

Teacher Quality, Pakistan's Educational Policy, and Teacher Mentoring: What Are We Missing? A Teacher Educator's Perspective

Abstract

With the recent policy developments initiated by the government of Pakistan, the issue of teacher quality has gained much more attention than ever before. In this paper, it is argued that teacher quality should be of concern for policy makers and teacher educators at both pre-service and in-service levels. By analyzing the policy actions stated in Educational Policy of Pakistan 2009 with respect to teacher education, the paper discusses three major issues – lack of differentiation between in-service and pre-service teacher education, teacher preparation neglect, and defining and assessing teacher quality. Also taking on an andragogical approach to teacher development and initiation of formal mentoring are suggested as solutions to both professional development of teachers and improvement in teacher quality.

Keywords: *Pakistan, education policy, teacher quality, in-service, pre-service, mentoring, professional development, andragogical approach*

INTRODUCTION

With the recent policy developments initiated by the government of Pakistan, improvement in teacher quality has gained much more attention than ever before. The research on pre-service and in-service teaching (e.g., Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2000, 2009; Ministry of Education, 2009b; Feiman-Nemser, 2001, 2012a; Lortie, 1975/2002, Zeichner, 2010), suggests disconnect between what is taught to pre-service teachers during teacher preparation and what happens in schools. Research also indicates two different but interrelated explanations of this disconnect and unattained teacher quality. The first explanation suggests that Teacher Education (TE) does not prepare prospective teachers in reform-minded and innovative ways of teaching to improve students' achievement. The term *reform-minded* here refers to teachers who understand the importance of reforms and are ready to change their teaching according to the need of the reforms in question. The second explanation is focused on school settings and researchers suggest that

Dr. Samina Naseem

Incharge/Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education,
Fatima Jinnah Women University, The Mall, Rawalpindi
Email: samina.naseem05@gmail.com

beginning teachers adopt traditional teaching practices that promote rote memorization when they become a part of a school teaching force. Schools are breeding places for traditional as well as reform-minded teaching. I argue that even if TE prepares quality teachers, the contexts in which teachers work might restrict them from using their learning. Thus, it becomes important to professionally develop in-service teachers who can create a work environment that nurtures teaching practices to foster conceptual understanding rather than rote memorization. Such environments in turn will provide opportunities for prospective teachers to apply and practice reform-minded teaching. Therefore, teacher quality should be a concern for policy makers and teacher educators at both pre-service and in-service levels. This position paper analyses policy actions stated in the Educational Policy of Pakistan 2009 with respect to TE and suggests *mentoring* as a probable solution for improving teacher quality at both levels (cf. Naseem, 2014; Moir, Barlin, Gless, & Miles, 2009). Using pragmatic analysis approach, the paper answers the following question; in what ways the policy actions address teacher quality at pre-service and in-service levels? The issue discussed in this paper is significant because the Education Policy of Pakistan (Ministry of Education, 2009b) places greater emphasis on improving TE and has set the stage for the introduction of reforms to improve the teacher quality as well (e.g., National Professional Standards for Teacher Preparation in Pakistan [NPST, 2009]).

To substantiate prospective teachers' learning and to improve teacher quality subsequently, we need to think outside the box. In this paper, I present two major steps that can help improve both in-service and pre-service teacher quality. First, the policy-makers need to recognize in-service and pre-service as two distinct stages of teachers' learning and must address issues related to each of these stages separately in the official policy documents. Along with the said differentiation, use of clear and affirmative language that represents teachers as information creators rather than deficient in information would be an important step toward change. In its current state, the language used in policy documents positions teachers as recipients of knowledge; just like students in the classroom who can be lectured to with new knowledge and can be asked to replicate the knowledge in their classrooms. It would be helpful to position teachers as professionals who have knowledge and who create new knowledge. This step might provide the basis for implementation and sustainability of reform-minded ways of teaching. Using principles of adult learning (Knowles, 1990) as a framework, this paper suggests change in the approach of professional development (PD) to teacher-centered. Second, keeping in mind the significance of mentoring as a two-way PD (Feiman-Nemser, 2003), I also propose the initiation of formal mentoring for prospective teachers as one of the ways to improve both in-service and pre-service teacher quality.

