Abstract
This report summarizes the staff development provided to secondary teachers at four dioceses schools in the North and South Pare of Tanzania in 2014. Included is information supporting the need for a seminar on English conversation and teaching strategies, overview of the ELCT schools educational system, the seminar curriculum including past training experiences, the dioceses project proposal submission, and the staff development interest survey. The report also discusses project goals, scheduling and attendance by participants in the seminar at the schools, information about the teachers’ subject content areas of instruction, and reported years of teaching experience. Discussion of classroom visitations and observations and the use of technology are presented. A Post-Evaluation: Staff Development Implementation Survey discussing potential use of the strategies with students is also presented. A teacher evaluation of the seminar and a proposal with further recommendations are provided. This is the fourth on-site seminar provided to the schools since 2006, 2008 and 2011 by the author.
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Introduction
The paper discusses a seminar experience provided at four dioceses schools located in the North and South Pare region of Tanzania, Africa. This was the fourth on-site training in teaching strategies and conversational English, since beginning the program in 2006. The report presents a rationale for providing the seminar training to the secondary teachers, program goals and curriculum, writing the project proposal, scheduling arrangements, and participant demographics with content teaching subjects identified. Additional information is given on the use of technology, classroom observations of teachers in their content subject areas, and a proposal recommendation for the dioceses schools based on changes in student enrollment. Seminar evaluation survey findings are reported based on data gathered on a Staff Development Interest Survey, Post-Evaluation: Staff Development Implementation Survey, and a Staff Development
Rationale for the Seminar
An ongoing problem facing many teachers and the schools in Tanzania is supporting teachers in their English teaching skills for delivery of instruction. English instruction is provided to students in the schools starting in Form 1 after seven years of primary school in Tanzania (see Figure 1). While English delivery of instruction is required in Form 1 - IV, teachers may not have the proficiency or confidence to teach their subject entirely in the English language. This is also compounded by the fact these teachers speak the national language of Swahili, taught in all content areas in Standard I – VII, along with their local language (e.g., Pare) and possibly an additional family tribal language. Given the language circumstances support for offering an English seminar to these teachers is necessary.

- Preparation (Kindergarten) – One year
- Standard I – VII (Primary) – Seven years with exam after Standard 7
- Form I – IV (Secondary) – Four years with exams after Form 2 and 4
- Form V – VI (High School) – Two years with exam after Form 6
- College and University – Three to five years with diploma (Teaching diploma in three years)
*National Exams are given over a period of one week (Standard 7) to two weeks in length (Form 2, 4 and 6).
**If you attend another university outside of Tanzania (e.g., U.S. or Europe) a national exam must be completed to enter industry or government positions (Foreign Credits, Inc. 2011).

Figure 1. The Tanzania Educational System and Exam Protocol

Other issues, particularly affecting the dioceses schools, are a teacher shortage in the country created with the opening of government public “community” secondary schools and a required national testing scheme. The government schools can attract teachers for providing higher salaries and/or less “extra” teacher assignment of responsibilities (e.g., remaining on campus for the weekend to oversee students in the dormitories). The teacher shortage has resulted in higher staff turnover and the recruitment of teachers to the dioceses schools with limited post-secondary education (i.e., Form 6 graduation certificate) and formal teacher preparation or training as provided with a university teaching diploma. This turnover has been perpetuated by lower student achievement test scores, given in Form 4, which are posted online for parent viewing along with each school’s ranking. The scores influence enrollment at the schools since parents move their students to higher performing schools. The shift away from the dioceses schools has reduced the amount of tuition money revenue and stifled the ability to pay teachers on a timely basis. These issues have resulted in a high number of younger teaching staff at the dioceses schools with limited curriculum resources and books. Teacher preparation students (i.e., student teachers) have also been recruited to support the staff shortage at the schools. However, it has been recently reported during the seminar-training period that test scores appear to be rebounding according to the headmasters at Manka and Dindimo Secondary Schools and substantiated by the Secretary of Education at the dioceses.
The dioceses teachers have reported that instruction focusing on use of “chalk-talk” presentation methods or involving students copying notes off the chalkboard written by the teacher from the textbook is common. Sometimes teachers are only provided with a single textbook copy of course content for instruction. While dioceses libraries and use of multiple copies are becoming more prevalent in the classrooms, teachers need instructional support in teaching methodologies given these limited teaching resources.

Given these circumstances at the dioceses schools, the need for a return seminar site visit was proposed to the secretary of education at the dioceses. The focus of the seminar is similar to the past training programs to develop teachers’ English skills and include instructional methodologies and techniques for delivering information in a problem-solving format, which engages students thinking skills. The seminar would provide support for the “chalk-talk” teaching strategy integrating various teaching methodologies, encourage use of cooperative learning with multiple text resources when available, and support teachers in the use of technology. When electricity was available, teacher training was provided in the use of computers donated through funding and ongoing technology support from the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Mecklenburg, Germany.

The Training Curriculum and Past Seminars
The seminar is the fourth site visit at the dioceses school since the training experience was provided in 2006, 2008 and 2011. Information about the previous seminars and curriculum can be found in the article “Providing Staff Development in Teaching and English Language at an Evangelical Lutheran Church of Tanzania,” a refereed journal publication in the African Journal of Teacher Education (AJOTE). The journal may be electronically viewed in HTML or PDF format by selecting the link in the AJOTE table of contents after entering the listed URL:

African Journal of Teacher Education
http://gir.uoguelph.ca/index.php/ajote/issue/view/138

The seminar text, discussed in the AJOTE publication, provided to teachers Strategies to Promote English Language Conversation in Tanzania, Africa (2014) and guided the staff development training experience for secondary dioceses teachers in the Northern and Southern Pare schools. The staff development was similar to the previous training seminars with each attendee provided the instructional book Strategies to Promote English Language Conversation in Tanzania, Africa and access to the computer labs at the school when available. A survey needs assessments was conducted at the beginning of the seminar to assess areas of instruction to emphasize models of teaching in note taking, cooperative learning strategies, computer training and English conversational discussion activities. Added training options provided for the seminar in 2014 included teaching question-writing strategies and using the Linux Computer System Reference Guide.

