



The Standard and Performance of Professional Upskilling of English Language Teachers Programme: An Evaluation

Hasreena A.R¹ and Jamil Ahmad²

The National University of Malaysia, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy,
Faculty of Education, 43600 UKM, Bangi Selangor, Malaysia.

Corresponding email hasreenarahman@yahoo.com, jamil3191@yahoo.co.uk

Article Information

Keywords

professional development programme, English teachers, programme evaluation, discrepancy evaluation model, Provus

Abstract

The first step that need to be done before fully implementing a professional development programme is the objectives of the programme have to be defined in details to be used as the programme design. These objectives, known as the programme standard, will be compared to the programme installation that acts as the programme performance. The programme evaluated was The Professional Upskilling Of English Language Teachers (Pro-ELT) Programme. The objective of this study is to identify any discrepancies that might occur by comparing the programme design set by the Ministry of Education (MOE) Malaysia with the programme installation. The consultant expertise, staff qualifications and experiences, and participant prerequisite requirements were the elements evaluated under the programme selection. For programme facilities, the two elements evaluated were training venue suitability and testing equipment adequacy. Twelve respondents were interviewed. The interview transcripts and official documents were collected and analysed. As a result, most discrepancies were identified under testing equipment adequacy in terms of the system requirements. In conclusion, the identified discrepancies were able to give information on what areas need to be amended to ensure smooth implementation of the programme.

INTRODUCTION

You were instructed to attend a programme at the eleventh hour that was not in your interest or you did not really need professionally or personally. The programme that you attended was short and just a one-off kind of programme. Most of the time, the programmes were conducted where you became a passive listener listening to the experts sharing their ideas. While listening to the experts, you were wondering why the programmes were conducted. After the programme, you went back and all were forgotten. This is a typical scenario that sometimes is experienced by teachers when attending professional development programmes. When analysis is done based on the above scenario, some issues arise regarding the programme such as the objective, the participant selection, the need analysis, the form, the content and the duration, to name a few (Birman, Desimone, Porter, & Garet, 2000; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Hunzicker, 2011; Khattak, Abbasi, & Ahmad, 2011; Kennedy, 2014; Patton, Parker, & Tannehill, 2015). Hence these issues should be taken into account when planning a programme before it is fully implemented.

It is important to ensure a programme is well-defined and clearly specified especially when the programme is conducted in multiple settings or sites with multiple facilitators (Borko, 2004). Thus, the specified and well-defined standards are vital to ensure the effectiveness of a professional development programme. Klentschy (2005) and Gwynne-Atwater (2011) have identified that “[t]he standards movement... has created a real need for teaching learning” that should be targeted and directly related to teachers’ practice, should be site based and sustained over time, should be integrated into the regular practices of teachers, and should be curriculum-based to improve students’ performance and understanding. Hence, there are certain standards need to be met to ensure the effectiveness of programmes. These standards are set earlier before the implementation of the programme. Thus early planning is vitally essential and critical. To evaluate the effectiveness and success of a programme, Fox (2011) mentioned that one of the fundamental strategies is to ensure what is planned should ideally be interpreted accordingly by implementing the plan as what it should be. The “what is” is the standard that is set earlier before the implementation of a programme and the “what should be” is the reality of what is really happening during the programme implementation. Therefore, before implementing any professional development programmes, careful planning must be done meticulously and in detail as to reduce any potential high-risk failures. When planning is completed, the programme has to be implemented as planned. In summary, whatever really happens during the programme implementation must be aligned to whatever that should happen as planned. Any differences between what really happen with what should happen can be identified. Based on the information gauged on those differences, suggestions for improvement then can be made. Therefore, discrepancy evaluation model (DEM) by Malcolm Provus is the appropriate model to be used for this study. This is because the DEM emphasises on the comparison between what should happen (or known as the programme standard) with what really happen (also known as the programme performance) (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004; Provus, 1969, 1971). The DEM is also able to identify any differences (or discrepancies) that can be used to improve the programme (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004; Provus, 1969, 1971).

Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM)

In the DEM, there are five stages of evaluation which are i) programme design/definition, ii) programme installation or the input stage, iii) programme process, iv) programme product or also known as the output stage, and v) cost-benefit analysis (Provus, 1969, 1971). In Stage I, the information about the design of the programme is obtained to be used as the programme standard (Alter, 1998; Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984). The first comparison between the standard set in Stage I with performance in terms of the programme operation happens in Stage II of DEM (Provus, 1969, 1971). At this stage, evaluation is conducted to assess the implementation of the programme installation to be compared with the programme standard set out in Stage I and to identify any problems (otherwise known as the discrepancies) that arise (Alter, 1998; Provus, 1969, 1971). In the next stage (Stage III), the purpose of evaluation is to estimate the impact of process elements or treatment variables to the output element or dependent variable to ensure that the resources and techniques implemented are consistent with programme goals (Alter, 1998; Provus, 1969, 1971). In summary, Stage III evaluation is to assess whether the process can change the input to the output (Provus, 1969, 1971). For Stage IV, the objective of evaluation is to assess whether the programme implemented has achieved its objectives (Alter, 1998; Provus, 1969, 1971). Stage V deals with a comparison between the financial allocation of the programme implemented with other programmes that have produced the same output in order to decide which programme has spent the allocation most effectively (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984). In short, Stage I is the programme standard, and Stages II, III, IV and V are the programme performance.

Stage I (programme design) and Stage II (programme installation) are the most critical stages in DEM. Redefinition of the programme is done here when discrepancies occur (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984). Stage I is where the information on the programme design is gathered and used as the programme standard. In ensuring the readiness of a professional development programme to be fully implemented, the programme objectives have to be defined in detail to be used as the programme design. These objectives, or also known as the programme standard, will then be compared to the programme installation that acts as the programme performance. This comparison is conducted in Stage II that deals with the programme input including the receptors, staff, and pre-requisite requirements (Yavorsky, 1984).

The Professional Upskilling Of English Language Teachers (Pro-ELT) Programme

As stated earlier, the professional development programmes that would be evaluated in this study was The Professional Upskilling Of English Language Teachers (Pro-ELT) Programme. The Pro-ELT Programme is one of the programmes introduced under Shift 2 initiative in The Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013 – 2025). This initiative is to ensure students are proficient in English language by enhancing the level of English proficiency and pedagogical competence of teachers (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2012; Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2013). When teachers are more competent, the proficiency level of students are also expected to

increase (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2012). This programme is also consistent with the Ministry of Education (MOE) Malaysia's commitment to improve the competence of teachers through professional development programme that is more focused and effective, and consistent with the requirements of the MOE Malaysia to improve the quality of the education system as a whole (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2012). The first batch of 5,010 teachers participated in the programme for a year. This programme involved 480 hours of blended learning mode, including 240 hours of face-to-face training sessions with the staff/trainers and 240 hours of online training sessions with the e-Moderators. The face-to-face training sessions were conducted outside the school hours and during school holidays whereas the online training sessions were conducted throughout the programme. Teaching and learning materials and modules were prepared by the appointed consultant (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2012).

Before the full implementation of The Pro-ELT Programme, the MOE Malaysia had issued a request for proposal (RfP) to eight potential service providers or programme consultants. The selection process for the programme consultant was conducted thoroughly where the potential programme consultants had to go through stringent requirement based on 6Cs criteria. Those 6Cs criteria were competence, capacity, content, customisation, context and cost (Performance and Delivery Management Unit (PEMANDU), 2012b). A panel of experts from the MOE Malaysia was set up to evaluate and select the programme consultant that had fulfilled all the 6Cs criteria at the lowest cost.

After a programme consultant was appointed, the next selection process was on the programme staff/trainers. The minimum requirement in qualifications and experiences was listed such as the first and second degree of the trainer applicants have to be related to English language, have at least seven years of experience in teaching English language, and have experience in conducting courses or writing materials in English language (English Language Teaching Centre (ELTC), 2012). An additional requirement was included for the e-Moderators which indicated that the applicants should have experience in online teaching and training.