RESULTS & ANALYSIS

Policy Actions to Improve Teacher Quality

The tenth five-year plan (2010-2015) is titled, "Investing in People." Two major objectives directly related to education focus on achieving universal primary enrolment. The plan itself does not mention any aspect of teacher development that directly relates to teacher quality. In its major objectives, however, the tenth five-year plan also stresses bringing about "marked improvement in the education imparted" (Planning Commission of Pakistan, 2010). One of the key elements of these policies has been improvement of TE (others being adult literacy, universal primary education, reduction of dropouts, improving quality and access of education, equity, etc.). However, in comparison to the previous education policies, the Education Policy of Pakistan 2009 has dedicated a section in Chapter Six, titled "Raising the Quality of Education" (pp. 42-50) in seventy-one page long document. The specific section which captures the issue related to teacher quality is detailed on two pages (Chapter 6, Section 6, pp. 42-43). On the one hand, the Educational Policy (Ministry of Education, 2009b) clearly recognizes that TE needs to be improved for achieving desired student achievement. On the other hand, the small portion dedicated to the issue tells a different tale. There are twenty-two policy actions given in the policy that directly target teacher education- both pre-service and in-service. These policy actions in their current form provide a very rosy picture of the government intentions to enhance TE. However, if we look closely and critically, three major issues are seen (discussed below), which can have long lasting impact on teacher quality improvement.

Lack of differentiation between pre-service and in-service teacher education

Pre-service and in-service teacher education caters to two different cadres of teachers. These teachers are at different stages of development and usually have a different set of practices and ways to approach students. More importantly, teachers at these two levels have a different understanding of teaching and learning. This difference suggests a need for a different set of PD and guidance at each stage. It is unfortunate that the difference in the developmental stages of the two groups of teachers is not recognized in the Education Policy of Pakistan 2009. This shows a lack of understanding about teacher development on the part of policy makers. There is a need to consider the two populations of teachers separately and policy actions should be suggested accordingly. The Policy document discusses policy actions for both pre-service and in-service teachers under one Section 6.1 (pp. 42-43). Out of twenty-two policy actions, only five (Policy Actions 7, 8, 11, 12, & 17) explicitly relate with in-service TE. The focus of these five policy actions is mainly pedagogy, content knowledge, mathematics and science teaching, language skills, and assessment practices. The Policy Action Four states, "A separate cadre of specialized teacher

trainer shall be developed” (Ministry of Education, 2009b, p.43). The Punjab government hired district teacher educators (DTEs), who have Master’s degree in a particular subject, who then are trained to mentor primary school teachers. The DTEs observe classroom teaching of primary teachers and a collective meeting (called PD Day- Professional Development Day) is organized in one of the schools. DTEs then share their observations and provide guidance to teachers to improve the area pointed out by DTEs. DTEs are expected to be skilled activity-based teachers. Based on my own observations of two PD-Days, most of the DTEs use traditional lecture-based method, with minimum to no participation from participants. The focus is mainly on *content* rather than *pedagogy*. This again points out toward a content-focus approach over a methodological approach by DTEs in general.

With respect to PDs in general, Ball and Cohen (1999) see that strong PD prompts teachers to "reconsider their current practices and to examine others, as well as to learn more about the subjects and students they teach" (p. 3). Ball and Cohen also emphasize on involving teachers in their own learning rather telling them what to do. However, Ball and Cohen also argue that most of the PDs neglect expertise teachers bring to PD workshops. Similar scenario is prevalent in Pakistani context as well, where teachers are treated as recipients of knowledge. Research on teacher development (e.g., Hangreaves & Fullan, 1992) strongly suggests that PD is most likely to fail in achieving its desired goals if teachers are considered *deficient*. i.e., it is presumed that teachers know nothing about teaching and learning; their prior teaching experiences are not taken into account, and they are not involved in their own PD. There is a need to use language that makes PD more teacher-centered just as student-centered curriculum is emphasized. For instance, policy action #6 suggests that “all teachers shall have opportunities for professional development through a program organized on a three-year cycle” (p. 43). Teachers who are observed to be effective Teachers and are willing to learn and try out innovative teaching strategies can be a part of this cycle. It would be naïve to assume that all teachers teaching in public sectors are inefficient or are not effective teachers. Teachers whose students understand subject ideas conceptually and are able to apply those ideas in different scenarios, are effective teachers regardless of what teaching strategy they use. Fourteen policy actions can be listed under general category. These policy actions are related to equal opportunities to all teachers for PD, recruitment, teacher absenteeism, accountability, allocation of teachers in different areas, salaries, social status of teachers, training need assessment, and public-private partnerships for teacher PD.