Seminar topics on teaching strategies included finding information using a People Bingo activity, studying of question learning strategies, using graphic organizers for presenting information to students, practicing the models of teaching (i.e., inductive and concept attainment), and integrating cooperative learning techniques with instruction. Reading an article on the Maasai provided information for question writing and teaching an inductive lesson. A Survey About
Tanzania was administered for practice of the four corners cooperative learning strategy. A questionnaire on opinions and attitudes was given to learn a graffiti cooperative learning strategy. Most discussion activities (e.g., The Risk Taker Test) were not completed due to the limited amount of seminar meeting time. Participants were required to write a lesson plan using one or more strategies in their teaching content area and to share with the group on the last seminar meeting day.

**Proposal for the Project**

The diocese secretary of education was sent a proposal by e-mail identifying goals and interest in returning to Pare to give a staff seminar to teachers at the school sites. The proposal was to provide the seminar to Mruma and Shighatini in North Pare and Manka and Dindimo secondary schools in the South Pare. Arrangements were made for an internship teacher from Usangi College to provide the seminar to teachers at Usangi Secondary School. She attended the seminar in Shighatini to support her training to deliver the curriculum, but was unable to provide the training at Usangi due to unforeseen circumstances.

The proposal included teacher enrollment numbers or participation in the previous seminars to provide an idea of the number of copies of the text, *Strategies to Promote English Language Conversation in Tanzania, Africa*, were needed to deliver the staff training along with handouts (e.g. survey evaluations). The URL link and copy of the AJOTE publication was provided along with a suggested teaching assignment schedule (see Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Depart Iowa to Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2 – 3</td>
<td>Arrive to KIA on February 2 with two nights (one full day) at Elephant Hotel in Same. February 3 visit dioceses to confirm arrangements and pay transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4 – 8</td>
<td>Depart from Same to Mruma for five nights and four days teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: Usangi College intern will attend the seminar and provide instruction to Usangi staff at their school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9 – 14</td>
<td>Depart from Mruma to Shighatini for six nights and four days teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15 – 16</td>
<td>Depart Shighatini for Same for two nights (one full day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17 – 21</td>
<td>Depart from Same to Manka for five nights and four days teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22 – 26</td>
<td>Depart from Manka to Dindimo for five nights and four days teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27 – 28</td>
<td>Depart Dindimo to Same for two nights (one full day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1:</td>
<td>Depart from Same to KIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2. Proposed and Implemented Teaching Assignment Schedule**

A proposed budget was included in the report. The total expenses estimated in the report were $3260 USD. The actual expenditures increased due to airline, travel insurance and ground transportation costs (see Figure 3). The lodging costs in Same were adjusted to include stay at the Nzoroko Hotel and Amani Hostel, the latter owned by the ELCT dioceses. Food costs were also added for the time spent in Same upon arrival, between North and South Pare assignments, and prior to departure for Kilimanjaro (KIA) airport.
I. Teacher’s Trainer Costs
- Airline ticket and airport transport to/from U.S. $2200
- Travel insurance 200
- Visa 100
- Teaching materials – Training book student copies and supplies 150
- Lodging in Same $35/night @ 5 nights including food 175

Total Trainer Costs $2825

II. Ground Transportation Costs for Pare Dioceses
SUV Transportation Costs to KIA, Same and Pare:
1. Arrival/Departure KIA
   - KIA to Same 145 km
   - Same to KIA 145 km
2. North Pare
   - Same to Mruma 65 km
   - Shighatini to Same 80 km
3. South Pare
   - Same to Manka 70 km
   - Dindimo to Same 140 km

Total Transportation Costs @ $1.00/km $645

III. Transportation, Lodging, and Food Costs to the Schools
1. Transportation Costs Within Pare: Transport between schools in the North and South Pare provided by the school:
   - Mruma: Taxi transport to Shighatini $1.00/km x 30 km = $30
   - Manka: Truck transport to Dindimo $1.00/km x 20 km = $20
   Transport Costs $50

2. Room and board (food) at the school site at $30/day
   - Mruma $30 x 5 nights = $150
   - Shighatini $30 x 6 nights = $180
   - Manka $30 x 5 nights = $150
   - Dindimo $30 x 5 nights = $150
   Room and Board Costs $630
   Total Room Board and Transportation and Board $680
   Proposed Grand Total $4150

Figure 3. Budget and Expenses for the Staff Development

The Staff Development Interest Survey
The Staff Development Interest Survey (see Figure 4) was given to participants at the beginning of the seminar. Participants generally showed high interest in learning about the listed course topics. There was a tendency for higher interest in learning cooperative strategies, drawing graphic organizers, and studying the models of teaching. A “somewhat” interest rating was recorded by participants in team teaching or planning a lesson, and learning a program in the
computer lab. The survey did show that most participants (n=21) had not previously taken the seminar. Eight teachers responded attending the seminar as follows:

- 2006 (n=2)
- 2008 (n=2)
- 2011 (n=4)

Two participants reported attending the seminar in 2006 and 2008, but not in 2011. Two teachers responded attending all three previously offered seminars. Those having attended the seminar previously informally reported the relearning of material was helpful since there were numerous strategies presented in a short amount of time.