The process of selecting the programme participants was also conducted. The participant selection was based on the teacher's performance in two tests: the Cambridge Placement Test (CPT) first and then the Aptis Test. Both tests were graded according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) standard. Based on CEFR standard, those who achieve Level A are basic users, Level B are independent user, and Level C are proficient users. Both tests assess on reading, writing, listening, speaking, and language/grammar skills. A total of 61,035 English Language teachers and lecturers sat for the CPT (Performance and Delivery Management Unit (PEMANDU), 2012a). After the CPT results were obtained, almost 62 percent of them achieved Level B where they were considered as potential participants of The Pro-ELT Programme (Performance and Delivery Management Unit (PEMANDU), 2012a). Those teachers then had to sit for the second test that is more comprehensive named the Aptis Test. Teachers who still obtained Level B in the Aptis Test were then officially selected as the participants of the programme. The Aptis Test results were also used as the entry point of the teachers to be compared to the test results after the completion of the Pro-ELT Programme to determine their level of improvement.

Besides the human capital element, the availability of programme facilities was also vital in ensuring a smooth implementation of The Pro-ELT Programme. One of the important facilities that need to be available was the training venues. The preferred training venues for The Pro-ELT Programme were the government buildings such as schools and teacher activity centres or *Pusat Kegiatan Guru* (PKG). Other listed criteria such as the facilities in the room, location, information technology (IT) equipment, and furniture were also considered in deciding the training venues.

Equally important in programme facility is having the right equipment. Since the tests were conducted online, having the adequate equipment that fulfilled the prerequisite minimum standard was vital. For The Pro-ELT Programme, there were few system requirements need to be fulfilled as the minimum standard. Those system requirements were divided into three: hardware, software and bandwidth minimum requirements. For hardware minimum requirements, five components were listed consist of the processor, the random-access memory (RAM), the hard disk drive (HDD) space, the video such as the screen resolution and graphics card memory, and the peripherals such as headphones and speakers. The minimum requirement for the processor is either 2.33Gigahertz (GHz) for single core central processing unit (CPU) or 1.2GHz for dual core CPU. As for RAM, the minimum requirement stated is 1 to 2 gigabyte (GB). The minimum HDD free space required to implement the tests is 1GB. For video streaming, the recommended requirements listed including screen resolution of 1024x768, graphics card with at least 64 megabyte (MB) to 128MB of memory. Besides that, having fully equipped and functional peripherals are crucial in the test implementation. The peripherals required are two button mouse, keyboard, audio capability or microphones, and headphones. Three elements were taken into consideration in software minimum requirements including the operating system (OS), the internet browser, and

the additional software such as Adobe Flash Player. The supported platforms for the OS are Windows XP (SP3), Windows Vista (32bit or 64bit), and Windows 7 (32bit or 64 bit). For the internet browser, the suggested platforms are Internet Explorer 7,8 or 9. Besides that, one additional software is also needed in the test implementation that is Adobe Flash Player 10.1, 10.2 or 10.3. Since the tests were conducted online, the bandwidth minimum requirement was crucial in ensuring the success of The Pro-ELT Programme. The minimum requirement for bandwidth was set to 512 kilobits per second (kbps).

Since the first two stages of DEM were conducted before the full implementation of the programme, this study is aimed to identify any discrepancies that occur by comparing the programme design with the programme installation in terms of programme selection and programme facilities. The programme selection elements focused on selecting consultant, staff/trainers, and participants. Another essential element is the programme facilities where two elements were evaluated consist of training venue suitability and testing equipment adequacy.

METHODOLOGY

Twelve respondents were interviewed involving two programme consultants, two programme managers from the Ministry of Education Malaysia, and the officers from the state and district education offices in four states. One state and one district education officers were interviewed for each state. These four states were the first states that implemented the programme. Official documents such as observation reports, programme blueprints and minutes of meetings were acquired for the comparison of the programme standard and installation of The Pro-ELT Programme. Interview protocol and document checklist were used to get information on the standard set and the installation performance of the programme. The interview transcripts and documents were collected, analysed, and compared to identify any discrepancies that existed.

