme has given a stage to speak English confidently, to learn more English, to improve their grammar and communication skills. They felt that the mind block against English has been removed due to the programme and are no longer intimidated or inhibited. The thematic teaching method taking real life situations as trigger for activities enabled teachers to express themselves. However, a majority of teachers felt that there was too much trainer talk during the sessions which led to fewer opportunities for participants to speak or participate actively and meaningfully. The training content too was not fully useful in real classroom situations and teaching-learning. The teachers wanted inputs to help them transact the stipulated curriculum and enable them to teach the prescribed lessons. Most of the teachers felt that the TM was engaging and students found it interesting. But the drawback was that it was not fully compatible with the Activity Based Learning (ABL) methodology, the key feature of which is that it uses child-friendly educational aids to foster self-learning and allows a child to study according to his or her aptitude and skill. They felt that the training does not directly link to the real classrooms, ignores local contexts, and does not address trainees’ mental constructs, their needs and expectations.

Most of the training is done in workshop mode. A few workshops have been conducted but there has been no sustained data gathering for evidence on how perspective of teachers is being developed on elements like language acquisition and learning, language pedagogy and so on. This would impact how ELTTP intends to use and scale-up the training process. At present, the content of training seems to be focused on skills and seeing language acquisition and teaching in terms of skill-development. However, questions like how to bring mother tongue into the language or how to integrate local flavoured speaking activities, stories and poems have not been addressed. There is also little integration on how language acquisition and mastery could be useful for other subjects. The importance of learning English seems to be limited to the English subject teacher. How, for instance, it could be useful for a Science or a Mathematics teacher has not been explored and taken up as part of the strategy. In our observations, we also found the teachers wanting in how to ensure that most learners are engaged and encouraged. Most of the questions were being answered by a select few students. It was felt that understanding and responding to such class dynamics has not been explored in a systematic way in the trainings.

The issue of absenteeism in trainings needs to be addressed on a war footing. Strategies must be devised based on a two pronged approach of intrinsic motivation coupled with tangible rewards such as prizes /awards/certificates or intangible ones such as appreciation/praise at public/open forums.

Monitoring Visits
CE trainers visit schools to observe the lessons of the ELTTP teachers and see them in action. This aspect is a must in order to check the knowledge and skills acquired, transferred and implemented - the programme has this aspect covered. Monitoring visits are conducted twice at the end of the TM cycle. The first visit is for observation of just one teacher per school and the second time around, almost all teachers are covered. The trainers are allotted schools and they manage to visit 3 to 4 schools per day. The visits might be announced or not as per the trainer but not on any set criteria. The trainer observes one period of a lesson using a classroom observation tool and then gives oral feedback to the teacher; beginning with self-reflection by the teacher. This is followed by the ‘two stars and a wish’ method of feedback by the trainer commencing with at least two positive aspects followed by the areas for development. The feedback is generally very brief with excessive stress on the positives.

Overall monitoring visits are helpful as they can check the stages of implementation and the level of English of the teachers. However, for monitoring to be effective, the following can be considered:

- Monitoring should start from the beginning of the training – both LT and TM so that implementation can be rigorous and any bottlenecks can be ironed out. Inputs will be put into practice more effectively and internalized by teachers.
- Number of monitoring visits must be increased for support as well as for rigorous supervision and effective implementation
- The trainers can provide more handholding support to teachers by giving demo sessions in the classroom / micro teaching to enable better clarity and providing usable examples for teachers.
- Train teachers better on self-reflection
- Consolidate, analyze and use the data from the trainers Classroom observation tool to find strengths and areas for development and feed into training inputs
- Track the progress of each teacher. Maintain records, set targets and share them with the teachers
- Provide effective diagnostic and constructive feedback to help improve their teaching-learning
- TMF conducts its own monitoring regularly. This can be compared with the trainers’ findings and issues prioritized and resolved.

**Classroom Observations**

The classroom observations are the litmus test for the project and they give the true picture of the project efficacy. The team of assessors observed lessons of 40 teachers using the classroom observation tool designed and developed for this study. The tool has 7 major indicators with various elements under each with a total of 50 elements, as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>No. of Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and preparing the session</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening the session</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and learning methods</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using language appropriately for a range of classroom functions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology and Classroom Management</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence and use of ELTTP inputs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One important impressive point was that practically most of the teachers observed were very welcoming and eager to demonstrate their teaching and English skills. They were enthusiastic in teaching and communicated that enthusiasm to the students. Most of the teachers conducted the larger part or majority of the lesson in English. They were confident while teaching and a majority spoke fluently despite a minority of grammatical errors, mispronunciation.

The overall summary of lessons observed is shown in the table below:

Table- Percentage of lessons in each rating-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTSTANDING- 4</th>
<th>GOOD - 3</th>
<th>ACCEPTABLE -2</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY - 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is heartening that there were pockets of good practice and that acceptable teaching was seen in nearly over two-fifths of lessons; overall nearly half the lessons were acceptable or better.

The graph below gives details of indicator wise observations.

