



RESEARCH PAPER

Analysis of B. Ed (Hons.) Curriculum with Reference to Outcome Based Education and National Professional Standards for Teachers in Pakistan

¹ Abida Parveen* ² Mushtaq Ahmad ³ Muhammad Sarwar

1. Ph D Scholar, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Professor, Department of Education, University of Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Received: May 11, 2021</p> <p>Accepted: September 05, 2021</p> <p>Online: September 08, 2021</p> <p>Keywords: Course Learning Outcomes, Curriculum, Outcome Based Education, Prospective Teachers</p> <p>*Corresponding Author: abida717@gmail.com</p>	<p>The study was conducted to evaluate the existing curriculum with reference to outcome based teacher education and National Professional Standards for Teachers in Pakistan. Qualitative methodology was used and a semi-structured interview was developed by following CIPP model. Interview was conducted with 10 Head of the Education Departments of the Universities where B. Ed (Hons.) program was running. The data analysis revealed that existing curriculum is neither aligned with National Professional Standards for Teachers nor with the indicators of outcome based education. There is need to improve the existing curriculum with respect to National Professional Standards for Teachers and outcome based indicators. It is recommended that HEC may constitute a committee of stake holders to completely revise the curriculum and courses of teacher education programs and develop and align the PLOs & CLOs with NPSTs to make it outcome based.</p>

Introduction

Now-a-days to improve the quality of teacher education program, pre-service teachers must understand the changes for the application of contents in order to modify the curriculum practices in the classroom. Outcome bases education guide for practices of contents and curriculum focusing on outcome.

Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan has designed teacher education programs of B.Ed. (Hon.) 4 years degree program. This teacher education programs is available for the training of pre-service teachers in Pakistan (Akhtar, 2012). To improve the quality of education in Pakistan, at elementary level a teacher should have a bachelor's degree in general education with B. Ed. On the other hand for the secondary and higher secondary, a master level degree with a B. Ed. 1.5 year is required by 2018" (National Education Policy, 2009).

“A Higher Education Commission (HEC) meeting was conducted on the agenda ‘deliberate teacher education road map’. In this meeting, representatives of federal and provincial Punjab Public Service Commission approved HEC- teacher education road map under the supervision of executive director HEC. It described two main objectives of new teacher education roadmap; first is "raising teacher prestige in society and second ensuring their professional knowledge, skills and competencies" (HEC, 2016) and second was to ensure program wise (e.g. B. Ed, MA etc.) professional knowledge, skills and competencies” (National Qualification Framework, 2016).

To achieve the knowledge, skills and competencies in higher education a new approach of outcome based education is favored worldwide. Developed countries like USA, United Kingdom, New Zealand, United Kingdom, and Australia, etc. and under developed countries like South Africa, Singapore and Hong Kong etc. favor outcome based education to improve the quality of education (Donnelly, (2007). Outcome based education focused on continuous quality improvements (CQI) in the form of aligning overall learning process with the achievement of course learning outcomes (Jackson & Jonsson, 2013, Ricketts, 2014). Outcome of teacher education was based on the document titled ‘National Professional Standards for teachers in Pakistan’ which is a collection of relevant knowledge skills and dispositions for prospective teachers (NPSTs, 2009).

To update the curriculum and make the course learning outcomes clear for university teachers, that need to be based on relevant domain e.g. cognitive, affective and psychomotor (Harden, 2001). Furthermore Spady (2001) and Hussey & Smith (2003) stated that course learning outcomes are critically important for curriculum developers especially with reference to outcome based education. Experts focused on the aligning the course objectives with respect to clarity, content and assessment through evaluating the curriculum. Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, (2007) has given CIPP model for curriculum evaluation, in this model context means project objectives, future expectations, and needs of project. Input includes methods to meet objectives, personal capabilities, and potential benefit of methodologies. Process includes procedural events and activities e.g. teaching methodologies for the contents of teacher education programs. Product in CIPP model of evaluation is outcomes to measure the objectives to determine effectiveness.