Open-ended questions requesting reasons for participating in the seminar were typically written about needing to develop teaching skills, including methodologies and strategies to improve instruction for students (n= 14). Other responses reported interest in improving English language speaking and writing skills (n= 4) and creating student independence through cooperative learning (n=4). One participant recorded the reason for taking the staff development training as follows:

- To develop [my idea] and ability on transforming my knowledge to students

Survey responses regarding interest in team-teaching resulted in a few questions written about preferences for times to team-teach or inquiry into when to schedule time in the classroom. Other specific general questions and statements given were:

- Why are you conducting this training seminar?
- What forces made you plan the seminar for teachers?
- How [can we] practice these learning strategies in classes with more than 100 students?
- Why don’t you pay us for the seminar?
- How will it be possible to teach without facilitators?
- It will be better if you come again in May or April.

These questions were discussed at some schools as they were brought up orally during the seminar class. The idea of using strategies with larger class sizes included facilitator sharing of methods of assigning small sub-groups of students at one time to participate, while others record notes or answers to questions at their desk. For example, if a teacher was using the cooperative strategy of four-corners, requiring students to move to a corner of the room after given a closed form question, they could assign a segment of the class to stand up and move to the correct answer (e.g., multiple-choice A, B, C, or D) corner of the room. It is also noted that some of these similar survey responses were also recorded on the seminar post evaluation.

Many participants (n=14) expressed interest in learning and using technology, and included responses given for survey item number eight as follows:

- PowerPoint (n=4)
- Word processing (MSWord or Office) (n=3)
- Internet and website use (n=2)
- Open Office or Microsoft (n=2)
- Computer operating systems (n=1)
These technology activities were found to be the topics of interest when teachers were provided technology instruction in the school lab.

The interest survey was found to be helpful in planning the staff training, especially since time was limited prohibiting completing of all activities. It was also insightful in learning about concerns and issues expressed by participants at the beginning of the seminar experience.

**Staff Development Interest Survey**

Name __________________________________________

(Given, abbreviated, nick or alias name)

School: ________________________________

Teaching Subject Content Area: __________________________

Part I. Have you taken this seminar before?   YES   NO (circle one)

If so, when?   2006   2008   2011 (circle)

Part II. Rank from 1 to 5 (low to high) or U (undecided) your interest in learning the following topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Practice in learning conversational English using discussion activities (e.g., opinion surveys).

   - Mruma: 4.39
   - Shighatini: 4.57
   - Manka: 4.20
   - Dindimo: 4.33
   - Overall Average (n=27) 4.22

2. Learning cooperative learning strategies for classroom teaching.

   - Mruma: 4.00
   - Shighatini: 4.14
   - Manka: 4.00
   - Dindimo: 4.33
   - Overall Average (n=29) 4.10

3. Learning question-writing strategies using different techniques to develop student problem-solving skills.

   - Mruma: 4.27
   - Shighatini: 4.57
   - Manka: 4.75
   - Dindimo: 4.83
   - Overall Average (n=28) 4.54

4. Drawing different graphic organizers (e.g., Venn diagrams) to share information on the board.

   - Mruma: 4.18
   - Shighatini: 4.17
   - Manka: 3.25
   - Dindimo: 4.67
   - Overall Average (n=27) 4.15

5. Learning about the model of teaching for creating concept attainment (i.e., developing T-charts) and inductive strategies (i.e., grouping facts of information) for teaching.

   - Mruma: 3.91
   - Shighatini: 4.14
   - Manka: 5.00
   - Dindimo: 4.17
   - Overall Average (n=28) 4.18

6. Writing and planning a lesson for use in your classroom.

   - Mruma: 4.00
   - Shighatini: 4.29
   - Manka: 5.00
   - Dindimo: 4.50
   - Overall Average (n=28) 4.32

7. Having your instructor teach a strategy with your students and team plan a lesson.

   - Mruma: 3.50
   - Shighatini: 4.14
   - Manka: 3.75
   - Dindimo: 3.80
   - Overall Average (n=26) 3.77
8. Learning and using a program in the computer lab. If interested, which program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Mruma</th>
<th>Shighatini</th>
<th>Manka</th>
<th>Dindimo</th>
<th>Overall Average (n=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Rate you ability to speak and write in the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Mruma</th>
<th>Shighatini</th>
<th>Manka</th>
<th>Dindimo</th>
<th>Overall Average (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III. Open-ended questions:

1. Why did you decide to take the staff development-training seminar?

2. Do you have any questions for the instructor or interest in team teaching a lesson? If interested in team-teaching, when?

Thank-you! This will be helpful in planning the seminar activities. Responses are kept confidential.

Figure 4. The Staff Development Interest Survey

Project Goals and Scheduling

The primary goal of the project was to provide an 8-hour or longer seminar on teaching strategies and conversational English to secondary teachers at four ELCT school sites in the Pare Mountains of northern Tanzania during the scheduled time of visit. The seminars were typically scheduled during the Monday to Friday teaching period in which the teachers were present and the schools were in session with students. The headmaster and teachers at all schools preferred to have the seminar meet after class instruction was completed, usually between 14:00 and 17:00 in the afternoon. Sessions would typically meet daily for two to three hours. At Mruma the teachers requested an additional seminar period meeting on a Saturday.

During the academic periods, the computer lab was made available for teachers to drop-in on a voluntary free time basis for instruction on the Linux system. Since electricity was more readily available at Mruma and sometimes at Dindimo, teachers were able to volunteer for computer instruction. At Shighatini electricity was very limited and therefore affected the ability to provide computer training to staff. Only about a half-hour of training was provided during the seminar meeting time at Shighatini. Manka had limited computer access due to the technology instructor providing computer instruction to students during school hours. If no electricity was available during the day, classrooms visits to observe teaching in different content areas were conducted. Arrangements were also made when staff members requested a visitation to observe use of various strategies or teaching methodologies in the classroom.