The majority of teachers were familiar with the content of the lesson and the materials used. A minority had a clear view of learners’ needs and capabilities, or a plan to find out these. Only a few selected a range of learning activities to promote active learning and designed the lesson to elicit and sustain students’ attention, interest and involvement. The majority of teachers prepared suitable resources and learning aids to support learning. The assessors did not see any lesson plans of the teachers and when asked, they gave varying responses about teaching diaries but were not provided.
However, in a minority of lessons, teachers took time to settle the students, gather resources and begin teaching. This impacted on the instructional time as it took away a good 5 to 10 minutes in each case.

Most of the teachers incorporated appropriate introductory warm-up/starter activities and presentation techniques to motivate students – however, they appeared to be rote/mechanical such as rain claps, or ‘sit/stand’ instruction. In a few cases, teachers instructed students to stand in a circle and asked students to follow randomly called out ‘in’ or ‘out’ – those who follow correctly continue the game while others are ‘out’ of the game. This goes on till the last student who is the winner. It took too long and had no link to the lesson or buildup of knowledge.

Sharing the learning objective with students was a weaker aspect as a majority of teachers bypassed this step – just wrote the topic on the board. Those that did share were not fully effective. None of the teachers outlined the plan of the session to the students and only a few started the lesson by linking back to previous learning. Checking the present level of knowledge skills and understanding was weak as choral answers were accepted and this was not conducive for the teacher to be aware of which students needed further inputs or re-negotiating the session if necessary.

The teachers, in most of the cases, used whole class traditional teaching methods – read out selected portions of the text and explained mostly in English and bilingually – for eg, even in a class on Data Handling for grade 4. Majority used flash cards and ABL cards to reinforce learning. Selected methods were not always appropriate for the students’ age and abilities or for the subject matter being taught in a majority of the cases. Hands on activities were not observed except in two classes – one on planets and the other on types of nouns. In the former, the teacher distributed pictures of planets and names of planets on cards to students and they had to find their pair. It was not well organized and the class became noisy. In the latter, the teacher made 4 students stand, each nominated with one type of noun – person, place, animal and thing. She distributed cards with examples of each and the students had to read their cards and line up under the appropriate type.

However, overall, the teachers did not fully use a variety of methods that promoted active learning, involved students or provided them opportunities to speak or made the students use higher order thinking skills.

Teachers motivated the students by being enthusiastic and making the lesson interesting through questioning. Most of the teachers had a good rapport with students and were caring. In four cases observed, the children with special needs were largely ignored in the class but in one case, a child was given class minding duties and was reported to have improved in socialization. The students too looked up to their teachers and were very fond of them. But it is a matter of concern that a few teachers used harsh/scolding tones, were too loud and intimidated students. In six classes, canes / scales were observed and in one class, a teacher was holding a cane and not for pointing. This is not acceptable under any circumstance and needs to be fully eradicated at the earliest.

The highlight of the teaching was the use of English in the classroom, though at a very basic level. The teachers were fluent though were constrained by their limited vocabulary a few common grammatical errors and mispronunciation. A majority of the teachers were successful in getting learners’ attention with sentences such as ‘All sit down’, ‘open page number...’; ‘today we will learn....’. The common grammatical errors were: subject-verb agreement, improper usage of articles, (particularly use of ‘the’), plurals, tenses, word order (syntax).
Their skills of instructing were acceptable and they could tell students to listen, match, count etc – there was little evidence of complex instructions or for hands on activities. Modeling was used often and students repeated the teachers’ sentences which were demonstrated. Encouraging and prompting were a well-entrenched part of the teaching as well as nominating. It was heartening to see teachers using names of students.

Questioning was used to elicit information and to check information for activities (ICQ). However CCQ – Concept Checking Questioning to check understanding was limited to recall of facts and closed yes/no questions. Teachers need more inputs on asking open-ended questions and give appropriate constructive feedback to students for their progress. They also need to develop skills to ask targeted, relevant questions in a more natural manner and link it to the topic.

In almost all the lessons, the vocabulary teaching was weak. Words and the meaning of words were written on the board (which is already given in textbooks / ABL cards) but when the students were asked to write/frame a sentence using the word, most of the students could not do so. Sometimes the meanings were confusing/ more difficult than the word. More time needs to be spent on this aspect in classes. As well as giving the meaning of words, the teacher needs to get the students to use the words in sentences. The next step is to teach the students to use the dictionary (or Pictionary for lower classes with younger children) rather than the teacher writing the word and meaning on the black board.

A majority of the teachers seemed to be teaching a repetition class rather than a new lesson and hence the students were quite well prepared to answer questions. In a minority of the classes observed, the teachers were teaching prepositions. It appeared formulaic – teachers would write a list of prepositions on the board, bring out a few items available in the classroom such as pens, pencils, bags, books, purse, ball, box, pencil box/pouch and place them in various positions relating to a table and tell the students the relevant sentence, eg, ‘the book is on the table’ followed by choral repetition and drilling.