In outcome based curriculum, alignment of program leaning outcome (PLOs) and course learning outcomes (CLOs) is focused. Alignment of PLOs with the curriculum is used in mapping into the university settings (Wang, 2014). According to Lam and Tsui, (2013) alignment of course learning outcomes with assessment procedure is needed to produce graduate with relevant knowledge, skills and competencies in teacher education programs. Program Learning Outcomes are zsu of ‘that graduates from a particular university degree program should be able to do in the form of knowledge, skills and disposition in the result of undertaking the program (Biggs & Tang, 2009). Further, Eames, (2003) described that PLOs must address ‘knowledge, skills, abilities and dispositions’ for producing ideal graduates should demonstrate upon completion of a program. In short, outcome based curriculum focus on the alignment of the course learning outcomes of courses of teacher education programs with knowledge, skills and dispositions (Sumsion & fellow, 2004).

In Pakistan, a planned set of activities was designed in the form of teacher education curriculum for different teacher education programs. According to Akhtar, (2012) existing teacher education programs are not satisfactory regarding achievement of course objectives, standards in contents, appropriate teaching methodologies and assessment of the program. Different documents as National Education Policy, (2009) and Higher Education Commission, (2016). National Curriculum Revision Committee expressed that there is need of quality improvement in teacher education curriculum. Because quality of teacher education programs is based on the prescribe curriculum. But there is need to align course objectives given in the curriculum with the National Professional Standards for Teachers to achieve effective outcomes of the programs.

Material and Methods

Qualitative methodology was followed to evaluate existing curriculum alignment with outcome based teacher education with reference to NPSTs. Population was all the Heads of Education Departments of public sector universities of Pakistan. A sample of 15 Heads of Education Departments was selected through purposive sampling technique where B. Ed (hon.) program was running but only 10 were available. An interview schedule was developed with reference to the context, input, process and product (CIPP) model of Stufflebeam and validated through the opinion of five experts of department of education university of Sargodha who have worked as Heads in the Department of Education. Interviews were conducted face to face and on telephone and responses were recorded with the permission of respondents.

Data Analysis

A qualitative data analysis was carried out and themes were derived then frequencies and percentages of the response were calculated.

Analysis of Interviews of Heads of Departments about Teacher Education Curriculum with Reference to Outcome Based Education

Question 1: What do you think about the courses of the existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons) are developed according to the National Professional Standards for Teachers?

Respondent 1: I think Not at all, the courses of existing curriculum designed by Higher Education Commission of Pakistan (HEC) are not aligned in accordance with NPST of Pakistan. Because there are many loopholes and all the courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) curriculum are not aligned with NPST. I think to develop higher order thinking skills alignment of existing curriculum with the national professional standards and appropriate taxonomy needs to focus.

Respondent 2: According to my opinion the courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) Program don't meet the National and international standards for teachers as well as in contents, knowledge are focused skills and disposition are ignored during teacher education.

Respondent 3: What I think the existing curriculum is in fifty, fifty situations align with National Professional Standards for Teachers and NPSTs are designed in a better way with a combination of theoretical and practical aspects.

Respondent 4: No because when these NPST in 2009 and curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) is developed in 2014; I was a member of curriculum review committee. Existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) program and all other teacher education programs must align 100% with the NPST as well as National Qualification Framework.

Respondent 5: It was a project of USAID to work on the curriculum. Curriculum is not focused and not aligned with NPST.

Respondent 6: There is no alignment among the existing curriculum with the NPST. In the introduction section of B.Ed. (Hons.) curriculum, it is needed to state NPSTs align the courses with them.

Respondent 7: Not aligned with NPST, least knowledge, skills and competencies are followed during teacher education program.

Respondent 8: Existing curriculum is not aligned with the NPST in a best fit way. There is need to develop skills and competencies based curriculum for B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 9: I have observed existing curriculum is not integrated with NPST especially in the existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) program prepared by HEC with the cooperation of USAID.

Respondent 10: what i have observed existing curriculum of (B.Ed. Hons.) is not according to NPST. We have not prepared the existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) program by keeping in views NPSTs.

Question 2: Domission and visions of B.Ed. (Hons.) program are aligned with course learning outcomes?

Respondent 1: The mission and vision are not aligned with the CLOs. As I know B. Ed (Hons.) courses has no vision and mission included.

Respondent 2: In existing curriculum mission and vision are not properly displayed even not given weightage. So how mission and vision can be aligned with course learning outcomes?

Respondent 3: Mission and vision are not written in the HEC suggested curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) program; these are needed to be incorporated.

Respondent 4: Mission and vision of teacher education program is not aligned with the course learning outcomes.

Respondent 5: Mission and vision are not even written down in the document. Objectives for teachers are not developed, so it's not possible to align with methodology and assessment.