RESULTS

Programme Selection

The first comparison was done on the programme selection. Three elements that were evaluated under the programme selection involved the selection process of the programme consultant, the programme staff/trainers, and the programme participants. The first selection process was on the programme consultant. After comparing the programme installation and the programme standard, no discrepancies were identified in the selection of the programme consultant as it was implemented according to the programme standard. The next process after appointing the programme consultant was selecting the staff/trainers. It was found that the selection of the programme staff/trainers was implemented according to the programme standard, thus no discrepancies were found. For selecting programme participants, it was based on the English teachers' performance in the CPT first and then later the Aptis Test where both tests are graded according to the CEFR standard. Few discrepancies were identified in the programme participant selection (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012c). In the first stage selection using the CPT results, it was revealed that not all teachers were identified. Besides that, a discrepancy also occurred when some of the participants who were already selected to be in the programme did not have their Aptis Test results. The results for programme selection could be summarised as shown in Table 1 below:

TABLE I
A COMPARISON BETWEEN PROGRAMME STANDARD AND PERFORMANCE FOR PROGRAMME SELECTION

Elements	Standard	Performance
Consultant Expertise	6Cs Competence, capacity, content, customisation, context and cost lowest	Implemented according to the programme standard set
Staff/Trainer Qualifications and Experiences	Required Qualifications And Experiences - First and second degree related to English language - At least seven years' experience in teaching English language - Conduct courses or write materials in English language - For e-Moderators, the applicants should have experience in online teaching and training	Implemented according to the programme standard set
Participant Prerequisite Requirements	First Stage (CPT) Potential participants selected if they achieved Level B Second Stage (Aptis Test) Participants selected if still obtained Level B	Not all potential participants were identified Participants selected for the Pro-ELT Programme did not have Aptis Test results

Programme Facilities

For the programme facilities, two elements were evaluated that consist of training venue suitability, and testing equipment adequacy. The first element evaluated was the training venue suitability. All interviewed respondents explained that the training venues fulfilled the minimum requirement based on the analysis and the comparison between the standard and the performance on the training venue suitability. In contrast to the training venue suitability, some discrepancies were mentioned repeatedly by the respondents in terms of testing equipment adequacy (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012a, 2012d). In general, one of the major discrepancies identified was the lack of personal computers (PCs) that complied to the minimum prerequisite system requirement for information and communications technology (ICT) at the testing centres. Besides that, there were insufficient numbers of microphones and headphones to conduct the listening and speaking sections of the tests. Similarly, the prerequisite minimum standard of the system requirement in terms of software was unfulfilled because of the unavailability of the latest version of Adobe Flash Player. As for the bandwidth minimum requirement, it was clearly stated that the minimum requirement for the bandwidth was 512 kbps. However there was a glitch during the test implementation even when the minimum requirement had been fulfilled. These results can be summarised in Table 2.

TABLE 2
A COMPARISON BETWEEN PROGRAMME STANDARD AND PERFORMANCE FOR PROGRAMME FACILITIES

Elements	Standard	Performance
Training Venue Suitability	Requirements Government buildings, facilities, location, IT equipment, furniture	Fulfilled the minimum standard set in the programme standard
Testing Equipment Adequacy	System Requirements i) Hardware - Processor – 2.33GHz Single core CPU or 1.2GHz Dual core CPU - RAM – 1GB – 2 GB - HDD space – 1GB of free space - Video – Screen resolution of 1024x768, graphics card with at least 64MB – 128MB of memory - Peripherals – Two button mouse, keyboard, audio capability and headphones ii) Software - OS – Windows XP (SP3), Windows Vista (32bit or 64bit), Windows 7 (32bit or 64bit) - Internet browser – Internet Explorer 7,8, or 9 - Additional software – Adobe Flash Player 10.1, 10.2 or 10.3 iii) Bandwidth - 512 kbps	 Personal Computers (PCs) - Lack of computers that complied to the system requirement for ICT in schools Peripherals - Lack of microphones and headphones to implement listening and speaking sections Additional Software - Did not have the latest Adobe Flash Player Fulfilled the minimum standard but with a glitch

DISCUSSIONS

When discrepancies are identified, programme managers can use the information gauged to make amendments, re-evaluations, or rational decisions about the programme (Cole, 1999; Marrs & Helge, 1978; Provus, 1971; Singh, 2013; Steinmetz, 1989). These identified discrepancies can be solved by either redefining or reframing the unrealistic programme standards or performance, or by imposing and/or improving control on the process or the implementation of the programme, or by terminating the programme if there are no other viable solutions available (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984). Thus, suggestions for improvements for The Pro-ELT Programme revolve around these suggested solutions.