Students in most of the schools were eager to learn, attentive and engaged in learning, although they were required to listen for long periods before being asked to respond to questions. Older students responded well to teacher direction and questions and demonstrated understanding of their lessons. Rote learning predominated in all the classes and so students did not become self-directed or independent learners. There was no provision for students with special educational needs but low achievers were rarely given extra support, time and help in their learning by the teachers during their free time. Similarly, high achievers were not encouraged to think critically or challenged enough to develop research skills which impeded their progress.
Overall the whole programme focuses on ‘teaching’ rather than on ‘learning’. It is recommended to shift to a learner-centric approach, though the transition period from a traditional classroom to the idea of a learner-learner environment may cause some difficulties at first. However, after setting particular goals and adjusting to the new situation; there is no doubt that when teachers decide to focus on learning rather than teaching, the successes far outweigh the problems. GOOD LEARNING has these features - motivated and eager students; actively involved in learning and improving their skills in learning; interest is evident in the questions they ask; development in understanding is evident through the connections they make; they are reflective and analytical; independence in learning is evident; collaborate well in groups and support their peers; they apply skills, knowledge and understanding to new learning contexts and real life situations; display proficient research skills using books and ICT; show critical thinking and make accurate and appropriate conclusions. This is underpinned by the development and use of 21st century skills which include Innovation, effective communication, enterprise, enquiry, research, critical thinking and use of learning technologies, Application of learning to the world and making connections between areas of learning. The teachers must be trained on these aspects and how to develop these skills in students. The lesson observation tools too need to be customized to capture these elements in a classroom.

The findings of the study show that unfamiliarity with the sound system of English, inadequate range of vocabulary, inability to form certain grammatical constructions, listening and speaking - two of the four skills of English language, have been considered as a crucial problem. Learners confront lots of difficulties in oral communication, especially in pronunciation including sounds, stress, intonation, etc. They also often find English word formation and sentence construction quite challenging. Moreover, the learners face difficulties in learning vocabulary items and to convey meanings through and/or receive meanings of words, phrases, clauses, sentences/utterances and so forth. Such problems obviously seriously hamper the learners’ oral as well as written communication. Therefore, it seems reasonable to take account of and identify what major linguistic barriers the students encounter in oral and written communication and what measures can be taken to overcome those barriers.

Interviews with stakeholders
Discussions/interviews using specially developed Interview schedules, tools were held with all stakeholders—primary stakeholders—beneficiaries or targets of the effort i.e. teachers; secondary stakeholders—those directly involved with and responsible for beneficiaries or targets of the effort i.e. TMF and CE officials; key stakeholders—government officials and policy makers i.e. CoC officials and HMs.

During interviews, information was obtained through inquiry and recorded by the assessors. Structured interviews were performed by using survey forms, along with open interviews with notes taken while talking with respondents. The notes were subsequently structured (interpreted) for further analysis.

**Teachers**

Teachers were administered an interview schedule as well as an attitude scale (towards the end of this section of Main Findings). They were asked about the positives and most of them were unanimous in saying that they lost their fear of English and that their confidence to speak has improved, which they attributed to the trainers encouragement and support.

Teachers were asked regarding barriers for not taking interest in the professional development trainings. They gave different responses. Several reasons and factors were identified by teachers which hinder their active participation and interest in professional development trainings. Identified elements were:

- extra workload
- high standards of inputs which were not accessible to teachers
- highly accented listening exercises which were too fast to follow
- lack of sufficient practice
- not helpful in transacting the prescribed curriculum
- insufficient time
- absence of incentives in professional development trainings
- over emphasis on theoretical aspects than practice
- family responsibilities
- teacher’s conservativeness
- lack of awareness regarding usefulness of training
- conflict with teachers working schedule.
- not in sync with the existing ABL methodology in schools
- loss of instructional time for their students
- too long duration of training
- lack of on-site support

These were some barriers or reasons which were identified by teachers.

A majority felt that training does not directly link to the real classrooms, ignores local contexts, and does not address trainees’ mental constructs, their needs and expectations.

When asked to suggest some ways through which they can be motivated for taking interest in professional development trainings, different ways were suggested by the teachers through which teachers can be motivated to take interest in the professional development trainings. They suggested that first of all teacher should be aware that how important professional development training is, for their successful career. Much emphasis should be given on aspects that help them in the classroom, what and how to teach. Teachers should be rewarded for good jobs. Incentives or stimuli should be offered during professional development trainings. There should be proper monitoring of teachers’ teaching practices after trainings. Traveling and accommodation facilities were cited by a minority of teachers if trainings centers are far away from their schools. Teachers
should be encouraged and motivated during trainings. These were some suggestions which can be used for motivating teachers to take interest in the professional development trainings.

**HMs**

Most of the HMs recognized that there is an essential need to switch over to English in the light of current needs so this TMF project is a very useful and timely one to enable vernacular teachers teach in English. They recognize the value and they have a very good view of it. This was seen in the interactions of the assessors with HMs right from the first contact over phone. Almost all HMs recognized the programme and were very welcoming, right from giving accurate directions to schools. They were very co-operative of the assessment process, were eager to interact, allow classroom observations and interviews with teachers and do everything to take the project forward. One HM called it as ‘golden opportunity for teachers’. This showed that the image of the project is very good.

In most of the HMs perspectives, one of the most important factors contributing for the lack of 100% implementation of the TMF teacher training is the attitude of teachers. Most teachers (not all because few are active and work hard) do not feel such training as an opportunity for their professional development, whereas they feel it as a burden without any chance to earn extra money. It is necessary to make them feel the importance of it. Therefore, teachers need to change their attitude and apply the skills learnt in training in their classroom. From the discussions, the assessors think a possible solution for this problem can be a good head master/mistress. If a HM has positive attitude towards training, knowledge and understanding of the training components, and encourages his/her teachers to apply new ideas in classroom, teachers cannot afford to be reluctant to transfer the skills in the classrooms.