Respondent 6: Mission and vision are not defined and not stated in the curriculum.

Respondent 7: Mission and vision are not aligned with course learning outcomes of the courses.

Respondent 8: Mission and vision are not aligned; all the universities are trying their best for the development of mission and vision by following NPST.

Respondent 9: The mission and vision clarifies the next path to be followed. But Mission and vision are not aligned Vision with course learning outcomes.

Respondent 10: Mission and vision are not aligned with course learning outcomes.

Question 3: What are the weaknesses (course learning outcomes, contents, teaching methodologies and assessment) of the courses of existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) program?

Respondent 1: Objectives are designed well but unable to achieve. Curriculum content of B.Ed. (Hons.) program is also not satisfactory. Teacher at university level are unable to adapt modern methods and use information communication technologies (ICT).

Respondent 2: Not only B.Ed. (Hons.) in Pakistan but in all other teacher education programs assessment mechanism is weak. Practical aspects in the classroom are not being given proper weightage and do not produce skills and disposition among the student teachers.

Respondent 3: Objective, content, methodology and assessment is not flexible according to the subject; assessment is also not structured according to objectives. In assessment, skills and competencies are ignored and not given weightage.

Respondent 4: Objective, content, methodology and assessment; all components are not aligned with vision and mission and not aligned with each another. The inculcation of objectives with the knowledge, skills and competencies is missing in B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 5: All the components are not satisfactory and need alignments to produce competent graduates in the field and at some extent NPST should be focused.

Respondent 6: Objectives are to some extent clear. methodology and assessment are not aligned with objectives.

Respondent 7: Objectives are not aligned with the Bloom Taxonomy. Exam is not aligned with the objectives, paper pencil assessment and scores are focused.

Respondent 8: What I think, if assessment of teacher training programs is not aligned with all other components i.e. objectives, contents, methodologies. Semester system needs much more vigilance from teachers.

Respondent 9: Assessment is not relevant to the objectives and teaching methods. Assessment in B.Ed. (Hons.) program should be assessment for learning.

Respondent 10: Well what I think, weakness in the existing curriculum are all of the four components i.e. Objectives, contents, teaching methodologies and assessment.

Question 4: Do teachers follow course learning outcomes for the development of knowledge, skills and competencies during B.Ed. (Hons.) program?

Respondent 1: No the teachers even at university level did not follow knowledge, skills and competencies to achieve desired outcomes for the development of higher order thinking. Universities adapted HEC curriculum that cannot achieve the overall objectives of education.

Respondent 2: Some of the university teachers do not follow the objectives of the course of B.Ed. (Hons.) program; their focus is only on the content.

Respondent 3: B.Ed. (Hons.) teacher do not follow the objectives and course learning out comes and just give lectures.

Respondent 4: knowledge to some extent is focused but skills and competencies are not focused. Teaching methodologies are not developed in relevance to the content of courses and competencies are not focused.

Respondent 5: Objectives are not clear and not the relevant knowledge, skills and competencies are being disseminated.

Respondent 6: Well! Objectives are the heart of any course but alignment of course objectives with the assessment is not focused in B.Ed. (Hons.) courses.

Respondent 7: Objectives and course learning outcomes are not being followed satisfactorily.

Respondent 8: Knowledge, skills and competencies are not according to objectives and course learning outcomes at satisfactory level.

Respondent 9: I do not think that Knowledge, skills and competencies are thoroughly linked with course learning outcomes.

Respondent 10: I do not think that objectives are being followed for the prospective teachers enrolled in B.Ed. (Hons.) program. There is no sharing of information and its assessment aligned with the course learning outcomes.

Question 5: What do you think that knowledge, skills and competencies in the courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) program aligned with the National Professional Standards for Teachers?

Respondent 1: knowledge, skills and competencies are not aligned with NPSTs. However, that needs to be focused.

Respondent 2: Objectives, content, methodologies of B.Ed. (Hons.) program are not according to NPSTs.

Respondent 3: Not aligned; assessment structure, quality of question paper not satisfactory just traditional and not aligned with NPSTs.

Respondent 4: NPSTs are policy documents and not blend with the courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 5: Teaching and learning is not aligned with NPSTs.

Respondent 6: Not aligned but there is need of alignment with NPSTs.

Respondent 7: Existing curriculum is not compatible with NPST. Methodologies and assessment are also not aligned with the objectives and NPSTs.