The first discrepancy identified at the very beginning of the programme was on the participant selection. As not all teachers were identified as potential candidates in the first stage, the programme managers was struggling to achieve the required number of candidates for each batch. The main causes of this problem were the lack of the CPT results matching the teachers who sat for the test, and the tests were not fully completed by the teachers (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012c). The first cause was due to the fact that the teachers did not type their full name and identity card number as required when sitting for the test. This led to unsuccessful matching

of the CPT results to those who took the test. It was scrutinised later that when the test tokens were given to the state and district education officers to be distributed to the teachers later, no detailed standard operating procedure was given (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012c). Consequently, no information could be used as back-up data for triangulation in matching the CPT results with the teachers. This has shown that not all potential participants had been identified at the very beginning of participation selection. Based on the discrepancy described, the discrepancy lies in the process of test administration. Hence the solution suggested by Provus (1969, 1971) and Yavorsky (1984) is to improve and impose control in the process of the programme. One suggested solution is to improve the instructions to the teachers before test administration on filling in the full name and identity card number. Subsequently, imposing the standard operating procedure in distributing test tokens may help in ensuring the potential participant selection to be conducted smoothly. The next discrepancy involved teachers who did not complete the test. The teachers were not able finish answering all the questions in 30 minutes because the PC screens froze or hung while taking the test (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012c). Thus the 30-minute allocated test time was still running until the end. Therefore the test ended without the teachers had the opportunity to complete it. If there was still time left in the test, the teachers could reactivate their test tokens and continue answering the test where they had left off. Without completing the test, these teachers could not be identified as the potential participants for The Pro-ELT Programme because the results would be indicated as (*) or incomplete. The consultant's solution to reduce incomplete tests was to instruct the teachers to shut down their windows if the PC screens froze or hung, or the loading took more than 30 seconds (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012c). However, this solution did not work in all states. In fact, in certain states, the number of incomplete tests had increased. It was disclosed that most of the teachers did not reactivate the test tokens, and they took new test tokens and sat for the test again. This had caused more test tokens to be used and the previous tokens were still left incomplete. Based on this discrepancy, it was identified that there was a lack of control in the process of test implementation in terms of instructions given to the teachers and education officers, and detailed guidelines from the consultant in terms of solutions to problems that may occur. Hence, more control should be imposed to the process so these problems could be minimised (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984). Besides the above-mentioned discrepancies identified, there was another problem occurred during the implementation of the CPT where the servers were down on one of the test days (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012b). This had caused most teachers unable to access the test, thus some of them gave up and did not sit for the test at all which led to less number of potential candidates identified. The solution made at that time was to ask the teachers to sit for the test on other days which still showed a low number of teachers who took the test. Based on this scenario, there is a need to impose and improve control on the process of test implementation when the servers are down (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984).

Similarly, the discrepancy also occurred during the Aptis Test implementation where the participants selected for The Pro-ELT Programme did not have their Aptis Test results. The Aptis Test results was crucial because the test results were used as the pre-test results to be compared to their post-test results after completing the programme. These pre-and-post test results were used to indicate any changes in their proficiency levels. In the programme standard, it was clearly stated that the participants would be selected if they still obtained Level B in the second stage after sitting for the Aptis Test. On the contrary, the participants selected for the programme were without their Aptis Test results. Further probing implied that the consultant was not able to retrieve the test results at the stipulated time. This was due to some of the test results could not be generated as the answers given by the teachers were not saved in the CPU or went missing because of the computer virus attack (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012e). Hence the test results retrieved were incomplete. This had caused some of the teachers not having their Aptis Test results as their entry point before participating in The Pro-ELT Programme. Due to the time constraint in obtaining the Aptis Test results on time, the decision was made to send the offer letter to the teachers to participate in the programme based on their earlier CPT results since the starting date of The Pro-ELT Programme was getting nearer (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012e). Since there was a correlation between the Aptis Test results with the CPT results, thus that decision was made. It is viewed that the discrepancy occurred because there was less control on the process of obtaining the test results on time due to technical problems on the PCs. To solve this discrepancy, the programme managers need to impose and improve control on the process of thorough checking and testing on the CPU prior to the testing day (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984).