The HMs also pointed out, very subtly, the weak monitoring system as yet another factor for this problem. Despite having Resource Persons (RP) and supervisors, the government is unable to make monitoring effective. Classroom inspection and supervision are not given their full due. The RPs do not observe classes minutely or offer constructive feedback to teachers. This, they felt, was not conducive to ensure teachers are transferring the skills in their classes. They felt that all the officials and HMs should be trained to monitor and support teachers.

The positives, according to a majority of HMs are the improved English skills of teachers, lack of fear and a paradigm shift in classroom language.

They pointed out that this course is easier for graduates or teachers with higher educational qualifications. So it can’t go in tandem for teachers of varied abilities, backgrounds, age, attitudes. They suggested a bridge course for those less proficient before they can take up this training. A minority of HMs felt that their students are slowly able to understand basic questions in English and have started responding in English with one-word answers. They felt that more spoken English practice should be given and more curriculum related inputs.

A few said that there are issues with parents due to long absences of teachers on a weekly basis on account of the training. They said that the British Council model of 4-6 days training or the TFI (Teach for India) model of in-school teacher can be followed to avoid these lengthy absences. They were particularly extolling the impact of the TFI model.

**CoC officials**
The CoC officials felt that the programme intentions were good and essential at this juncture but that it was weak in implementation. As the officials were not aware of the training inputs they were not able to give any feedback vis-à-vis the content or modalities. They however said that they have not observed much difference in the quantum of use of English in the classroom. There is not much transfer of learning to the classroom. The trainings must empower teachers to create situations for students to speak in English. Initiative and vocabulary must be developed in teachers and they should have the joy and interest to speak in English with consistent practice and motivation; repetition and reinforcement. More monitoring visits must be made and teacher performance should be graded on a range of parameters using specially designed templates for lesson observation; with suitable follow up activities. A pre- and post-intervention test has to be administered for both teachers and students linked with the curriculum expectations.

They were very appreciative of the initiative and extended all support for the programme.

**ELTTP Trainers (CE-EBEK)**

As already discussed in the section under Training, the trainers are the key to the project who have slowly changed the attitudes of teachers towards the project positively and built their confidence to attempt to speak in English.

Almost all the trainers felt that the thematic methodology is based on real life situations and helps teachers react appropriately. It removes inhibitions of teachers and encourages them to speak in English. Most used bi-lingual training methods initially till the teachers reached their comfort zone in understanding English. They felt that a one week gap between one class to another is not conducive to learning and takes away the focus of the teachers. They tend to forget what they learnt and most of the session time is spent on refreshing their memories and relearning rather than on new learning. This leads to backlog and a rush at the end when they have to face exams. So they suggested closely-knit sessions for continuity instead of long drawn-out ones. Teachers need support from management and the latter should ensure that the teachers stay focused on the training and not on other activities or trainings.

Teachers should be recognized and provided with incentives or awards to encourage attendance which is a big issue.

**CE Staff**

The CE representatives shared their perspective of the project from the implementation point of view as the knowledge and training partner. A lot of the discussions centred on the content, implementation and assessment and has been enumerated and assessed throughout this report in various sections. The team was clear about their objectives and their focus on assessment of international standards as they believe that teachers are the heart of education and their training intervention needs measurement. They cater to their client TMF, not CoC as the latter is done by TMF and they have no direct interface with CoC.

The quality of the books and materials is high as it is research based, using core principles of LT and interactive learning.
The challenges faced were more due to natural calamities due to which the phases of the project could not be adhered to fully and the assessments had to be put forward. The language assessment had to be completed after the LT but this was not possible due to aforementioned reason and also due to the strict blocking of exam dates which has to be done much in advance. This caused anxiety to teachers.

The other challenge is overcoming the resistance of teachers; lack of understanding of the objectives of the programme by all levels of CoC; only 50% of objectives achieved as they are battling with the issue of teacher motivation, lack of attendance and lack of progress, especially in their speaking and listening skills.

The strengths of the programme are - adapting to changes and CoC requirements and improving teacher motivation; self-awareness and reflection on test results and sharing with teachers

Overall the CE staff are dedicated and hard working in their implementation of the programme but if they could reflect on the recommendations and implement them, it would go to the next level.

**TMF Staff**

A wide ranging discussion was held with the TMF representative right from the vision of the project to the sustainability. This interview clearly showed that TMF has a long term vision with a plan of action to achieve it; is very aware of the ground realities and is in the process of planning to tackle the issues which are road blocks to a full take up of the project. The capacity to articulate, innovate and adapt are the key strengths of the project management. TMF, as already mentioned, is working tirelessly in the field of building capacity of Govt. or Corporation school teachers. The aim to develop a one-of-a-kind training centre to provide all kinds of training services to Govt. schools for quality outcomes.; train teachers to teach English better.

The decision to introduce English in CoC schools was in response to the spread of English as a global language and the need to equip students with academic and communication skills in the language. This was also in response to the aspirations of parents to help their children have better employment opportunities and achieve economic mobility in society. CoC wanted TMF’s assistance to convert Tamil medium schools to English medium ones or run the English medium ones parallel with Tamil medium ones by a two pronged approach - improving English Language proficiency of teachers as well as their pedagogy.