Figure 5 shows when seminar sessions were scheduled with participant attendance information. Thirty-seven teachers participated in the seminar with two teachers attending only one session. Attendance was high with most participants (n = 21) available for the entire session meeting time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Meeting Days</th>
<th>Approx. Time</th>
<th>Total Hrs.</th>
<th>No. in Seminar Ave. Attend Hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mruma</td>
<td>Tues. – Thurs., Sat. 2:30 - 3:30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10 + 1*</td>
<td>80% + 21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Subjects and Staff Participation

Figure 6 shows a majority of teachers (n=18/26), reporting on the attendance roster, had less than four years of teaching experience. At Mruma, five participants attending the seminar were enrolled in the teacher preparation program (i.e., student teaching) at Mwenge University in Moshi located in the Kilimanjaro region. They reported having less than one year of teaching experience and are included in the data set since they were actively involved in teaching students.

- 1 year or < – (n=11)
- 2 years - (n=5)
- 3 years – (n=2)
- 5 - 8 years – (n=3)
- 20 – 25 years – (n=3)
- 30 – 40 years – (n=2)

Total number with < 4 years teaching = 18/26 = 69%

Figure 6. Teachers Reported Number of Years Teaching (n=26)

The content subject area teachers reported (n=34) teaching at the schools are shown in Figure 7. Due to the school’s enrollment many teachers are providing instruction in more than one content area. Headmasters attended the seminar if they were available or part time due to administrative responsibilities. One identified himself as headmaster on the class roster.

Language Arts & History
- English (n=4)
- English, Geography & History (n=1)
- English (Literature) & Civics (n=2)
- Geography (n=1)
- History (n=1)
- Geography & History (n=3)
- Kiswahili (n=1)
- Kiswahili, Civics & History (n=1)
- Kiswahili & Geography (n=1)
- Kiswahili & History (n=2)

Math & Science
- Biology (n=2)
- Biology & Physics (n=2)
- Chemistry & Math (n=2)
- Chemistry, Physics & Computer (n=1)
- Chemistry & Physics (n=1)
- Computer Technology (n=1)
- Math & Physics (n=1)

Other
- Commerce & Bookkeeping (n=1)
- Headmaster (n=1)
- Teacher Preparation (n=5)

Figure 7. Teachers’ Subject Content Area for Teaching (n=34)
Time to support teachers in the classroom was also arranged through observations of teaching strategies. The morning and early afternoon classroom observations were conducted on a drop-in basis or by teacher invitation. Figure 8 shows the subject and content topic for the teacher’s classroom visitation. Following the visitation teachers were provided verbal feedback recognizing use of different teaching strategies along with ideas to consider in supporting implementation of other instructional methodologies.

### Mruma
- Biology – Food Digestion
- Geography – Intro to Research
- Kiswahili – Composing Letters

### Shighatini
- Biology – Reproduction of Angiosperms
- Chemistry – Pollution of Carbon Dioxide
- Civics – Effects of Globalization
- English – Story on Football (Soccer)

### Manka
- Chemistry – Organic Formulas
- English – Book Analysis *Unanswered Cries*
- Technology (Form I-IV)

### Shighatini (Continued)
- Geography – The Trans-Sahara Trade & Slavery
- History – The Berlin Conference and Colonization
- Government – Federal and State Comparison

### Dindimo
- Technology (Form I, III & IV) - Keyboarding

* Provided assisted instruction and teaching Word Processing, HTML Web Design, Data Bases and Spreadsheets

**Figure 8. Classroom Visitations at the Schools and Topics of Instruction**

**Use of Technology**

When electricity was available; students and seminar teachers received computer instruction (see Figure 9). At Manka, technology-learning using team instruction (i.e., support by _____) in teaching technology skills to students was provided. Teaching support was given at Dindimo with keyboarding instruction provided to students. Teachers were encouraged to visit the computer lab to receive technology training with support on a program or tool of their choice. Computer usage of programs selected by teachers volunteering for computer instruction is shown in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OpenOfficeWriter (word processing)</td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OpenOfficeCalc (spreadsheet)</td>
<td>(n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Application Programs (e.g., KGeography and TuxPaint drawing tools)</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. E-book reading</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accessories (i.e., calculator and dictionary)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OpenOfficeImpress (PowerPoint)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Computer skills (i.e., copying files)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9. Computer Program Usage by Teachers Volunteers: Computer Instruction Mruma and Dindimo**
Instruction was provided in seminar class using technology on word processing (i.e., Open Office Writer) and teacher e-book reading in their content area at Shighatini for 0.5 hour and one hour at Manka and Dindimo. At Mruma there was not adequate electricity during seminar meeting times. Teachers preferred to select word processing and reading e-books when given a choice for selecting technology learning during seminar, and these items were most frequently selected when volunteering for computer instruction in the computer lab.

Post Implementation Survey Findings
A Post-Evaluation: Staff Development Implementation Survey was given to participants at the end of the seminar (see Figure 10 and 11). The survey was completed by teachers (n=32) at the four schools with the number of no responses (nr) on question items ranging from 0 to 3. The rating scale items on the implementation surveys was evaluated using a descriptive statistical procedure (Arsham, 2015) to gain insight into potential use of the teaching strategies by teachers in the classroom following seminar instruction. This information is helpful in understanding teachers’ interest in implementing and using strategies in their subject areas.

Review of the rating scale items in Figure 10 show generally “sometimes” to “usually” score values for planned or anticipated use of the teaching strategies. Highest mean ratings of 4.0 or greater values are given for use of “learning together” cooperative learning, inductive teaching and question anticipation guides. This may be due to the fact these strategies are being used at some level by teachers, based on classroom observations conducted during the seminar. Other cooperative group instructional learning was rated lower (mean values of 3.61 - 3.94). Perhaps due to being newly acquired strategies, teachers will need to evaluate how they could be used effectively with students. Teaching techniques teachers anticipated using “sometimes” to “usually” included question writing, graphic organizers, and concept attainment strategies. These too will require support for teachers to assist in providing ideas on how to integrate and use these teaching techniques with their curriculum. When teachers were provided time for large group sharing of lesson plans it was evident that the higher ratings for potential use of some strategies were more likely identified in their teaching plans.