Teacher preparation neglect

Three policy actions (No. 1, 2, & 3) cover the pre-service TE. The focus of these policy actions is on initiation of four-year B.Ed. (honors), standardization of accreditation procedures, and adjusting TE curriculum to meet the needs of

curriculum taught in schools. The pre-service TE seems to be a minor focus in the Policy, 2009. Moreover, the initiation of four-year B.Ed, standardization, accreditation, national standards, etc., seem promising, but the question then arises is – are the faculty of education prepared to teach for improving quality of education imparted to prospective teachers to achieve any of the initiatives? Such questions open a plethora of issues, beyond the scope of this paper, but point out to a related issue of implementation gap. Neglecting teacher preparation and use of vague language has resulted in the neglect of teacher educators' preparation to teach the courses to four-year B.Ed students. The policy makers need to recognize that as “the most significant action is required in improving the pedagogical approaches teachers employ” (Ministry of Education, 2009b, p.42) in schools; similar action is required to improve teaching approaches used by teacher educators in B.Ed. programs. Based on my own observation of teaching in a B.Ed. program, teacher educators use B.Ed curriculum guides provided by USAID and Higher Education Commission as textbooks. They rarely understand the nuances of those curriculum guide books. The pedagogical courses are taught with prescribed books and exams are based on reproduction of the material. It is suggested that the policy makers should consider teacher preparation as a separate unit and address it separately in policy with special emphasis on PD of teacher educators for maximizing implementation of the reforms.

Defining and assessing teacher quality

To complement the Education Policy of Pakistan (Ministry of Education, 2009b), several reforms have been introduced related to teacher PD and improving quality of teaching, such as NPST and the Road Map by the Punjab government in 2009. The lack of consistency in defining measures for teacher quality in the three documents adds to the dilemma of assessing the teacher quality. It is worth mentioning that teacher qualifications and professional qualifications have been subsequently improved, if teacher quality is defined in terms of teacher qualification and training. For example, according to the ASER National Report (2013), majority of teachers in government schools have masters' degree and B.Ed or M.Ed (for details see ASER National Report, 2013, p.16). The Educational Policy (Ministry of Education, 2009b) considers improvement in teaching resources and pedagogical approaches as improvement in teacher quality. Hiring and preparation of DTEs is a step toward improving pedagogical approaches. With no regular follow-up related to implementation of new teaching approaches is uncertain. This uncertainty is echoed in the Report on Quality Assurance of Teacher Training Programs (2007). The Road Map document provides an interesting approach to assess teacher quality. According to the Road Map, teacher quality which will be assessed merely on teacher presence, presence and use of teacher guides given by the government, and DTEs' visits. This criteria is also met, but this criteria does not reflect the true essence of teacher quality as described by the Education Policy of Pakistan (Ministry of Education, 2009b) that

focuses on resources and teaching approaches. If for a while we consider teacher quality to have improved based on qualification, resources, and teaching approaches, the question then is why are Pakistani students performing low as compared to their counterparts around the world? Why the PDs offered did not produce fruitful outcomes? The answer may lie in the focus of the PDs offered.