In the ABL methodology, spoken English is not focused upon – focusing largely on Math and science and text book English for Reading and Writing. So the mandate was to focus on English in the TMF project. This eschewed the ABL-ELTTP methodology mis-match as spoken English was not in the picture – it would be a new introduction with a new approach. However as the assessor observed, in reality all subjects are being taught in English and teachers are not equipped with the subject specific vocabulary. There is no focus on spoken English in classrooms – traditional text-based teaching is going on along with grammar concepts being taught traditionally with definitions, examples, drill and practice.

TMF closely monitors the programme with its own staff visiting schools and observing lessons using an in-house designed tool. It also conducts an annual tri-partite review to address challenges and adapt the programme according to the current needs. TMF is also big on innovation in planning to set up a new sub-training centre, in North Madras, easily accessible to teachers so that with this
single initiative, the twin issues of attendance and teacher fatigue can be addressed in addition to aligning with TMF’s vision of setting up high quality training centres. TMF also plans to work with CoC to improve attendance by having a point-person and the Dy. Commissioner to motivate teachers and share the importance of this game changer in education.

The highlights of this programme are –

- The entire CoC understands this programme and supports it extensively, right from the Commissioner, middle management and HMs. The Dy.Comm, invited TMF officials to his office and gave them his contact details and support. TMF officials need not wait for appointments and can meet him on short notice.
- It is a great model for other CoC schools.
- The good and effective impact on teachers where nearly 60% teach in English and the positive impact on the students
- The appreciation from the CoC officials and teachers
- The learning for the team that a long term programme makes more impact; the formation of a committee with the CoC for continuity
- The great service to the community by aiming to provide English medium education in CoC schools on par with private schools so that poor parents can avoid the burden of exorbitant fees and the CoC schools can see the reverse trend of burgeoning enrolment numbers

TMF has planned sustainability by multiple options – select a pool of Resource Persons / master trainers from among the best teachers with the potential and train them to be RPs in the CoC/Govt. schools; aligning this programme with the mandated training by the Govt so that the Govt mechanism trains, monitors and tracks the progress of the programme along with in-built review sessions. The clear vision of TMF coupled with the flexibility to meet challenges and changes makes it a well-executed project. Overall this programme is well-conceived, designed, fills an extenuating necessity and is sustainable if the recommendations suggested are implemented.

**Findings from the Attitude Scale for teachers**

An attitude scale with a five-point rating having 5 categories of responses was administered to the teacher group who underwent the ELTTP. Scoring weights of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 were used for strongly agree (SA), agree (A), don’t know (DK), Disagree (D), strongly disagree (SD) for the statements with favourable attitude. The total number of items was 20.

The purpose of the administration of the attitude scale was to explore CoC teachers' attitudes toward the professional development programme. It was found that although the majority of teachers generally agreed and were satisfied with the efficiency of the current in-service teacher training programmes, their attitudes were not significantly positive. The results of the study showed that CoC teachers are not significantly satisfied with the ELTTP professional development programme. The results showed that participants agreed to some extent that the ELTTP in-service teacher training programmes are efficient. (See Appendix for details)

CoC teachers were significantly homogeneous regarding their attitudes towards the current in-service teacher training programme ELTTP. Their ideas did not vary across different ages, genders,
academic background and teaching experience. In other words, dissatisfaction is what most teachers felt. The perceptions of teachers towards the ELTTP reflected their needs, and their degrees of interest and priorities regarding professional development and additional training. The results of study provided some theoretical and pedagogical implications. As a theoretical implication, this study presented the ELTTP professional development programme as the way to increase the quality of teaching practice, support teachers, and reinforce teachers’ knowledge and ability. It also provides situation for teachers to have a new understanding of their teaching materials, update their knowledge and share their teaching strategies with other colleagues.

The findings of this study also suggest some implications for pedagogy. This study revealed some problems and challenges of teachers regarding their participation in in-service teacher training programmes. In ELTTP contexts, there is no or little exposure to target language for both teachers and students out of classroom setting. ELTTP could help to keep continuous contact with target language. The results of this study provided insights for teacher educators to improve teachers’ understanding of their beliefs about language learning and direct them in order to promote the teaching practices such as the selection of class activities and materials as well as the teaching approaches that match with the goals or the curriculum of the schools.

Data indicated that there are many reasons due to which teachers do not take interest in the professional development trainings. Reasons or barriers were absence of incentive, lack of enough stimuli, teachers’ workload, and work stress, much theoretical aspect then practical aspect, family responsibilities, lack of opportunities and not having awareness regarding usefulness of professional development training. Data indicated that majority of the teachers attend professional development trainings just due to pressure from the top.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Report concludes by providing specific recommendations that TMF could consider for implementation in the future in order to redress the challenges faced. These recommendations here reiterate the key ones and elaborate on the ones provided both in the Executive Summary as well as sprinkled throughout the Main Findings, under various headings, as below:

**Project Planning**

1. **Alignment of the vision, goals and expected outcomes** - It would be useful for TMF, CoC and Cambridge to take the feedback from the intervention along-with the points raised in this review and re-look at the goals and objectives of the project. A joint session with the teachers, the HMs, the CoC officials right from CRPs/BRTs upwards, the TMF and Cambridge staff would help fixing what are the specific goals of ELTTP and the timeframes for achieving them. ELTTP could make explicit its model and approach on how its interventions combine to improve the English proficiency of its target audience.