The post-evaluation survey included some open-ended response items for participants to complete. For item 16 most teachers reported use of word processing and e-books for student instruction. It was also reported that books about computers and teaching (computer off-site reference materials) are provided. Other uses of computer technology or teaching tools are shown in Figure 11. Some schools are providing computer technology to students, particular at Manka where instruction is given in word processing, spreadsheet, multimedia and web design. Other school sites (e.g., Dindimo) instruction in word processing and keyboarding was encouraged and provided by the seminar facilitator. However, technology use is limited in most of the schools due to the reasons identified by teachers and observed at the campus sites. Unpredictable availability of electricity and teacher training or knowledge is limiting computer technology use.

When teachers were asked to identify what is needed the most to support and improve your classroom teaching responses included teaching and learning materials or resources (e.g., aids); greater computer technology access or need for new computer lab (e.g., laptops); textbooks and
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e-learning references; and using technology methodologies and strategies creatively. These ideas suggest a need to support the schools financially in providing more books and teaching aides along with updated computer technology. Addition of these resources will require needed staff development or seminar training to support effective implementation and use of technology with students.

Post-Evaluation: Staff Development Implementation Survey

DIRECTIONS: Please circle the number on the rating scale, which best describes your **planned or anticipated use** of these teaching strategies provided in the staff development English conversation seminar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Students will work in cooperative groups learning together and discussing ideas.  
   Mean = 4.19  Median = 4.5  Range = 4  Standard Deviation = 0.998  
   Variance = 0.996  nr=0

2. Students will share in cooperative groups using think pair share and say and switch strategies.  
   Mean = 3.94  Median = 4.0  Range = 4  Standard Deviation = 1.076  
   Variance = 1.157  nr=0

3. Round table or round robin cooperative strategies will be used with students.  
   Mean = 3.61  Median = 4.0  Range = 4  Standard Deviation = 0.989  
   Variance = 0.978  nr=1

4. Corners cooperative strategies or evaluation (i.e., opinion questions) will be practiced in my classroom.  
   Mean = 3.61  Median = 3.0  Range = 3  Standard Deviation = 0.955  
   Variance = 0.912  nr=1

5. Jigsaw and graffiti cooperative strategies will be used in the classroom.  
   Mean = 3.81  Median = 4.0  Range = 3  Standard Deviation = 0.873  
   Variance = 0.761  nr=1

6. “Think-alouds” and anticipation guides will be written for questioning students’ comprehension about reading information.  
   Mean = 4.00  Median = 4.0  Range = 3  Standard Deviation = 0.894  
   Variance = 0.80  nr=1

7. Questioning strategies (e.g., true-false supply type and rank order matching) will be given to students to evaluate understanding of content information.  
   Mean = 3.97  Median = 4.0  Range = 4  Standard Deviation = 0.967  
   Variance = 0.934  nr=0

8. Students will be taught questioning strategies and assigned to write their own questions.  
   Mean = 3.57  Median = 3.0  Range = 4  Standard Deviation = 1.001  
   Variance = 1.013  nr=2

9. Graphic organizers (e.g., time lines, sequence maps, and cycles) will be drawn to show information on the board.  
   Mean = 3.74  Median = 4.0  Range = 4  Standard Deviation = 1.237  
   Variance = 1.531  nr=1
10. Semantic, concept maps, or hierarchical arrays (e.g., Venn diagrams showing lines and to circles) will be drawn to show information on the board.

\[
\text{Mean} = 3.72 \quad \text{Median} = 4.0 \quad \text{Range} = 3 \quad \text{Standard Deviation} = 0.923
\]

\[
\text{Variance} = 0.850 \quad \text{nr}=3
\]

11. Semantic feature analysis matrices (i.e., information charts) will be drawn to show and present information on the board.

\[
\text{Mean} = 3.87 \quad \text{Median} = 4.0 \quad \text{Range} = 4 \quad \text{Standard Deviation} = 1.176
\]

\[
\text{Variance} = 1.383 \quad \text{nr}=1
\]

12. Concept attainment strategies (i.e., two column notes) will be written and shown with my students for teaching.

\[
\text{Mean} = 3.68 \quad \text{Median} = 4.0 \quad \text{Range} = 3 \quad \text{Standard Deviation} = 0.772
\]

\[
\text{Variance} = 0.597 \quad \text{nr}=2
\]

13. Inductive teaching strategies (i.e., categorizing notes on the board) will be used with my students for teaching.

\[
\text{Mean} = 4.13 \quad \text{Median} = 4.0 \quad \text{Range} = 3 \quad \text{Standard Deviation} = 0.937
\]

\[
\text{Variance} = 0.878 \quad \text{nr}=2
\]

14. I will use and teach these strategies (rated above for items 1 to 13) with the materials and resources available in my classroom.

\[
\text{Mean} = 4.23 \quad \text{Median} = 5.0 \quad \text{Range} = 4 \quad \text{Standard Deviation} = 1.023
\]

\[
\text{Variance} = 1.047 \quad \text{nr}=1
\]

15. Lecture and student note-taking will be the primary method used for teaching students course content information.

\[
\text{Mean} = 3.53 \quad \text{Median} = 3.5 \quad \text{Range} = 4 \quad \text{Standard Deviation} = 1.295
\]

\[
\text{Variance} = 1.676 \quad \text{nr}=0
\]

16. Computer technology will be used with students when I teach.

\[
\text{Mean} = 3.17 \quad \text{Median} = 3.0 \quad \text{Range} = 4 \quad \text{Standard Deviation} = 0.986
\]

\[
\text{Variance} = 0.971 \quad \text{nr}=2
\]

**Figure 10. Staff Development Course Post-Evaluation Implementation Survey Rating Scale Item Findings (n=32)**

While the post implementation survey provides a snapshot in time about teachers’ perceptions regarding potential use of strategies, actual utilization to more fully implement these teaching techniques will require further instructor assistance. Support will be needed in guiding teachers in developing lessons plans on how to efficiently and effectively select and implement appropriate teaching techniques. In addition, observation in the classroom will be needed to provide feedback on teacher use of the strategies with students. Instructor modeling with the teacher’s students would also support the implementation and use of the strategies.