Most of the discrepancies identified involved programme facilities especially the testing equipment adequacy. This was important and applied to the Aptis Test implementation specifically. In terms of hardware requirements, the first one deals with the insufficient number of computers in schools that complied to the minimum system requirements (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2013). Most of the computers were outdated in school computer labs. It was also decided at that time to find other computer labs such as at the state or district education offices, district teacher activity centres, and state education resource centres as these other centres were equipped with more latest and updated computers. As a result, some of the test implementations

were conducted in these centres. This shows that by redefining the programme standard, the programme installation can be implemented efficiently (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984). Moreover, another discrepancy identified revolved around the lack of peripherals especially microphones and headphones (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012a, 2012d). The availability of headphones and microphones was crucial in the listening and speaking sections of the test. However, some of the computer labs did not have sufficient number of these two equipments even though the PCs in the computer labs fulfilled the minimum requirement standard. The district and state education officers took their own initiatives to acquire the headphones and microphones from other computer labs that were not used during the test. This indicates that in order to solve the problem of insufficient peripherals, the process of the programme needs to be improved by making sure that all the requirements have been fulfilled before the test implementation (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984).

As for the software requirements, it was discovered that some of the PCs did not have the latest Adobe Flash Player (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012a, 2012d). The discovery happened on the day of the test implementation. This had caused delay on the test implementation which frustrated the teachers. This discrepancy may be due to no prior checking and testing were conducted even though the programme standard had clearly stated that checking and testing should be done before the test implementation. This can be analysed as lack of control on the process of test implementation involving checklists on what to do before the test implementation (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984). Hence the suggested solution is to enforce and impose more control on conducting prior checking and testing before the test implementation.

In the programme standard, it was notified that the minimum required bandwidth was 512 kbps. However even when the minimum requirement for the bandwidth was fulfilled, it was later revealed that the bandwidth was insufficient. The minimum required bandwidth stated is only sufficient if there is only one candidate sitting for the test. The mentioned bandwidth could not accommodate teachers sitting for the test concurrently (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012a, 2012d). Thus the internet access was an issue that was raised during the test implementation. Moreover, the information on the ICT minimum requirements was not detailed enough. Based on this discrepancy, the main problem revolves around the insufficient details in the programme standard. Therefore, the suggested solution viable is to redefine the programme standards by including more details in the ICT minimum requirements (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984).

Similarly, even when the PCs had fulfilled all the prerequisite minimum standard, surprisingly there was a glitch in the implementation of the Aptis Test. It was found out that the problem was caused by the multiple-synched PCs where few PCs are connected to one another and do not stand alone (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012a, 2012d). This happened at the school computer labs where the PCs were linked to one another as a 'safety control' measure for the teachers to monitor students' activities when using the PCs. In order for the teachers to sit for the tests, the PCs should be able to stand alone as to save the individual teacher's answers in the CPU. This problem was unprecedented as usually the PCs used were not connected to each other. Thus this also indicates a need to redefine the programme standard (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984).

With all the requirements had been fulfilled, there was still a delay during the test implementation caused by the key codes for the Aptis Test (Delivery Management Office (DMO), 2012a, 2012d). The key codes were supposed to be distributed earlier to be installed on the PCs. Unfortunately, the key codes arrived on the day of the test, consequently created a massive delay as it took some times to install the key codes and to assign the key codes to each individual teacher. This problem shows a lack of control in the process of the programme. In the future, there is a need to impose and improve control on distributing the key codes few days before the implementation of the Aptis test (Provus, 1969, 1971; Yavorsky, 1984).

It has been shown here that discrepancies identified in the programme were able to give information to programme managers on areas need to be amended. Generally these problems could be minimised if the prior checking and testing were conducted few days before the implementation of the test so that the next step of actions could be identified. By identifying discrepancies earlier and making amendments afterwards can really help in improving the programme. As Provus (1969) has stated, one of the main purposes of evaluation is to gauge vital information (or discrepancies) on the programme so that amendments and improvement can be done in the early stages of planning and installation before more damages are done.

REFERENCES

Alter, K. (1998). Electrical Construction Management Specialization Program: A Formative Evaluation. *Journal of Construction Education*, 3(2), 60–72.