2. **Develop a few model schools that offer high quality inputs and showcase them; provide exposure visits to teachers to observe and imbibe and implement the best practices.**

3. **ELTTP has the long term aims of improving the language skills in English for “children” in the select schools in terms of listening, speaking, reading and writing. However, the objectives of the programme have been translated in terms of improving capacity of “teachers” through a tried and tested programme which could be scaled up. Hence the aims and the objectives of the**
programme need to be more aligned. It might be useful to view the improvement in capacity of teachers as an intermediate outcome and not as the prime objective of the programme.

4. Limitations of the cascade model are fully recognised but, because of the large numbers involved and the vast geographical reach, direct inputs to students was not an option. Strategies for minimising transition loss must be embedded into the implementation plan. Master trainers are the direct communication with trainers, trainers with teachers and, similarly, teachers are the direct communication with learners. Teachers need to be convinced that the proposed ‘change’ will have beneficial effects. Not only do they need to know ‘What’s in it for me?’, but it also helps if they know what the intended change in classroom practice might look like. Celebrate and communicate success and provide continuing support for trainers and teachers to enable them to continue growing after the initial programme has concluded.

5. Develop and implement strategies to improve attendance and take up by providing incentives

6. Very serious reflection on the future plans is suggested. Develop a proper project lifecycle, performance and goal setting with a concrete result set, project management methodology, quality assurance and strategic development plans – both short and long term.

Stakeholder Involvement

7. Involve all stakeholders, particularly teachers for developing ownership of the programme. For instance have a brainstorming or competition to come up with a catchy name for the programme, develop schedules of training, choose content, share their training needs, etc. Involve HMs, CoC officials by training them to monitor the programme. Have meaningful consultations leading to shared expectations and the importance of building a relationship of mutual respect and trust.

8. More importantly, individual schools and head teachers should be made responsible for the successful implementation of the teaching of English at the primary level by providing exposure to varied and meaningful inputs in English, creating a real need and desire to use English and providing sufficient time for English to become crucial at the early stages of learning the language.

9. A key area in learning English is the school climate. If a school is trying to stress English, there should be some sign of the existence of a print rich environment in English in schools. This was not the case. Further coordination with the CoC and school management should be done to see if the school can change its culture more to a bilingual school, showed by the notices in the school, the school assemblies etc.

Training Methodology

10. The training programme should be learner-centric, as below:

- Instruction – Multimodal/multimedia, Learner-centered, Open, flexible, “any time, any place” learning approach grounded in constructivism.
- The role of instructor gradually changes to one where instructor provides ongoing support, is a co-learner, assesses and supports learner’s process, progress, and products
- Role of learner moves to Learner as member of community of learning and practice, promotes collegiality and shared learning, constant communication and collaboration among learners, combines online and face-to-face interactions
- Learning - Multisensory/multichannel with active and participatory learning
• Assessment - Practically based/performance-based/ focused on classroom application
assessment which is diagnostic, formative, and summative and assesses knowledge, skills,
behaviors, and attitudes and is assessed by instructor, peers, and self

11. Presentation of textual material could be multidimensional. In other words, role plays, different
narrative styles, games, rhymes and songs, argumentative - dialogic and art forms and other
strategies could have been integrated with the textual material and presented in a psychological
and emotional manner. It is strongly felt that integration of rhymes and songs with textual
material and creating space for children to produce their own rhymes, songs and stories have a
lot of potential for generating children’s discourses and creative expressions.

12. Understand and incorporate principles of learning in children - Children are good at acquiring
languages rather than learning one. Acquisition means developing an ability to pick up useful
utterances, meaningful phrases and expressions and using such utterances in natural,
communicative situations. Both the teachers (learners in ELTTP) and students can be provided
* exposure so that students develop the interest required to acquire the target language
* facilities to develop the ability to communicate using the target language in an environment
that requires its use

*To facilitate the acquisition of English, to provide a broad level of vocabulary, 250 – 1000 items,
and a set of structures and functions consisting of components such as: stories for narration,
total physical response activities, dialogues for practice, rhymes and songs and language games.
Children love games of all kinds and this tendency of the young learners towards ‘play’ can be
utilized in the language classroom. Play has a key role in the learning process for children. Play is
a source of motivation, interest and enjoyment ... for children, inside and outside the classroom,
playing is a source of language, and a context for language use. Therefore, the primary teacher
at the elementary level must be specially trained and highly skilled having a good knowledge not
only of his/her subject but also of the child psychology. S/He has to be trained in such a way that
she patiently deals with young children in a friendly, congenial and happy atmosphere so as to
sustain their interest in the learning activities. They have to get to the level of their young
students by applying different teaching/learning strategies like demonstration and bodily
gestures, facial expressions, actions etc. to make the class an interesting and enjoyable place.