Taking Andragogical Approach into Consideration

Ali (2006) summarized both conventional and cognitive reasons of policy failure in Pakistan. One of his arguments pertinent to this paper is related to the ways in which humans learn. Ali (2006) stated, “It is argued that because policy provisions intend to bring change in individuals’ practices, it is important for policy makers to know how individuals’ learn and change their behavior” (p. 4). He then related his argument to the “cognitive constraints of human learning and sense-making” (p.4), and suggested that policies that considers both conventional and cognitive constraints in implementing their actions have a better chance to achieve their desired outcomes. Considering Ali’s argument about cognitive constraints, then improved teacher qualifications (ASER National Report, 2013) may not be *the* solution for teaching and learning but rather its teachers’ understanding of how students learn and their teaching practices. Although this is not the focus of this paper, but it is worth mentioning that besides cognitive constraints regarding how teachers learn, it is also teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning. Taking into consideration individuals’ learning styles Knowles (1990 as cited in Kearsley, 2010) in his theory of andragogy gave four principles of adult learning. The principles are;

1. Adults need to be involved in the planning and evaluation of their instruction.
2. Experience (including mistakes) provides the basis for learning activities.
3. Adults are most interested in learning subjects that have immediate relevance to their job or personal life.
4. Adult learning is problem-centered rather than content-oriented. (Kearsley, 2010)

Knowles (1990) argued that the andragogical model of learning differs from traditional learning model with respect to how content is being taught and the role of the teacher or teacher educator. In the former model, the teacher or PD organizers decide the content and skill they want to be transmitted, arrange them into logical sequence, and select best ways of transmitting it to learners. Whereas in the andragogical model, the teacher, whose role is to facilitate and who acts as a change agent, thinks about and structures procedures that involve learners. The andragogical approach which is constructive in nature creates environment that is not only

conducive to learning but also shows respect for adult learners' experiences that they bring in with them in PD. The Education Policy of Pakistan (Ministry of Education, 2009b) emphasizes on improving teaching through PD of teachers but ignores the ways in which adult learning happens. The Ministry of Education (2009a) clearly stated that, "The pedagogical skills taught are also designed to foster rote learning, unquestioning, acceptance of textual materials and passive preparation for the tests" (p.8). As a teacher educator, I think the problem lies in ways we approach PD of teachers. The PD as argued by Hangreaves & Fullan (1992) neither involves teachers nor challenges teachers' prior beliefs to bring change in their practices. Most of the PD workshops organized are content-focused, offer quick fixes for teaching problems (Feiman-Nemser, 2012a), and participant teachers are considered as blank slates and/or ones who are recipients of knowledge rather than creators, thus ignoring the vast personal and professional knowledge they bring with them to workshops. Such an approach that is content focused, does not involve teachers, and more importantly disregards the very core of adult learning cannot be expected to achieve the expected outcomes of PD.

Mentoring: A Probable Solution

One way to improve the quality of teacher training is to adapt ways to support both pre-service and in-service teacher development. Mentoring as a process should work both ways. On the one hand, mentoring provides learning opportunities to pre-service teachers and, on the other hand, veteran teachers who serve as mentors also professionally develop while they guide their mentees. Veteran teachers are teachers who are experienced teachers, i.e., they have been teaching for five or more years. The interconnectedness of mentoring with veteran teachers' PD as well as student teachers is intriguing. Feiman-Nemser (2003) stated, "Mentoring can be a powerful professional development experience for veteran teachers" (p. 1037). Hiring public school teachers as mentors can not only benefit student teachers, but sharing new information about teaching and learning can develop veteran teachers professionally. With respect to lack of monetary resources in Pakistan, I also found mentoring as a cost effective approach to teacher development. More importantly, by initiating mentoring, teacher preparation would then be a shared activity between TE programs and schools. I see well organized mentoring as one of the significant features of TE to help teacher educators, in collaboration with veteran teachers, to develop most, if not all, pedagogical skills as identified in the national teacher education standards for "quality" teaching.