Modeling and demonstration of strategies may not be an option in Tanzania unless the Education Ministry grants permission for seminar instructor teaching of content subject matter in the schools. While it would be important for the strategies to be observed being used with students with instructional coaching feedback provided to teachers in the classroom, it would require more time to be allocated at the school sites for a future training program.
Post-Evaluation: Staff Development Implementation Survey
16. Computer technology will be used with students when I teach.
If so, which program or tool?
- Text editor or Word (MSWord or MSOffice) – n=10
- Books about computers and teaching – n=6
- E-library or e-books (4AllFolder) or Wikipedia – n=5
- PowerPoint – n=5
- Excel Spreadsheet – n=4
- Mobile phone (for Internet) - n=3
- Open Office – n=2
- Website or Internet tools and program search – n=2
- Publisher – n=1
- Simulation programs – n=1
If not, why not?
- Lack of teacher knowledge (materials) and learning (use) – n=5
- Lack of infrastructure or electricity power problems – n=3
- Students lack computer knowledge – n=2
- Projectors – n=1
17. What is needed the most to support and improve your classroom teaching?
- Teaching and learning materials or resources (aids) – n=8
- Lack of computer technology or need for new computer lab or laptops – n=5
- Books (textbooks) and e-learning – n=5
- Using technology methodologies and strategies creatively – n=3
- Internet access – n=1
- Computer for every teacher – n=1
- Computer knowledge – n=1
- Attention of students – n=1

Figure 11. Staff Development Course Post-Evaluation Implementation Survey Open Item Response Item Findings

Approximately one standard deviation range of variation or dispersion of scores from the expected mean value (SD = 0.772 – 1.295) was found on the survey question items. This degree of variability suggests differences in teachers’ perceptions regarding use and implementation of the strategies with their students in the classroom. The individual differences in the use of the teaching strategies support the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) and related literature suggesting that teachers show developmental and subgroup variation in learning, attitudes, and implementation of in-service experiences (Glassberg, 1981, Donlan, 1983, & Winner, 1983). The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) was a result of a four-year study by the Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations (PAEI) Program at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas, Austin. Hall, Wallace, and Dosset (1973) studied ways individuals react to and perceive new programs and addressed the concerns of individual teachers as they become familiar with and involved with new programs, processes, and/or educational practices in their schools. CBAM is based on Fuller’s
(1969) research of the concerns of student teachers and identified three phases of concern: pre-teaching phase (non-concern), an early teaching phase (concern with self), and a late teaching phase (concern with pupils). Fuller later identified these concerns as “self,” “task,” and “impact.” Hall, Wallace, Dossett, George, and others (Hall & Hord, 1987) identified seven States of Concern teachers experience when learning new practices and an innovation moving from awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, and collaboration to refocusing. It is evident from the survey responses that teachers at the schools are at different stages of concern and readiness for implementation of the various strategies. Given the differences in teachers’ planned or anticipated use of the strategies suggest differentiation in seminar experiences support for teachers will need to be provided at the schools in the future.

**Teacher Seminar Evaluation**

A post-survey was administered on the final day of the seminar to evaluate overall program effectiveness. Figure 12 shows the staff development course post-evaluation score averages on the rating scale for each school and a total average score for the item. Overall the seminar was rated highly for satisfaction reported by participants who attended and completed the evaluation.

### Staff Development Course Post-Evaluation

Name ________________________________
(Given, abbreviated, nick or alias name)
School: ________________________________
Teaching Subject Content Area: __________________________

Please circle the number which best describes the effectiveness of staff development in promoting English conversation using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Instruction and presentation of the strategies were clearly introduced.

   | Mruma | Shighatini | Manka | Dindimo | **Overall Average (n=32)** |
|-------|------------|-------|---------|---------|---------------------------|
| 4.78  | 4.88       | 4.13  | 5.00    | 4.69    |

2. Adequate opportunity was provided to practice the strategies.

   | Mruma | Shighatini | Manka | Dindimo | **Overall Average (n=32)** |
|-------|------------|-------|---------|---------|---------------------------|
| 4.56  | 4.88       | 3.50  | 4.57    | 4.38    |

3. Cooperative learning strategies are useful to promote English conversation in the classroom.

   | Mruma | Shighatini | Manka | Dindimo | **Overall Average (n=32)** |
|-------|------------|-------|---------|---------|---------------------------|
| 5.00  | 4.63       | 4.63  | 4.57    | 4.72    |

4. The discussion topic ideas are useful for classroom use.

   | Mruma | Shighatini | Manka | Dindimo | **Overall Average (n=32)** |
|-------|------------|-------|---------|---------|---------------------------|
| 4.78  | 4.5        | 3.88  | 4.57    | 4.44    |

5. The lesson examples are helpful and provide useful models to promote English conversation.

   | Mruma | Shighatini | Manka | Dindimo | **Overall Average (n=31)** |
|-------|------------|-------|---------|---------|---------------------------|
| 5.00  | 4.38       | 4.57  | 4.57    | 4.74    |
6. The teacher templates are useful for teacher use (e.g., question writing, problem-solution graphic and lesson plan templates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Shighatini</th>
<th>Manka</th>
<th>Dindimo</th>
<th>Overall Average (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mruma</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shighatini</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manka</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dindimo</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The instructor was helpful and provided the staff development environment in an open “easy-going” manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Shighatini</th>
<th>Manka</th>
<th>Dindimo</th>
<th>Overall Average (n=31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mruma</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shighatini</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manka</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dindimo</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Rate the quality and value of the staff development-training seminar in helping to improve my teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Shighatini</th>
<th>Manka</th>
<th>Dindimo</th>
<th>Overall Average (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mruma</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shighatini</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manka</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dindimo</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12. Staff Development Course Post-Evaluation Ratings**