Respondent 8: All university teachers are well known with the NPSTs but do not take interest to follow that.

Respondent 9: not at all; there is any utilization of NPSTs for the development of objectives and content of B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 10: There is need of suitable application of NPSTs for objectives, knowledge, skills and competencies in the courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Question 6: What do you think that teaching methodologies in courses of existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) are relevant to final assessment?

Respondent 1: No the teaching methodologies are not relevant. Even teachers are not able to select suitable teaching methodology for the different subjects e.g. science subjects.

Respondent 2: Teaching techniques selected by the faculty members are not as suggested by HEC.

Respondent 3: Teaching methodologies are not relevant to the final assessment during B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 4: All the teaching methodologies are not designed as well as not implemented or aligned with assessment.

Respondent 5: Teaching methodologies in courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) are not relevant to the formative and summative assessment.

Respondent 6: Relevance is not focused either objectives of courses to the teaching methodologies or teaching methodologies with the assessment.

Respondent 7: According to my opinion teachers have knowledge of all methodologies but they are unable to align them with assessment.

Respondent 8: Only lecture method is one of the traditional methods so all other methods are ignored or not partially used. But alignment is not there with assessment.

Respondent 9: Teaching methodologies are not relevant to the midterm and final term assessment because in short time teacher is unable to consider about these alignments.

Respondent 10: Teaching methodologies as classroom assignment, lecture is aligned with the assessment but all other activities are not considered.

Question 7: Do teaching methodologies are designed for the relevant knowledge, skills and competencies during B.Ed. (Hons.) program?

Respondent 1: No! Teaching methodologies are not designed separately for knowledge, skills and competencies.

Respondent 2: No! as what I have observed in my career of teaching B.Ed. (Hons.) program, students even lack the content knowledge. There should be outcome based assessment system in B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 3: No! but assessment may be designed for skills and competencies also.

Respondent 4: No! but in some cases it happens where teaching methodologies are relevant with course objective and assessment as reported by HOD and departmental coordinators.

Respondent 5: Teaching methodologies in courses of existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) are not relevant to final assessment.

Respondent 6: University teachers do not care for aligning teaching methodologies with assessment.

Respondent 7: No! I think knowledge is to some extent focused for assessment but overall all the domains are not focused with reference to designing teaching methodologies of the courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 8: No! Alignment is not there. There is no relevancy between methodology, Knowledge, skills, competencies and assessment.

Respondent 9: No! alignment. I think seventy percent university teachers did not plan lectures and CLOs according to relevant domain.

Respondent 10: Teaching methodologies are not designed with reference to knowledge, skills, competencies and assessment.

Question 8: What do you think that course learning outcomes of existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) are aligned according to appropriate domains i.e. cognitive, affective and psychomotor?

Respondent 1: Only cognitive domain is focused and even in this knowledge, comprehension and application are focused but higher order skills like analysis,

synthesis, and evaluation are ignored. Affective and psychomotor domains are also missing from the curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 2: Situation of existing B.Ed. (Hons.) curriculum is not satisfactory with respect to affective and psychomotor domains.

Respondent 3: There is no alignment of objectives of the courses in existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) program with all the three domains.

Respondent 4: No, affective and psychomotor domains are not focused in the courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) program.

Respondent 5: CLOs of B.Ed. (Hons.) program and Teaching-learning is not aligned with the taxonomy and its domains.

Respondent 6: Knowledge is focused in the curriculum, disposition is totally ignored with reference to the alignment of NPST. No alignment is observed in objectives and taxonomy.

Respondent 7: CLOs are not aligned with appropriate domain and its levels as well.

Respondent 8: I think psychomotor domain is missing. Teacher training component of B.Ed. (Hons.) program is not properly designed with respect to affective and psychomotor domains.

Respondent 9: Only cognitive domain is focused other affective and psychomotor are missing in B.Ed. (Hons.) program. Universities should redesign focus the teaching practice.

Respondent 10: CLOs are not designed with appropriate taxonomy and its domains i.e. cognitive, affective and psychomotor.

Question 9: *Is exam (mid- term, final term) are aligned with the course learning outcomes?*

Respondent 1: Exams are not aligned with the course learning outcomes even teachers and students both do not know about the question from where question is derived such that cognitive, affective and psychomotor domain or from which NPST. Assessment techniques and teacher training need severe revision and students should be assessed on the basis of course learning outcomes.