Initiating Formal Mentoring

Mentoring is not a new concept in teacher preparation and teacher development in Pakistan. Ali (1996) conducted case studies of six veteran teachers (both males and females, from public and private schools) enrolled in a master's degree program at a

Pakistani university, to understand the construction of identity amongst novice mentors. Likewise, another large scale study conducted by Andrabi, Khan, Khan, and Naseer (2012) in the province of Punjab, to investigate the effectiveness of in-service teacher training to improve the pedagogical skills of teachers, found a positive effect of mentoring on students' performance. While one appreciates the steps taken by the government to improve the quality of teaching by initiating mentoring as one of the ways to help teachers improve their pedagogical skills; the element of concern here is the underlying idea of mentors being responsible for telling teachers their weaknesses and "training" them rather than involving teachers in discussions around their weaknesses and finding possible solutions. This idea to some extent promotes the "promise to quick fix for [teachers'] deficits" (Clark, 1992, p. 79), rather than doing something that can be sustained over a period of time by teachers. Both studies (Ali, 1996; Andrabi, Khan, Khan, & Naseer, 2012) underscore the value of mentoring for professionally supporting in-service teachers to improve their teaching. There is, however, also a need to support student teachers during practicum, because those experiences will most likely affect the way they will teach and, if they become a mentor for in-service teachers, they will have the model of their own experience to follow. To achieve this goal, I propose that educational policy makers should consider making mentoring formal.

Systematic Hiring and PD of Mentors

Just making teacher mentoring formal in policy is not enough. The initiation of mentoring should be followed by systematic hiring and PD of teacher mentors. Systematic hiring of teacher mentors should begin with detailed descriptions of responsibilities and skills expected from the hired mentors. Guidelines can be taken from vast research on mentoring done around the world. Specifying skills will be helpful for veteran teachers to understand their role as mentors and confine everyone to apply for becoming a mentor. The applicants (veteran teachers) should be interviewed to understand their teaching and learning experiences along with their students' performance, because how the selected mentors conceive of themselves as mentors has the potential to influence future mentors. Naseem (2014) in her work with novice² teacher mentors found that the ways in which teacher mentors defined their role as mentors, shaped the ways in which they approached their student teacher. For instance, a female veteran science teacher, Julia, defined her role as a mentor to be a "friend" (Naseem, 2014). Being a "friend" involved sharing her teaching materials, editing her student teacher's lesson plans, and being emotionally supportive to her student teacher. To some extent, the novice mentor, Julia, was acting as a "local guide" (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p. 1032), who tends to move back,

² *Novice* refers to mentors who mentored student teachers for the first or the second time.

when they think the student teacher is confident enough to work alone. If Julia had support from the TE program she was working with, she would have been able to see beyond her role as a “friend” with her student teacher. Therefore, teacher educators should collaborate with the hired veteran school teachers to collect, analyze, and assess data as a way to start a process of self-reflection in teachers and also to strengthen research culture in TE in Pakistan, as noted by Huma (2013b). Collaboration can bring teacher preparation closer to the realities and needs of different teaching contexts (Naseem, 2013). Because it might be a new experience for both school teachers and teacher educators, this will also provide opportunities to both parties to develop a shared language and an understanding of each other's practices.

Shared language among the two stakeholders is important for the dissemination of professional knowledge regarding teaching (Stigler & Hiebert, 2004) and learning; whereas an understanding of each others' practices provides opportunity to student teachers to make connections between what they study in their TE courses and the actual teaching (Zeichner, 2002), hence, bridging the gap between theory and practice. *PD of mentors*. The literature about mentoring emphasizes a “carefully chunked and sequenced” (Moir, Barlin, Gless, & Miles, 2009, p. 53) approach to make it more appropriate according to the needs of the mentoring process and the new teachers. For PD of Pakistani teachers, the focus should be on helping teachers enhance their ability to think about and beyond teaching to analyze, reflect, and deconstruct their own teaching (Ottesen, 2007; Stanulis, 1994), and to support them to become independent thinkers rather than coming to PD looking for quick fixes. Feiman-Nemser (2012b) warns that without proper training of mentors - mentoring can have negative effect on student teachers' learning. Teacher educators and professional developers should use the PD opportunity to identify competent prospective teacher mentors regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Once identified, those teachers can help in sharing their expertise with other teachers.