This was also expressed in narrative form via comments written by the teachers. Somewhat lower scores were noted for use of teacher templates and discussion topics. This may be due to the fact that the least amount of time was provided in seminar for instruction on these topics. The lower average scores for adequate time to practice the strategies were also substantiated in the narrative responses given on the survey question item for seminar recommendations. Participants’ responded (n=11) the instructor should be given enough time to effectively conduct the seminar and the days of the seminar should be increased. Further review of the survey narrative comments revealed support for learning different teaching strategies and learning cooperative learning techniques. General ideas and comments expressed varied by individual teachers and are shown in Figure 13.

---

**Item 9. Identify favorite and least favorite activities about the seminar.**

**Favorite:**
- Learning different teaching strategies or methodologies (e.g., anticipation guide and think-alouds) and improve my teaching style – (n=9)
- Cooperative learning strategies (e.g., corners, jigsaw and graffiti) – (n=9)
- Teaching was good and useful to benefit students and my subject area – (n=3)
- Helped to prepare the lesson plan – (n=3)
- Sharing ideas and system of sharing activities in different ways (e.g., computer) – (n=2)
- Exchanging ideas, knowledge and knowing each other – (n=2)
- Unity and cooperation from the instructor was good – (n=2)
- Way the instructor presents his seminar make us to be attractive – (n=1)
- Seminar was very good and well planned – (n=1)
- Question writing template – (n=1)
- The things we learned were very important – (n=1)
- Oral reading - (n=1)

**Least Favorite:**
- Surveys – (n=2)
- Graphic organizers – (n=1)
- Lesson plan – (n=1)
- The afternoon time is tiresome - (n=1)
Item 10. Recommendations or suggestions for changes and improvement of the seminar.
• Instructor should be given enough time to conduct the seminar well and the days of the seminar should be increased – (n=11)
• Very good and went well or no changes – (n=6)
• Program should be given several times in our schools or repeated to keep us up to date and to understand more (e.g., continued next year) – (n=4)
• Those who attend the seminar should be paid or given motivators – (n=4)
• Time provided to practice the strategies in the classroom under supervision – (n=2)
• Time management and break periods during the seminar should be considered – (n=1)
• Use more simple English – (n=1)
• Provide more practice to develop the skill and knowledge of teaching methodology – (n=1)
• More time to learn about the computer – (n=1)
• Give equal chance for all to participate during the seminar times – (n=1)
• Provide the seminar in the morning session – (n=1)
• Provide laptops for teachers in order to keep more documents and materials for teaching – (n=1)
• Provide more examples on specific subjects in order for teachers to become content masters - (n=1)

Item 11. General comments and thoughts:
• The lessons were good and nice improving my profession and developing my teaching process – (n=8)
• Helped us in various teaching strategies in leading activities and helpful for teachers – (n=5)
• The seminar has been very educational and informative – (n=2)
• Thank you for increasing and putting more teaching strategies – (n=1)
• Regular seminars like this one will enrich both teachers and students – (n=1)
• The seminar was well conducted – (n=1)
• The program is good and should be insisted nationalized - (n=1)
• The seminar was conducted in a conducive environment and we succeed to get certificates from the seminar. – (n=1)

Figure 13. Staff Development Course Post-Evaluation Narrative Comments

Proposal for the Dioceses Schools
As discussed earlier the dioceses secondary schools need support to boost their student enrollment (see Figure 14), which will provide more revenue for teachers and instructional resources. The opening of government public “community” secondary schools and required national testing scheme has negatively impacted the dioceses schools in creating a teacher shortage and movement of students to the free public schools. The loss of students at the dioceses schools means less tuition revenue resulting in lower or delayed salaries for the teachers. The loss of revenue exacerbates the existing teacher shortage resulting in the hiring of many younger less-trained and experienced staff members with limited post-secondary education, and increased use of teacher preparation students from the university.
The less experienced staff needs greater support in order to deliver the curriculum most effectively to students in order to perform well on the national exams. The Form IV exam results are posted online for parents to review, along with the schools’ ranking, and create an environment where parents shift their students to higher performing schools.

While more recently the scores appear to be rebounding, the dioceses schools will need to not only focus on raising student test scores and performance on the national exams, but also become more attractive and competitive by providing services not offered by the government schools.

Given these circumstances a proposal was written during the service time spent in Tanzania, with some ideas shared with the headmasters and staff. The proposal was given to the dioceses secretary of education for review and discussion before departing Tanzania. The proposal ideas are summarized in Figure 15.

**Figure 14. Student Enrollment Comparisons in the Dioceses Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Enrollment 2011</th>
<th>Enrollment 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mruma</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shighatini</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manka</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dindimo</td>
<td>I-VI</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sponsorship** – Seek project money revenue from Rotary and student university projects to “Adopt a School.”

**Sister Congregation Support** – Request for sister congregation support (e.g., Iowa SE Synod) and Europe (e.g., Germany) to sponsor educational development funding projects for infrastructure (e.g., buy bricks), curriculum books, payment of student tuition or fees, and scholarships.

**After School Program** – Provide a study and meeting program with teachers, staff, and volunteers to raise academic and testing achievement of students.

**IT Teacher** – Assign one teacher as a full-time technology instructor to keep the computer lab updated and to provide computer skills to faculty and students (i.e., replicate Manka’s technology program).

