

## An Assessment of Project Teacher Exchange for ASEAN Teachers (TEACH) Program

Ma. Lourdes S. Agustin<sup>1</sup>, Darryl Roy T. Montebon<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Institute of Teaching and Learning, Philippine Normal University, Philippines

<sup>2</sup> College of Education, University of Saskatchewan, Canada

---

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received Nov 15, 2017

Revised Jan 30, 2018

Accepted Feb 23, 2018

---

#### Keyword:

ASEAN  
Collaboration  
Integration  
Project TEACH  
Teacher Education

---

### ABSTRACT

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) integration aims to unite the South East Asian countries to promote better opportunities for the member countries in different areas such as economics and education. As a response, Philippine Normal University spearheaded the formation of the Association of Southeast Asian Teacher Education Network to promote collaboration with ASEAN countries and enhance teacher education programs. The formation of AsTEN creates the impetus to explore possibilities for the internationalization of teacher education programs among the ASEAN countries. Thus, the Institute of Teaching and Learning of PNU initiated the Project Teacher Exchange for ASEAN Teachers (TEACH). This paper reports the assessment of the piloting of the Project TEACH as experienced by the Thai participants. Moreover, this research aims to develop a model that can be utilized by other ASEAN communities as they prepare for their own international teacher education programs.

Copyright © 2018 Institute of Advanced Engineering and Science.  
All rights reserved.

---

### Corresponding Author:

Darryl Roy T. Montebon,  
Institute of Teaching and Learning,  
Philippine Normal University,  
Taft Avenue cor Ayala Boulevard, Manila, Philippines.  
Email: montebon.drt@pnu.edu.ph

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) integration aims to unite the South East Asian countries to promote better opportunities for the member countries in different areas such as economics and education. Several schools around Asia have already rolled out its education program towards ASEAN 2015 as early as 1996 like Malaysia's Vision 2020 and Thailand English Speaking Year Project. In the Philippines, the Philippine Normal University (PNU), being the National Center for Teacher Education (NCTE), took the lead in organizing the premier teacher education institutions in the ASEAN region to form AsTEN or the ASEAN Teacher Education Network.

The formation of AsTEN creates the impetus to explore possibilities for the internationalization of teacher education programs among the ASEAN countries [1]. Thus, the Institute of Teaching and Learning of PNU initiated the Project Teacher Exchange for ASEAN Teachers (TEACH). The goal of the program is to share the education practices in the Philippines, particularly in the English language proficiency, among its ASEAN members. The Project TEACH is envisioned to be a venue where ASEAN country members can exchange ideas and develop partnerships in meeting the educational challenges in the region. With the Project TEACH program at hand, the fast mobility of teachers in the ASEAN region can be supported.

This paper reports the assessment of the pilot activities in the Project TEACH as experienced by the Thai participants. It is the aim of this paper to share both the good features of the program and the areas to be improved. The main goal of this research is to develop a model that can be utilized by other ASEAN communities as they prepare for their own international teacher education programs.

### 1.1. ASEAN Integration and the Role of Education

These are just some of the characteristics that the South East Asian (SEA) countries commonly share. Though individually each SEA country is unique on its own, commonalities in different factors are evident; its economic potential is promising [2]. The SEA countries are rich in natural resources and its position in the globe is potentially strategic for economic advantage.

*“ASEAN is a major global hub of manufacturing and trade, as well as one of the fastest-growing consumer markets in the world. As the region seeks to deepen its ties and capture an even greater share of global trade, its economic profile is rising—and it is crucial for those outside the region to understand its complexities and contradictions.”* - Vinayak, Thompson, and Tonby [3].

Realizing the said potential, ASEAN was formed. The initiative of having ASEAN integration started in 1967 when the heads of the five Southeast Asian countries namely Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand convened in Bangkok, Thailand and institutionalized their bounding ties named ASEAN (Bangkok) Agreement [4]. The ASEAN agreement acknowledges that the five South East Asian countries share a lot of things in common such as geographical location, culture, and even history. Thus, it is but fitting to form a coalition among the ASEAN countries to strengthen the economic and social stability of the region. Other Southeast Asian countries namely Brunei Darussalam, Vietnam, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Cambodia joined the ASEAN in the latter years.