Respondent 2: Assessment and objectives are aligned, but objectives of the B.Ed. (Hons.) courses are not formulated well with respect to three domains.

Respondent 3: An exam is not aligned with the course objectives. When objectives are not aligned with the content, there are so many gaps. Exam is not sufficient to evaluate blended outcomes related to NPSTs. Purpose is to develop skills but assessment is only based on paper pencil tests.

Respondent 4: No, But assessment should be three tier e.g. Knowledge, skills and competencies and exams should be aligned with CLOs.

Respondent 5: There is no alignment in the objectives of courses and exams in existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.).

Respondent 6: Mid and final exams are to some extent aligned with the CLOs. As assessment is only based on paper pencil tests and exams is based on the choice of teachers.

Respondent 7: Exams are to some extent aligned with the CLOs but not satisfactory like all other levels are ignored except focusing on the knowledge and comprehension. It is good if CLOs of courses B.Ed. (Hons.) program are aligned with updated bloom taxonomy and then implemented in the classrooms.

Respondent 8: Exams are only for the assessment of memorization of facts not for the skills or application; so these are not aligned with CLOs

Respondent 9: Not aligned. An exam is just for summarizing the facts not for measuring Knowledge, skills and competencies.

Respondent 10: Exams are not aligned with the objectives. I want to suggest that objectives of courses should be developed according to the NPSTs and after that exams should be conducted accordingly.

Table 1

Analysis of interviews data related to Heads of Education Department to explore outcome based education

S#	Themes related to OBE to be explored	Heads of education Department N=15 n=10
(Context)		
1	What do you think that courses of existing curriculum of B.Ed (Hons.) are aligned with National Professional Standards for Teachers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% did not agree. • Only 10% agreed with the statement.
2	Does mission and vision are aligned with course learning outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% disagreed. • Only 20% agreed with the statement.
3	What do you think that objectives, contents, teaching methodologies and assessment of the existing curriculum of B.Ed (Hons.) are weak and need improvement or not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% agreed that weaknesses are there. • Only 30 % disagreed with the statement.
(Input)		
4	University Teachers follow course learning outcomes for the development of knowledge, skills and competencies during B. Ed (Hons.) program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% disagreed they said that teachers do not care for skills and competencies, only focus on knowledge

5	What do you think that knowledge, skills and competencies in the courses of B.Ed (Hons.) program are aligning with the National Professional Standards for Teachers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 25 % agreed with the statement. • 80% disagreed that knowledge, skills and competencies in the courses of B.Ed. (Hons) program are aligning with the NPSTs • Only 20 % agreed with the statement.
(Process)		
6	What do you think that teaching methodologies in courses of existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons) are relevant to final assessment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% disagreed and said that teaching methodologies are not relevant to final assessment • Only 20 % agreed with the statement.
7	Do teaching methodologies are designed separately for the relevant knowledge, skills and competencies during B.Ed. (Hons) program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70 % disagreed • 30% agreed with the statement.
(Product)		
8	What do you think that course learning outcomes of existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons) are aligned with appropriate taxonomy and its domains i.e. cognitive, affective and psychomotor?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% disagreed • 30 % agreed with the statement.
9	Is exams (mid-term, final term) are aligned with the course learning outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% disagreed that weaknesses are there. • Only 20 % agreed with the statement.

Table 1 gives the conclusive portrait of the all the interviews. It reflects that according to 90% respondents existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) is not aligned with NPSTs; 80% respondents expressed that 80 mission and vision are aligned with course learning outcomes, 70% respondents agreed that objectives, contents, teaching methodologies and assessment of the existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) are weak and need improvement, 75% said that teachers do not care for skills and competencies, only focus on knowledge. 80% stated that knowledge, skills and competencies in the courses of B.Ed. (Hons.) program are not aligned with the NPSTs, 80% respondents views were that teaching methodologies in course of B.Ed. (Hons.) are not relevant to final assessment. 70% HODs said the teaching methodologies are not designed for the relevant skills and competencies during B.Ed. (Hons.) program but only for the knowledge purposes. 70% expressed that course learning outcomes of existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hons.) are only relevant to cognitive domain but not aligned affective and psychomotor, 80% respondents expressed that mostly exams are not aligned with the course learning outcome.