13. Understand and incorporate factors facilitating English language acquisition and train teachers
using them - Some learn a new language more quickly and easily than others. Some language
learners are successful by virtue of their determination, hard work and persistence. However
there are other crucial factors influencing success that are largely beyond the control of the
learner. These factors can be broadly categorized as internal and external. It is their complex
interplay that determines the speed and facility with which the new language is learned. The
figure below shows the factors influencing acquisition of English language:

Figure - The factors that influence the acquisition of English
Other factors that affect English Language acquisition are:

i) Scaffolding – providing demonstration while controlling the environment so that the students can learn step-by-step with support. Scaffolding improves language acquisition.

ii) Reciprocal Teaching – open dialogue between student and teacher which goes beyond simple question and answer session

iii) Chunking – is grouping information for efficient use of short-term memory. Chunking breaks up long strings of information into units or chunk which are easier to remember. It reduces cognitive load as the learner processes information

iv) Meaningfulness – Meaningful words are easier to remember than meaningless words. So students have to be given proper explanation of the meaning of words and ensure that they understand it.

v) Practice – This improves retention due to reinforcement as the saying goes, practice makes perfect. Distributed practice is more effective than massed practice

vi) Transfer of learning – There are some positive effects of prior learning on acquisition of English as some grammar rules may be similar. However, negative effects are seen when learners try to translate mother tongue into English and due to lack of knowledge of native local idioms.

vii) Cognitive learning styles and strategies

viii) Cultural background; Prior experience with English; Level of education; Teacher expectations; Classroom environment

ix) Affective factors - Self-esteem, Inhibition, Risk taking, Anxiety

These can be factored into the training content and methodology for teachers who can subsequently internalize them and cascade them to their students

14. Children have an innate ability to learn a language. They possess certain special characteristics that help them learn a language. Some of these characteristics, include:
Focusing on the meaning of utterances, rather than the form or rules of the language and the ability to interpret the meaning of a situation

Talking - they have a great desire to express their ideas with whatever limited language available to them.

Doing activities, playing games and singing songs and rhymes

Using ‘chunks’ (meaningful phrases) of language they have picked up from different sources

Experimenting with language and using it creatively

Materials
In addition to the current materials, develop and provide

15. Lesson planning - exemplars, templates, samples and if possible for all lessons; well done, brief and to the point, should be one of the main TLMs.

16. Develop Teacher Manuals and Teacher Self Improvement Booklets – English/bilingual Manuals/handbooks can be designed for teachers and provided. By and large all the manuals and teacher self-improvement books may touch upon the following aspects:

- Objectives; Classroom English; Activities; Guidelines; The philosophy behind the ELTP approach; Methods of transacting the content; Classroom Processes; Assessment and Evaluation strategies; Follow-up activities; etc.

Teacher’s manuals should empower teachers and provide an opportunity to them to develop adequate understanding about language, language skills, language acquisition, psychology of learning, strategies for transacting curriculum and educational approach to language learning.

17. Provide ready reckoners, bi-lingual dictionaries, key phrases, vocabulary lists, sight words, word walls, word banks, writing frames, substitution tables, examples, mind-mapping tools etc for the teachers which can in turn be used for students. These should be provided in tandem with the course and be updated. Use rubrics and student self-assessment techniques to foster meta-cognition for learning.

18. It should be practical, authentic, using problem-based approach with emphasis on application. Maximum opportunities to practice should be built in with continuous monitoring and feedback. If teachers’ socio-cultural contexts and interests are encapsulated in teacher training programmes, they are likely to be more effective.

Assessment

19. Consider replacing/revamping the current assessment of KET/PET/TKT assessments which teachers feel is not fully relevant and is too intimidating and high-brow, especially the listening section where they are at sea in comprehending due to the accent. Develop customized assessment strategies and tools to measure progress in practice rather than in theory. Develop assessment data analysis tools and methods to use this to give constructive feedback and to inform planning.

Monitoring

20. Monitoring must go hand in hand with programme implementation and delivery – ie commence right from the outset of the programme. Number of monitoring visits must be increased for support as well as for rigorous supervision and effective implementation. The trainers can provide more handholding on-site support to teachers by giving demo sessions in the classroom / micro teaching to enable better clarity and providing usable examples for teachers. Train and
involve CoC officials and HMs to monitor and provide feedback. Refer to monitoring section for detailed recommendations

**Alternative modes of delivery**

21. The long duration of the programme adversely affects instructional time not only of participating teachers-students but also for non-participants who are left to cover for the former and end up with large multi-grades which can just be supervised but cannot be taught. Parents too complain about the teacher absence and this causes tensions in the school-parents links and rapport. In order to cater to reduced training time, TMF can consider moving away for a part of the duration from traditional training methods to any suitable one of the following distance learning methods

(i) Print-based learning materials
(ii) Audio-based learning materials - Two-Way Audio, Broadcast Radio, Interactive Radio Instruction (IRI), Interactive Audio Instruction (IAI), Phones and Audio Conferencing.
(iii) Televisual-based learning materials - Television, Internet Protocol Television (IPTV), Video, Videoconferencing
(iv) Multimedia-based learning materials - CD-ROMs, DVDs, and VCDs; Digital Learning Games.
(vi) Web-based Models for Distance Learning - Blended Learning, Computer-Mediated Communication, Online Tutoring, Coaching and Mentoring, Online Learning Communities, Webcasts and Webinars, Portals, Real Simple Syndication (RSS)
(vii) Mobile Technologies for Distance Learning - Mobile Phones, Smart Phones, Hand-held Devices, Portable Media Players, Digital Tablets, E-Readers