Though the success of forming the ASEAN community is not as evident economically like that of the European Union, the ASEAN community has regional peace to be proud of [5]. But still, more work is yet to do. Thus, members of the ASEAN community initiated agreements that will ensure the success of the integration. To institutionalize the said efforts, Bali Concord II was signed in 2003. Bali Concord II describes the three pillars of the ASEAN community which are political security, economy, and socio-cultural identity. The three pillars are coherent and are designed to support each other. These three pillars guide the whole ASEAN integration program to ensure that the goals of the ten member countries are met.

But where does education stand in the ASEAN integration? What is its role? The ASEAN Secretariat [6] reported that education is the main support expected by the ASEAN Socio Cultural Community (ASCC). As its mandate, the ASCC shall ensure that the ASEAN work force *“shall be prepared for, and benefit from, economic integration by investing more resources for basic and higher education, training, science and technology development, job creation, and social protection”* [7]. Therefore, the ASCC gives primer on education because the development and enhancement of human resources is a key strategy for employment generation, alleviating poverty and socio-economic disparities, and ensuring economic growth with equity.

True to its mandate, the ASCC have been delivering a great number of positive results on enrollment rate, adult and youth literacy, school drop-out, and improvement in gender parity in both elementary and secondary schools. The said improvements in the education system in the members of the ASEAN region drives the ASCC to further promote a stronger educational cooperation among the ASEAN member states to help narrow the development gaps, prepare the youths for regional leadership, and to increase the competitiveness of the ASEAN people in the global stage.

Strategically, to achieve the set educational goals of the ASCC, the ASEAN 5-year work plan from 2011 to 2015 has been established. It is important for students to have a deeper global awareness and understanding of other cultures for it opens an opportunity for people to explore new ideas and prospects and understand how the world works for them [8]. In the case of ASEAN countries, understanding each other's culture and finding similarities and working on differences can lead to a community that promotes respect and a true sense of unity; not taking advantage of each other but considers each other's welfare.

With the welfare each ASEAN members in mind, ASCC strives to improve the quality of education in the region. Quality education is *“a complex system embedded in a political, cultural and economic context”* [9]. Quality education can be described by the quality of learners produced and their characteristics; the environment that supports the education process; the relevance of the content taught in the curricula; the processes of the education enterprise itself; and the outcomes achieved from the educational endeavor. Therefore, the ASCC strives for quality education in ASEAN region by promoting equal access to primary and secondary education; enhance the performance standards of ASEAN schools; support the professional development of teachers; produce students that are lifelong learners.

### 1.2. Strengthening Cross-border Mobility and Internationalization of Education

One of the aims of the ASCC is to aid the teacher and student mobility among ASEAN members because of its potential to help improve the education system of the region. Cross-border mobility is encouraged among members of the ASEAN *“to foster mutual understanding and promote peace and*

development in the region” [10]. Teacher mobility is highly relevant to both pre-service and in service teacher [11]. The OECD or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [12] enumerated the different purposes of cross-border mobility among different countries which are: 1) to participate in international knowledge flows, be exposed to new ideas or technologies, including the tacit knowledge associated to their use; 2) to improve teaching and administrative practices of higher education institutions by giving them international benchmarks (e.g. the feedback of international students); 3) to attract and keep, even temporarily, some talents for the economy and research system of the host country; 4) to generate revenue for the economy and the higher education sector; 5) to help developing and emerging countries build capacity.

Moreover, the OECD described the steps on how to go through with the internationalization in higher education among countries. First is to consult a variety of stakeholders to carefully determine the objectives of the internationalization program. An internationalization program should have a clear description of its purpose and how to go through with it. Upon consultation, countries should assess their sending and receiving policies to carefully weigh the potential risks that may affect the program. Second, is to address some basic questions that involve the faculty and the students. For students, questions on parallel academic offerings and credit recognition should be clear. Financial support must be known to both the students and the institution. For teachers, the availability of teaching position and the compensation scheme must be discussed. Other benefits like leave, summer pay, and even lodging should be a part of planning for internationalizations. For both student and teachers, formalities such as visa and other required documents must be part of the planning. These factors can be easily sorted out when the governments involved in the exchange have written understandings. The statement below summarizes how cross-border mobility among nations can be successful:

*“Cross-border higher education will not help developing countries unless it is accessible, available, affordable, relevant and of acceptable quality. Also key are the contentious issues of who awards the degree, who recognizes the degree and whether this is accredited or quality assured.” – Knight [13]*

Cross-border also poses risks in countries that participate in it. Such risks have been identified by OECD as countries proceed with their internationalization programs. One of the major risks the threat of inequality. With the influx of students and teachers from one country to another, displacement of people may occur. For students of a certain country, the chance of getting into a university might be lessened because of a completion that they will be facing with the incoming foreign students. For teachers, present professionals occupying a teaching position might get displaced when foreigners with better qualifications get accommodated in the universities. Another risk is the quality of the education provided to students. Internationalization strategies should ensure that the universities involved offer quality education to make sure that those avail the program does not get short-changed.

With the benefits and risks presented on cross-border mobility on higher education among countries, in ASEAN region in this case, [13] suggested that *“...is important that the higher education sector be informed and vigilant about the risks and benefits and, more importantly, about the need for appropriate policies and regulations to guide and monitor current and future developments”*.

### **1.3. The Philippines' Internationalization Strategy**

The Philippine government recognizes that to be true to the ASEAN spirit, it should also open up its doors to other countries and share what it can offer best, that is English language instruction. According to [14] *“the Philippines has become a popular destination for learners of English as a second language and is sometimes characterised as the home of the world's “budget” English teacher”*. The Philippines has been a destination of students who want to learn English efficiently with a less budget. The performance of the Philippines in English proficiency has been recognized by several institutions like the Pearson Business English Index [15] and Educational Testing Services [16].

Operationally, for international institutes to work with a Philippine university or college it must go through the Commission on Higher Education (CHED). CHED regulates the different programs on the internationalization strategy of Philippine institutions. In the case of the Philippine Normal University, CHED recognizes its mandate as the National Center for Teacher Education, thus it has an autonomy with its programs to innovate programs that will help teacher education in the country and beyond. As [17] pointed out that *“the internationalisation of teacher education cannot be understood without consideration of the broader processes associated with globalisation”*, thus PNU strives to be true to its mandate to design programs that answer societal issues either locally or internationally. Hence, Project TEACH in this paper is reported.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

The Project TEACH program offered by the PNU ITL was experienced by 24 teacher participants coming from Thailand. They are a mixture of science, math, and ICT teachers. Their ages range 25 to 58 years old and their exposure to the teaching profession varies from 1 year to 35 years of teaching experience. Table 1 shows the other demographics of the participants.

**Table 1. Demographics of Informants**

Categories		Frequency
Gender	Male	6
	Female	18
Civil Status	Married	11
	Single	13
Province	Chonburi	18
	Rayong	6
	Science	13
Subject Taught	Math	6
	ICT	5
	Junior High	8
Year Level Handled	Senior High	16
	Bachelor's Degree	11
Highest Educational Attainment	Master's Degree	13

This research employed both qualitative and quantitative research designs. Survey questionnaires and case study method were utilized. The survey questionnaire focused on four areas which aim to evaluate the experiences of the participants on Project TEACH in terms of their general experience on the program, the English language proficiency training, the teaching pedagogies, and their cultural exposure experiences. The questionnaire has been subjected to phase and content validity by different professors in PNU.

The items on the questionnaire for the general evaluation of the program and the pedagogical knowledge training were adapted from *Collective Evaluation Data: End of Session Questionnaires* [18]. For the English Language proficiency, the teachers' self-reported English proficiency [19] was modified to fit in the present research. Table 2 reports the reliability test of the selected areas on the questionnaire.

**Table 2. Reliability of Items on the Questionnaire**

Area	Cronbach Alpha's Coefficient
General Experience on Project Teach	0.796
a. administration, facilities, and logistics	0.830
b. instructors who lectured/facilitated the workshops	0.786
Self-Reported English Language Proficiency	0.822
Pedagogical Knowledge	0.909

The Project Teacher Exchange for ASEAN Teachers (TEACH) aims to create an ASEAN Teacher Education Forum for international co-operation and academic exchange that is deeply rooted on ASEAN culture. Project TEACH hopes to broaden ASEAN teachers' experience and understanding of the challenges of actual teaching and learning from an international perspective via Philippine experience. The program also provides opportunities for collaboration and work in partnership with ASEAN teacher education institutions for their teachers to learn the Philippine culture and from the best practices in teaching at the basic education level. It is also the aim of this program to facilitate the mobility of teachers in the ASEAN region to access higher quality of teaching experience in the Philippines.