Conclusion

To evaluate existing curriculum with reference to outcome based teacher education the results show that existing curriculum has no alignment with the National professional Standards for Teachers in Pakistan (NPSTs). The possible reason of this is this B. Ed (Hon.) curriculum was developed by HEC while NPSTs were developed under the supervision of Ministry of Education with the funds support of USAID. Obviously

there was no coordination between the two departments with the less or no involvement of the teachers who are teaching B. Ed (Hons.) curriculum.

Moreover the analysis show that according to majority of Heads of Education Departments, the CLOs of existing B. Ed (hon.) courses neither fulfill context of NPSTs nor OBC indicators and not even fulfill the context of CIPP model. Further analysis through CIPP model revealed that CLOs of existing B. Ed (hon.) courses do not fulfill the proper process according to of CIPP model and not showing the proper product. Its reasons may be that the curriculum was developed according to traditional way and no modern theory or model was followed and even not followed the outcome based curriculum of engineering education. Though from traditional curriculum it was a bit different as the students' participation was considered important but that is not appropriate approach of OBE. Outcome based education focused on the learned knowledge, skills and disposition results from particular training program e.g. B.Ed. (Hon.) as Eames, (2003) discussed that PLOs as National professional Standards for Teachers in Pakistan describe knowledge, skills and competencies and Sumsion and fellow (2004) said that without alignment of CLOs effective outcomes are not produced. In existing curriculum of B.Ed. (Hon.) alignment is required with NPSTs. Spady, (2001) said that effectiveness of program cannot ensure without overall proper procedure and its understanding of stakeholder. Harden (2001) explored that to clear the tracked course learning outcomes in the complete course of study to update the curriculum.

Recommendations

On the basis of data analysis and conclusions it is recommended that HEC may constitute a committee of stake holders to completely revise the curriculum and course of training program developing and aligning the PLOs &CLOs with NPSTs to make it outcome based.

Reference

- Akhtar, Z. (2012). Gender Inequality in Teacher Training Program. *International Journal of Business and social sciences Vol. 3, No. 10*.
- Biggs, J. & Tang, C. (2009). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University* (3rd Ed.). Open University Press.
- Donnelly, K. (2007). Australia's adoption of outcomes based education – a critique. *Educational Research, 17*(2).
- Eames, A. L. (2003). *Developing learning outcomes*. Northeastern Illinois University. <http://www.neiu.edu/~neassess/pdf/DevelopingLearningOutcomesOutline.pdf>
- Harden, R. (2001). AMEE Guide No. 21: Curriculum Mapping: A Tool for Transparent and Authentic Teaching and Learning. *Medical Teacher 23* (2): 123–37.
- Harden, R. (2006). International Medical Education and Future Directions: A Global Perspective. *Academic Medicine 81* (12): 22–29.
- Higher Education Commission, (2016). *HEC Deliberations on Teacher Education Roadmap*. <http://hec.gov.pk/english/news/news/Pages/HEC-Deliberates-Teacher-Education-Roadmap.aspx>
- Hussey, T., & P. Smith. (2003). The Uses of Learning Outcomes. *Teaching in Higher Education 8* (3): 357–68.
- Jackson, M., & Jonsson, J. O. (2013). Why does inequality of educational opportunity vary across countries? Primary and secondary effects in comparative context. In M. Jackson (Ed.), *Determined to succeed? Performance versus choice in educational attainment* (pp. 306–338). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lam, B.-H., & Tsui, K. T. (2013). Examining the Alignment of Subject Learning Outcomes and Course Curricula through Curriculum Mapping. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 38* (12).
- National Education Policy*, (2009). Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan.
- National Professional Standards for teachers in Pakistan*, (2009). Islamabad: Policy and Planning Wing Ministry of Education Government of Pakistan.
- National Qualification Framework of Pakistan*, (2009). Higher Education Commission Pakistan.
- Ricketts, A. (2014). Pre-service elementary teachers' ideas about scientific practices. *Science and Education, 23*, 2119–2135.
- Spady, W. G. (2001). *Beyond Counterfeit Reforms: Forging an Authentic Future for all Learners*. A Scarecrow Education Book. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Stufflebeam, D. L. & Shinkfield, A.J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models & applications*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sumsion, J., & J. Goodfellow. (2004). Identifying Generic Skills through Curriculum Mapping: A Critical Evaluation. *Higher Education Research & Development* 23 (3): 329-46.

Wang, C. L. (2014). *Mapping or Tracing? Rethinking Curriculum Mapping in Higher Education*. *Studies in Higher Education*. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03075079.2014.899343>