**Strengthening Teacher Professional Development**

22. Professional development of teachers needs to have the following elements.
   
   (a) Focus on Content - The trainings could become more intensive about helping teachers gain mastery over their own English language skills and improving their knowledge of how to teach English. This needs to be continually assessed through reflective journals, teacher workbooks, classroom observations and teacher’s own feedback.
   (b) Continuous - Conceptualized as extending over various sessions. This is already being done and needs to be continued.
   (c) Collaborative - Activities and tasks which involve other colleagues especially within the school would be very useful. At present, the teachers collaborate, if at all, only during the workshops. They could engage with other teachers in the same schools who would like to improve their own English or that of their students and create opportunities for interaction. Another authentic and useful way could be to work together on lessons through Lesson Study. One or a pair of teachers could design and teach a lesson while others observe and take notes. Later, the teachers discuss the lesson and the classroom session and try and understand ways in which it could be improved. Then another teacher takes this improved lesson and teaches it in her classroom while the others observe.
   (d) Closer links to curriculum - TMF could really strengthen its programme by aligning the training curriculum to that of the school wherever possible. This means using some of the exercises, stories and poems from the schools’ English textbooks if possible.
23. Provide a more robust CPD for the teachers so that they are able to adopt best practice with an understanding and encourage collegiality and sharing so that they implement the same in word and spirit. Incorporate the Principles of adult learning in the training methodology.

Other recommendations
24. Discussion on a possible follow up after class 8 should be done, to see how better students can be helped, or if not possible, at least to ascertain the progress of the students as a help to evaluate the programme.
25. The next contributing factor to the success of a programme is accountability and the existence of impunity. There is no strong and effective mechanism to reward those who are doing well and penalize irresponsible ones. This eventually discourages the teachers who are willing to do something. Hence a strategy to address this should be developed.

Conclusion
The attempt to improve the standard of English of the teachers of CoC schools is in the right direction and much progress has been made in the last three years. The assessors’ experience of rural government schools and their lesson observation of the classes in CoC schools and the interviews with various stakeholders including the heads of the schools show that much has been done to improve the standard of English and, in this context especially, the enthusiasm to learn English. And yet much more still has to be done. It is sincerely hoped that the reflections in this report may enable the TMF/CE team to reflect on how to take the programme to new heights and may be able to train the teachers, trainers and programme staff to continually ask themselves how well the teachers, and as a consequence the students, are learning to listen to, speak, read and write English better.

As an organization, the team felt that TMF has high energy and commitment with which it has worked with the teachers on the challenges of improving English language skills of the teachers and through them, those of students. The project team was also open to our thoughts and suggestions. We hope that this review would help them move towards concretely identifying and strengthening the underlying theory of the programme. This would be essential not only to ensure that the outcomes are indeed causally related to the intervention (internal validity) but also help generalize and scale up the programme (external validity).

We wish them the best in their endeavours.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>All responses in percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I feel comfortable with the TMF ELTTP and confident to use it.</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am ready to invest time and effort practicing the new methods of teaching.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The module is friendly and easy to use. The instructions in the module are clear, no problems were encountered in navigating through the courseware.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It is difficult to implement ELTTP and integrating it with the syllabus and ABL method.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I have no anxiety during assessment</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My students started getting good marks/scores in English tests after I started ELTTP method of teaching.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Students are interested in the new activities.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Group work activities take too long to organize and waste a lot of valuable teaching time. It is very difficult for the teacher to monitor the students’ performance and prevent them from using their mother tongue.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I feel the training is too long and my students miss classes.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I am gaining self-confidence to speak, read and write in English after the ELTTP.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I am developing my vocabulary in English after ELTTP method.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I have a positive feeling towards English due to learning English through the ELTTP.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I like speaking in English after learning through ELTTP. My communication skill has improved and I can now talk to others easily in English as a result of learning English through the ELTTP.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>It is difficult to prepare TLM. It sounds good in theory but does not work well in practice.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Training learners to take part in group activities is futile since learners are not used to such an approach.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Since errors are a normal part of learning, much correction is wasteful of time.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Professional development trainings are essential for teachers.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My reading speed in English has improved because of the Programme</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I would like to participate in future ELTTP activities for learning and teaching English.</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Overall I am satisfied with the ELTTP approach for Proficiency and pedagogy in English.</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2

### DETAILS OF SCHOOLS VISITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>No. of HMs</th>
<th>Attitude scale Administered</th>
<th>LO* Interviewed</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CPS NADUVAKKARAI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>CPS PULIYUR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CMS VADAPALANI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CPS JAFFERKHANPET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>CPS KOYAMBEDU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CPS NSK NAGAR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>CMS ARUMBAKKAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>CMS GUJJI STREET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CPS MANJA KOLLAI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>CMS MMDA-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>CMS PULLAPURAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>CMS MMDA-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>CMS M.H.ROAD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>CPS KOLATHUR-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>CPS SUBBURAYAN STREET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>CPS KILPAUK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>CPS KOLATHUR-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>CMS SUNDARAM STREET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>CMS VELLALA STREET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>CMS BELLS ROAD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>CMS KRISHINAMPET</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>CPS VP KOIL STREET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>C.M.S.SANJEEVIRAYAN KOIL ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>CMS G.P.W COLONY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>CUMS PERAMBUR BARRACKS RD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>CPS SEMBIAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>CPS GANESAPURAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>CPS MGR NAGAR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>CPS MAGAZINEPURAM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>CPS KORRUKUPET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lesson Observation*