For ASEAN countries to participate in the Project TEACH in PNU several working assumptions have been set. First, there should be a mutual understanding of the policies and procedures of both "receiving" (Philippines) and "sending" countries from Southeast Asia. Second, PNU through its International Office has a standing memorandum of agreement with the sending ASEAN universities. Third, the program participants' selection process will be based on the established procedures of the sending country. Lastly, financial support will be provided by the sending institutions to their teachers who qualify for the program.

The Project TEACH international teacher training program is a four-week rigid teacher training program that is designed to help ASEAN teachers in their English Language Proficiency (ELP) and Pedagogical Knowledge (PK). Experts from PNU provided lectures and workshops with the participants to

help them improve their ELP and their PK. Also, the program offers a cultural exposure to the participants for them to be familiarized with the Filipino culture and derive insights for education.

The experiences of the Thai teacher participants who were the first group of international teachers to participate in the Project TEACH is the subject of the present research. Upon evaluation, it is desired that the method utilized in conducting the whole program could be an effective model

### 3. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

#### 3.1. General Evaluation of Project TEACH

Participants were asked “*How would you rate your overall experience on the project?*” The mode of response gathered is ‘good’ (66.7 %, N=24). This number signifies that most participants agree that they find their experience on Project to TEACH to be significant though it has not reached the ‘excellent’ level yet. Participants gave varied explanations on their response; some of them are listed below.

*In project teach I: 1)was able to practice my English better; 2)learn to understand English better and participate in the program; 3)enjoyed the method of teaching by the lecturers;4)did some very good activities;5)learn how to teach my subject in English and I will try my very best to do it back home.*

One notable response was given by Informan number 21, which explains why their general evaluation of the program did not reach ‘excellent’ level. It is because they find the time too short for them. They said that the program would have been excellent if they were given more time to undergo the program.

*“My experiences on project teach is ‘good’. If only more time has been given for workshops, write lesson plans, and even more time for demonstration, Project Teach would be EXCELLENT!” - Informan 21*

Though participants found that the ‘time’ they have spent on the program affected their experience on Project TEACH, still most of them agreed that the time they have spent on the program is ‘very much’ worth it (45.5 %, N=24).

To further investigate on the general experience of students on Project TEACH, participants were made to respond on certain statements about the program. The average means scores for each statement has been interpreted to be strongly disagree when it’s value is 0.1 to 1.0; disagree if it’s 1.1 to 2.0; agree if it’s 2.1 to 3.0 and strongly agree if its 3.1 to 4.0.

Based on Table 3, it can be inferred that the participants generally gave the ‘Strongly Agree’ response on all of the items asked on the general impression on Project TEACH ( $M > 3.1$ ). It is also notable that all participants realized that the program has meet its objects as seen in the table that it yielded the highest mean score ( $M = 4.24$ ,  $SD = .50$ ) among the different items asked. With this response, it can be inferred that the objectives set by the Project TEACH which is primarily to broaden ASEAN teachers’ experience and understanding of the challenges of actual teaching and learning from an international perspective via Philippine experience has been accomplished.

Table 3. General Impression of Participants on Project TEACH

Project TEACH	Mean	SD
helped me better understand some classroom issues.	3.38	.49
provided information relevant to my work.	3.29	.46
were based on current and up-to date information.	3.33	.48
meet the objectives set.	3.42	.50
proceeded with smooth organization of topics.	3.21	.72
topics were easy to understand.	3.38	.77
provided trainings that will be of immediate use to my work.	3.38	.65

Moreover, participants were also asked to rate the physical aspect of the program. This area includes the administration and personnel, facilities, and the logistics part of Project Teach. Table 4 reports the said evaluation.