Taking prior experiences into consideration

A recent doctoral research study conducted by Huma (2013a) concluded that based on TE faculty members' prior experiences and the strengths of using and understanding innovative teaching strategies, their teaching varied even after having relevant PD. With reference to taking into account prior experiences of teacher mentors, the theory of andragogy contends that adults are interested in PD, if it relates to their job or personal experiences. The study conducted by Naseem (2014) also concluded that teacher mentors' prior experiences of what works and what does not work inform their decisions as mentors. Studies (e.g. Angelle, 2002; Boreen et al., 2000; Cherian, 2007; Yendol-Hoppey, 2007) showed that novices feel more confident to teach in real classroom settings if teacher mentors show trust in their teaching and

support them to adapt to the new environment. It will not be wrong to contend that prospective teacher mentors' teaching and learning experiences will inform and filter their understanding of mentoring practices. If not challenged with alternatives, just providing them PD might not make a difference.

Mentor teacher's preferred style of teaching

Another significant aspect to be taken into account is teacher mentors' preferred approach to teaching and learning. For instance, Naseem (2014) found that the way mentors learned themselves as students were their preferred approach to teaching as well. For instance, one of mentors herself learned by engaging in hands-on activities and labs, and she firmly believed that hands-on and labs was the way to teach students. She was very apt with the method and offered a lot of feedback when her student teacher did hands-on activities or labs. These findings have three implications for PD. First, having knowledge about mentors' learning style, professional developers can offer them knowledge related to mentoring using similar approach. Second, professional developers can help mentors to become apt at using their strengths in more productive ways to help their student teachers. And third, professional developers can involve mentors in their own professional development. The last implication is based on research conducted by Hargreaves & Fullan (1992) and more recently by DelleBovi (2013). These researchers have reported teachers to feel confident and most likely to sustain the learned practices if they are involved. The theory of andragogy also suggests involving adults in planning as well as evaluation. Furthermore, experienced-based PD as suggested by Knowles (1990) can provide opportunities to teacher mentors to make mistakes related to teaching-learning process and learn from them.

The policy actions talk about "training," "on-site component," and "separate cadre of specialized teachers." All these components of policy, no matter how vague they sound, can be catered to by considering mentoring. First, mentoring is a part of on-site component; second, selecting and professionally developing veteran teachers as mentors place them in the "special cadre of teachers." Third, with respect to TE curriculum, teacher mentors can play a crucial role by working closely and collaboratively with teacher educators. As veteran school teachers, mentors will know the school curriculum well and teacher educators will know the TE curriculum. Both stakeholders can help each other by sharing their curriculum goals and findings common grounds to support student teachers learn student-centered and cross-curricular approaches to teach. The collaborative nature of mentoring is significant because Naseem (2013) in her paper points out three major disconnects between TE and schools namely "ignorance about each other's practices," "lack of shared language," and "lack of supportive organizational structures" (pp. 40-41). I believe that creating collaborative spaces or "third spaces" (Zeichner, 2010) can provide

room where both stakeholders can discuss their differences and to be on the same page when it comes to preparation of new teachers. Here it also important to mention that although teacher educators emphasize on student-centered teaching, unfortunately teacher educators do not practice what they preach (Harrison, Dymoke, & Pell, 2006; Segall, 2001). Teacher educators should also use student-centered teaching approach to model for their student teachers. Crutcher & Naseem (2015) in their literature review present four effective mentoring practices - critical reflection and feedback, modeling, collaboration, and knowledge about the needs of novice teachers. These practices can be used as “core practices” (Naseem & Crutcher, 2016) for PD of teacher mentors. These practices can offer problem-centered approach rather than subject content-centered PD. For instance, how to provide effective feedback to students in classroom or to student teachers or what does an effective feedback look like?

Some Challenges

Although the initiation of mentoring program sounds promising to improve quality of teacher training, it is not without challenges. Here are some challenges that might slow down the process of initiating formal mentoring program: Teachers in general, favor rote memorization and encourage learn-to-test habits. It would be really hard to select teachers from the current cadre of teachers who think otherwise, especially from the public sector schools. Teachers usually come to PD workshops to find solutions. It is important to mention the deficit model approach, because the majority teachers in public schools believe (and professional developers, too) that they do not have the knowledge required to improve their students' learning and their own teaching. Bringing them on board as a part of the solution might require a paradigm shift among teachers.