- Birman, B. F., Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., & Garet, M. S. (2000). Designing professional development that works. *Educational Leadership*, 57(8), 28–33. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED455227> \n<http://cemse.uchicago.edu/computerscience/OS4CS/landscapestudy/resources/Birman-Desimone-Porter-and-Garet-2000.pdf> \n<http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-0034382095&partnerID=4>
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional Development and Teacher Learning. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3–15. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x033008003>
- Cole, G. E. (1999). Advancing the Development and Application of Theory-based Evaluation in the Practice of Public Health. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 20(3), 453–470. <http://doi.org/10.1177/109821409902000305>
- Delivery Management Office (DMO). (2012a). DMO Status Updates - 12th October 2012. Putrajaya.
- Delivery Management Office (DMO). (2012b). DMO Status Updates - 17th July 2012. Putrajaya.
- Delivery Management Office (DMO). (2012c). DMO Status Updates - 26th June 2012. Putrajaya.
- Delivery Management Office (DMO). (2012d). Minit Curai Perbincangan antara ELTC dan PEMANDU - 19 Oktober 2012. Kuala Lumpur.
- Delivery Management Office (DMO). (2012e). Minit Curai Perbincangan dengan British Council - 2 November 2012. Putrajaya: Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Delivery Management Office (DMO). (2013). DMO Status Update - 2nd January 2013. Putrajaya.
- English Language Teaching Centre (ELTC). (2012). Summary of Teacher Trainers Application.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program Evaluation : Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines* (3rd Ed). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Fox, R. D. (2011). Revisiting “ Discrepancy Analysis in Continuing Medical Education : A Conceptual Model .” *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 31(1), 71–76. <http://doi.org/10.1002/chp>
- Garet, M. S., Porter, a. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What Makes Professional Development Effective? Results From a National Sample of Teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4), 915–945. <http://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915>
- Gwynne-Atwater, A. (2011). An Evaluation of a Special Education Preschool Program Serving Children With Autism or Autistic-Like Behaviors. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Hunzicker, J. (2011). Effective professional development for teachers: a checklist. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(2), 177–179. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2010.523955>
- Kennedy, A. (2014). Models of Continuing Professional Development: a framework for analysis. *Professional Development in Education*, 40(3), 336–351. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13674580500200277>
- Khattak, Z. I., Abbasi, G., & Ahmad, A. (2011). Impact analysis of the in-service teacher training programmes of the Testing and Evaluation sub-committee of the ELTR Project in Pakistan. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 1479–1483. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.314>
- Klentschy, M. P. (2005). Designing Professional Development Opportunities for Teachers that Foster Collaboration, Capacity Building and Reflective Practice. *Science Educator*, 14(1), 1–8.
- Marrs, L. W., & Helge, D. I. (1978). The Role of Needs Assessment in Program Planning and Evaluation. *The Journal of Special Education*, 12(2), 143–151. <http://doi.org/10.1177/002246697801200207>
- Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2012). Slaid Program Professional Up-skilling of English Language Teachers (Pro-ELT). Putrajaya: Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2013). Pelan Pembangunan Pendidikan Malaysia 2013 - 2025 (Pendidikan Prasekolah hingga Lepas Menengah). Putrajaya.
- Patton, K., Parker, M., & Tannehill, D. (2015). Helping Teachers Help Themselves: Professional Development That Makes a Difference. *NASSP Bulletin*, 1–17. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0192636515576040>
- Performance and Delivery Management Unit (PEMANDU). (2012a). Delivery Task Force #5 NKRA Education. Putrajaya.
- Performance and Delivery Management Unit (PEMANDU). (2012b). English Lab Report.
- Provus, M. M. (1969). *The Discrepancy Evaluation Model: An Approach to Local Program Improvement and Development*. Pittsburgh: U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare Office of Education.
- Provus, M. M. (1971). *Discrepancy Evaluation For Educational Program and Assessment*. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Singh, M. (2013). Training Evaluation : Various Approaches and Applications. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 7(1), 27–35.
- Steinmetz, A. (1989). The Discrepancy Evaluation Model. In G. F. Madaus, M. S. Scriven, & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation* (pp. 79–99). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.
- Yavorsky, D. K. (1984). *Discrepancy Evaluation: A Practitioner’s Guide*. Virginia: University of Virginia.