Table 4. Physical Arrangements

Areas of Concern	Mean	SD
Pre-program communications	2.17	.70
Registration	2.50	.59
Location of the training	2.79	.41
Workbook/handouts	2.63	.49
Audio reception	2.71	.46
Video reception	2.71	.46
Meeting rooms	2.79	.51
Time allotment	2.29	.46

Note: To interpret the result, the following scale was set: 0.1 to 1.0 not satisfied; 1.1 to 2.0 satisfied; 2.1 to 3.0 very satisfied

The data in Table 4 revealed that participants were very satisfied of the physical arrangement of the Project TEACH ( $M > 2.1$ ). They are all most satisfied with the location of the trainings ( $M = 2.79$ ,  $SD = .41$ ) and the meeting rooms ( $M = 2.79$ ). This might have been due to the careful planning of the program that includes the meticulous selection of the venue. However, it is notable to see that the item that obtained the lowest satisfaction is on 'pre-program communications' ( $M = 0.17$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ).

Participants also evaluated the lecturers who handled the workshops. Table 5 below shows the result of the said evaluation. The average means scores for each statement has been interpreted to be strongly disagree when it's value is 0.1 to 1.0; disagree if it's 1.1 to 2.0; agree if it's 2.1 to 3.0 and strongly agree if its 3.1 to 4.0.

Table 5. Evaluation of the Performance of Lecturers and Facilitators

The lecturers and facilitators ...	Mean	SD
Know the subject	3.67	0.56
Encouraged participation	3.67	0.48
Answer questions completely	3.38	0.65
Respect your knowledge and experience	3.75	0.44
Use appropriate examples	3.54	0.51
Motivate you to learn	3.79	0.41
Use effective lecture approaches and workshops	3.63	0.49

Table 5 revealed that the participants generally agreed with the statements on the questionnaire about the lecturers and facilitators of the workshops ( $M > 3.1$ ). They all agreed that the lecturers and facilitators motivated them to learn during the sessions they had in Project TEACH, which yielded the highest average mean score of 3.79 at 0.41 SD. But the item that obtained the lowest strongly agree response is the way lecturers answered their questions ( $M = 3.38$ ,  $SD = 0.65$ ). This fact may be due to the time constraints of the workshops and even the language barrier.

Also, several matters have been pointed out by the participants when they were asked about the areas to be improved by the lecturers and facilitators. They suggested that the lectures and facilitators should *talk slowly*. They find it hard to understand when the manner of speaking is in a fast pace since they have problems with the English language. Also, they pointed out that handouts prior or during the lecture should be provided since they find it hard to copy the slides all the time. Lastly, they suggested that contact details of the lectures and facilitators should be provided so that they can contact them in the future for academic purposes.

When the participants were asked "Will you recommend Project TEACH to your other colleagues?" ninety five percent (95%,  $N = 24$ ) said 'yes'. From their answer, it can be deduced that Project TEACH Program can still continue but should still strive for improvement.

### 3.2. English Language Proficiency

In this section, participants were asked to rate their abilities to use the English language using the teachers' self-reported English proficiency. The scale includes fifteen items which contains statements like "I can talk in English about my culture", "I know how to act in social English-speaking situations", and "I can prepare lesson plans in English with minimal error". The scale also follows a four-point Likert scale where 1 is the lowest (Strongly Disagree) and 4 is the highest (Strongly Agree). Therefore, the scores of the participants ranged from 15 to 60 points.

Participants rated themselves before and after exposure to Project TEACH. The data that has been gathered was then subjected to Shapiro-Wilk Normality Test and it has been out that found out that the scores in both before ( $p = 0.670$ ) and after ( $p = 0.140$ ) of teachers self-evaluation on ELP are normally distributed. Thus, a parametric test to compare the means is appropriate. In this case a paired samples t-test was utilized to determine if there is significant differences in the ELP of the participants due to their participation in project TEACH. Table 6 reports the result of the English Language Proficiency test.

Table 6. Paired Sample T-test on ELP

	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Perceived English Language Proficiency (Before Project TEACH)	29.50	9.54	1.94769					
Perceived English Language Proficiency (After Project TEACH)	49.17	9.37	1.91170	-19.67	7.36	-13.094	23	.000

The average mean score of the participants before Project TEACH is 29.50 at SD 9.54 or is equivalent to 49.7 %. The result suggests that the participants' self-evaluation of their English Language Proficiency is low and did not even reach the passing mark. After Project TEACH, the average mean score of the students increased to 49.17 (SD=9.37) or reached to 81.95 %. A mean difference of 19.67 (SD=7.36) or 32.25% was observed. Such difference is said to be significant ( $t(23) = -13.094$ ).