It has been documented that general attitudes of veteran teachers towards student teachers also need to be addressed to make student teachers feel welcomed and respected by veteran teachers. It is also interesting to note that while reporting the key issues of TE in Pakistan, the authors of the NPST completely overlooked the experiences student teachers have during their practicum³, which is a compulsory component of TE degrees. Even though the practicum period ranges only for 6-8 weeks, these experiences not only significantly shape the teaching practices of Pakistani student teachers but most likely inform their attitudes and behavior as they continue to teach. Interestingly enough, teacher educators are considered solely responsible for new teacher preparation (Rahman, Jumani, Akhter, Chisthi, & Ajmal, 2011) and the role of schools during the practicum seems not to be a part of teacher

³ The practicum serves the same purpose as student teaching, although the time allotted is lesser than the time here in the US.

preparation. Therefore, the only support available to student teachers to help them in their process of learning to teach is from the TE faculty and their peers. The support cannot be extended to schools because of the lack of collaborations between schools and universities, which is very similar to issues described by Zeichner, Darling-Hammond, & Grossman with reference to TE program and schools. Sustaining a culture of collaboration and sharing among teachers within a school, with teachers from other schools, and teacher educators will be another challenge. Because there is little to no monetary support available, there is also a need to develop and sustain a culture of volunteerism, rather than commercialism.

CONCLUSION

This paper points out that the previous education reforms and the new ones have failed to achieve their goals of improving teacher quality because the policy makers have failed to understand the fundamental problem. i.e., considering teacher quality as one of the major issues and separating in-service from pre-service TE. Also the paper suggests taking an andragogical approach to teachers' PD in order to improve teacher quality. The change proposed in this paper begins with the change in the policy. The new Educational policy must consider quality as a significant issue along with distinguishing in-service from pre-service both in language and the policy actions. The policy document should clearly address each component separately thus providing separate and clear guidelines for both levels. This change can and will trickle down to individual level, when each veteran teacher will consider him/herself responsible for their PDs as well as for the development of people who join the profession of teaching. Although at times it seems difficult and even unrealistic to start something new amidst the socio-economic crises Pakistan is going through, I believe in the strength of Pakistani teachers and their strong desire for learning, improvement, and PD. Mentoring promotes PD. It seems reasonable to suggest that it is essential for teachers not only for their personal development but also for the provision of better learning opportunities for student teachers.

REFERENCES

- Ali, M. A. (1996). *On becoming a mentor: Influences on teachers' construction of their identities as mentors*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No.9706442)
- Andrabi, T., Das, J., Khwaja, A. I., Vishwanath, T., Zajonc, T., & the LEAPS Team. (2007). *PAKISTAN: Learning and Educational Achievements in Punjab Schools (LEAPS): Insights to inform the education policy debate*. Retrieved January 29, 2014 from

http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/akhwaja/papers/LEAPS_Report_Feb19_FINAL.pdf

Andrabi, T., Khan, S., Khan, Y., & Naseer, M. F. (2012). *Learning in public schools*. London, UK: International Growth Center. Retrieved January 30, 2014 from http://www.theigc.org/sites/default/files/Andrabi%20et%20al_Learning%20in%20public%20schools_Final_0.pdf

Angelle, P. S. (2002). Mentoring the beginning teacher: Providing assistance in differentially effective middle schools. *The High School Journal*, 86(1), 15-27.

Aslam, M. (2007). *The Relative Effectiveness of Government and Private Schools in Pakistan: Are Girls Worse Off?* Retrieved February 27, 2014 from <http://recoup.educ.cam.ac.uk/publications/WP4-MAs.pdf>

ASER National Report. (2013). Available at http://asERPakistan.org/document/aser/2013/reports/national/ASER_National_Report_2013.pdf

Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3-31). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Boreen, J., Johnson, M. K., Niday, D., & Potts, J. (2000). *Mentoring Beginning teachers: Guiding, reflecting, coaching*. Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.

Brouwer, N.,M & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal*, 42 (1), 153-224.

Cherian, F. (2007). Learning to teach: Teacher candidates reflect on the relational, conceptual, and contextual influences of responsive mentorship. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 30(1), 25-46.