**Solar Roof Panels** – Install over the computer labs to provide consistent electricity for learning, including computer technology.

**Dioceses Community Library** – Dedicate an unused classroom space for a community library overseen by a parent volunteer. Acquire books from sponsors with one computer from the lab dedicated for reviewing e-books. Provide free on-site use by teachers, community members and students. Assess a library card fee for off-site home book checkout to support the maintenance and further development of the library (e.g., purchase additional books).

**Dining Hall and Teacher Housing Rent** – Solicit community members and visitors to the schools to rent space in the dining hall for meetings and teacher housing, when
available.

• **School Duka** – Use the existing school supply store to sell for profit items to community members (e.g., flashlights, soap, local crafts, beverages and snack food items).

• **School Promotional Brochure** – Continue use of brochures for student distribution to homes highlighting features of a dioceses education including:
  1. High performance ranking on national exams
  2. 21st Century technology instruction provided to students on keyboarding skills, file management, word processing, spreadsheets and media design (i.e., web development and multimedia production)
  3. Practice and study of religion with development of student values for appropriate behavior
  4. Opportunity for development of student social-emotional skills and study habits with after school programs
  5. A motivating learning environment engaging students in receiving instruction by teachers using a variety of teaching methodologies.

• **School Campus Maintenance** - Headmaster and teacher-directed student with parent volunteers to develop and support the school campus infrastructure (e.g., building maintenance, grounds, and lawn upkeep).

**Figure 15. Proposal Report Ideas Shared with the Dioceses Secretary of Education**

The implementation of technology to effectively use the computer labs provided by the German group will require consistent access to electricity suggesting use of solar roof panels in the proposal. Discussion with the education secretary has included staff development provided to other teachers at the schools by the technology teacher at Manka, who has an effective program at this school site. At the time of this writing a correspondence with a German technician responsible for maintaining computers in the schools reported another site visit is scheduled in the spring with plans to redesign the computer cabinets to reduce the amount of electricity usage and stabilize the operating system. The technician reported the challenges in using solar electricity with the computers and provided options for adding Internet access through a mobile net system (i.e., an adequate bandwidth for e-mail and basic Internet use). The German technology team has scheduled complete hardware replacements in the fall, unless travel plans change.

It is the hope and intent that some or all of these proposal ideas will be shared and implemented at the schools. Teachers will also need to use their training in teaching strategies and content expertise to raise students’ scores to improve enrollment and revenue for the schools. If not, admissions will continue to decline with a greater number of lower achieving students accepted to support enrollment.

**Future Study and Seminar Recommendations**

While teachers reported support for the seminar training, feedback suggested a longer staff development experience would be needed. More training time at the schools is consistent with the recommendations provided by teachers in the implementation and course evaluation surveys given at the end of the seminar. It will be important for the strategies being used with
instructional coaching feedback provided to teachers in the classroom. Use of teacher assigned peer coaching and observation of classroom use of strategies would also be effective in supporting teachers in facilitating use of the strategies.

Additional time in Tanzania would open scheduling for a seminar on site at Usangi Secondary School. The sixth seminar offering would support implementation and use of the anticipated upgrade of computer technology hardware in the labs. For teachers participating in the seminar in 2014 a return visit would support use of the Staff Development Interest Survey to evaluate training activities requiring repeated instruction and practice in the classroom. Participants could be provided instruction on strategies they feel require re-teaching while new staff members would receive a full seminar training experience. Seminar trainer and or teacher peer coaching would support teacher development of lesson plans, to implement with students, utilizing the most effective strategies in a teacher’s content area of instruction.

Administration of the Post-Evaluation: Staff Development Implementation Survey after additional support is provided to teachers in learning with instructional coaching of strategies in their classroom should be conducted in the future seminar. Evaluation of the implementation survey given to participants following observation and coaching of strategies in their classroom should be studied. Study and observation of teachers’ use and concerns regarding implementation of the strategies would be evaluated. This information would be helpful to understand teachers’ stages of concern regarding the probability for continued use and implementation of strategies with their students. Hopefully, use of instructional coaches and facilitators will support teacher implementation and ongoing use of the strategies.

A recommended future schedule would be a proposal suggesting a two-month teaching seminar schedule including Usangi Secondary School. A longer school site visit would permit not only more time for seminar instruction and teaching coaching classroom support, but provide greater opportunity for staff computer instruction and completion of discussion activities using English communication skills. Greater time at the schools will support the continued strengthening of friendships through developing cultural understanding and exchanging information with teachers, staff and community.

Conclusion
The seminar accomplished its goal in providing at least eight hours of training to secondary teachers using Strategies to Promote English Language Conversation in Tanzania, Africa at four dioceses schools located in the North and South Pare regions. The need for providing the seminar training to less experienced secondary teachers at the schools was discussed including a description of the program goals and curriculum. Details of the project proposal for planning the seminar were presented along with scheduling arrangements supporting after school meeting times. Variation in the use of technology at the schools was discussed due to personnel qualifications and availability of electricity. Included in the report was a proposal recommending ideas for the dioceses schools to increase student enrollment numbers and revenue due to competition by government schools and testing policies. Based on the seminar post evaluation and feedback from participants, more time was suggested for seminar instructional time, and practice using the strategies with facilitators. Seminar attendees also
requested greater opportunity for developing lesson plans with coaching and facilitation provided in their classroom to support implementation and adoption of the various instructional strategies.

The overall experience in facilitating the instruction of teaching strategies at the schools was rewarding and culturally enlightening. Working and supporting the teachers and staff as colleagues was very enjoyable. My only regrets with the 2014 seminar experience was the limited scheduling time at the schools and learning that Usangi teachers were unable to receive the staff development training. I hope to return to offer another seminar training at the dioceses schools in the near future, and look forward to experiencing the gracious hospitality and friendship of the Pare Tanzania people.
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