Clark, C. M. (1992). Teachers as designers in self-directive professional development. In Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (Eds.). *Understanding teacher development* (pp. 75-84). New York, USA: Teachers College Record.

- Crutcher, P. A., & Naseem, S. (2015). Cheerleading and Cynicism of Effective Mentoring in Current Empirical Research. *Educational Review*, 68 (1), 40-55.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). *Teacher education and the American future*. Charles W. Hunt Lecture. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 166-173.
- DelleBovi, B. M. (2013). Professional Development: Partnerships for Success. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(3), 24-37.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2012a). *Teachers as learners*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2012b). Beyond solo teaching. *Supporting Beginning Teachers*, 69 (8), 10-16.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2003). What new teachers need to learn: Keeping good teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 25-29.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 17-30.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (1992). Introduction. In A. Hargreaves, & M.G., Fullan (Eds.) *Understanding teacher development* (pp. 1-19). New York, NY: Teachers College Record.
- Harrison, J., Dymoke, S., & Pell, T. (2006). Mentoring beginning teachers in secondary schools: An analysis of practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 1055-1067.
- Huma, A. (2013a). *Interpretive analysis of new teacher education curriculum reform introduced in Pakistan*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3604657)
- Huma, A. (2013b). Adaptable Program Evaluation Strategies for Teacher Education in Pakistan: A reflective paper written on the bases of literature review and document analysis. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(7), 298-305.

Knowles, M. (1990). *The adult learner. A neglected species*, 4th Edition. Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Kearsley, G. (2010). Andragogy (M.Knowles). *The theory Into practice database*. Retrieved October 9, 2014 from <http://www.instructionaldesign.org/theories/andragogy.html>.

Lortie, D. (1975/2002). *The limits of socialization. Schoolteacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Ministry of Education, (2009a). *National Professional Standards for Teachers in Pakistan*.

Islamabad: Government of Pakistan. Retrieved September 16, 2013 from <http://unesco.org.pk/education/teachereducation/files/National%20Professional%20Standards%20for%20Teachers.pdf>

Ministry of Education. (2009b). *National education policy*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan. Retrieved January 29, 2014 from <http://unesco.org.pk/education/teachereducation/files/National%20Educationpolicy.pdf>

Ministry of Education & Training, (2013). *Country report of Pakistan regarding: Accelerating millennium development goals 2013-15*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan. Retrieved on January 29, 2014 from <http://www.moptt.gov.pk>

Moir, E., D. Barlin, J. Gless, J & J. Miles (2009). *New Teacher Mentoring: Hopes and Promises for Improving Teacher Effectiveness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

Naseem, S., & Crutcher, P.A. (2016). Conceptualizing Core Practices for Professional Development of Novice Mentors. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, 33(1), 65-86.

Naseem, S. (2014). *A narrative inquiry into novice science mentor teachers' mentoring practices*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3632745)

Naseem, S. (2013). Looking Ahead: Insights from the US for Pakistani Teacher Education. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 2(4), 37-43.

Ottesen, E. (2007). Teachers "in the making": Building accounts of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 612-623.

- Planning Commission of Pakistan. (2010). *The tenth five year plan (2010-2015): Investing in people*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan. Retrieved September 30, 2013 from <http://studylib.net/doc/7144823/--ministry-of-planning--development-and-reforms>
- Rahman, F., Jumani, N. B., Akhter, Y., Chisthi, S.H., & Ajmal, M. (2011). Relationship between Training of Teachers and Effectiveness Teaching. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(4), 150-160.
- Segall, A. (2001). *Disturbing practices: reading teacher education as text*, NY: Peter Lang.
- Stanulis, R. N. (1994). Fading to a whisper: One mentor's story of sharing her wisdom without telling answers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(1), 31-37.
- Stigler, J.W., & Hiebert, J. (2004). Improving mathematics teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 61(5), 12-17.
- UNDP, (2011). Human development reports. Retrieved September 30, 2013 from <http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/PAK.html>
- Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2007). Mentor teachers' work with prospective teachers in a newly formed professional development school: Two illustrations, *Teachers College Record*, 109(3), 669–698.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89-99.
- Zeichner, K. (2002). Beyond traditional structures of student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 59-64.