### 3.3. Pedagogical Knowledge

To assess if participants improved their pedagogical knowledge under Project TEACH, they were allowed to self-evaluate through the questionnaire given. Different teaching areas under pedagogical knowledge were identified and the participants were asked to rate the extent to which they have improved. Table 7 shows the result.

Table 7. Pedagogical Knowledge of Participants

Teaching Areas	Mean	SD
Assess student performance in a classroom	2.08	.50
Ability to adapt teaching style based upon what students currently or not currently understand	2.33	.48
Ability to adapt teaching style to different learning situation	2.46	.51
Assess student learning in multiple ways	2.21	.59
Use wide range of teaching approaches in classroom setting	2.29	.46
Determine student conceptions and misconceptions in my subject	2.21	.66
Organize and maintain classroom management	2.29	.55

Note: Scale used to interpret: 0.1 to 1.0 did not improve; 1.1 to 2.0 improved; 2.1 to 3.0 significantly improved

The results for the self-evaluation of participants in their pedagogical knowledge as they were exposed to Project TEACH revealed that have significantly improved in all areas ( $M > 2.1$ ) except for one item which is on assessment of students ( $M = 2.08$ ,  $SD = 5.0$ ). Though the average mean score revealed that they have 'improved' on the said item, still it is the one got the lowest score.

Participants also described their experiences on the pedagogical training. Some of the responses are:  
*"I know how to prepare lesson plans in English for myself."*  
*"The activities and workshops made me confident."*  
*"I learn different teaching styles from different professors to improve myself in teaching."*

### 3.4. Cultural Exposure

The participants were immersed to the Filipino culture through different activities such as homestay and visits to different cultural heritage sites. They were asked to describe their experiences on the said activities. Most of the participants enjoyed their home stay. They described their host family to be warm and hospitable. They also enjoyed the food that was served to them. Below are some of verbatim responses of the participants on the home stay program.

*"I was really impressed with my host for our home stay. She is one of the professors who lectured us on Project TEACH. She taught many things about the Filipino culture like good manners and the Filipino attitude. Staying with their family made me forget about homesickness. They made me feel I am a part of their family. I love her and her family. I am really thankful for the experience."* – Informan 2

*"My host family really took care of me. They were warm and they too tried to teach me English."*  
– Informan 3

*"During my home stay, I had some new experiences like religion. It is my first time to attend a Christian church and participate in Christian activities on a Sunday. And Filipino food is very tasty, I had a very delicious 'adobo'. If it is possible I would like to eat 'adobo' before I go back to Thailand."*  
– Informan 16

However, one of the host family lives near the National Penitentiary. Though they find the host family warm and hospitable, they were not so pleased of the experience. The thought of being near a jail terrified them.

*“We were accommodated near a Prison Guard’s Home. The host family was good to us but I just don’t get the idea why we should stay near the jail?” – Informan23*

Another activity that the participants enjoyed was the visit on some cultural heritage sites. The highlight of the tour is in Villa Escudero in San Pablo, Laguna in the Philippines. The farm allowed participants to experience authentic Filipino traditions, food, and shows. They all enjoyed their cultural exposure trip.

*“It’s a good experience for me. I learned to eat food using my fingers. I also realized that Filipinos don’t eat much of spicy food”- Informan 16.*

*“I like the place so much. It’s a beautiful culture. The local people are very friendly.” – Informan 21*

They were also asked to list insights that they have learned from the cultural experiences that they had. Their answers revolved around three main themes which are food, lifestyle, and environment. An excerpt from the speech of one of the Informans during the closing program of Project TEACH best describes the insights they have learned during the program.

*“During our stay here in your country (Philippines), we learned a lot about your food, culture and lifestyle. We saw how kind the Filipino people are. The Philippines is very similar to our country (Thailand). We saw and visited many beautiful places and talked with people in and out of the school (PNU). We are very happy during our stay here. Now, it is time for us to go back to our country, but rest assured- we will bring good memories we had from here. We will use what we had learned here in Project TEACH to teach our students back home. What we learned, will be very useful to us. We are all thankful.” – Informan 22*

When asked, *“How will your cultural experience help you as a teacher back in your country?”* Informan 3 said that *“The cultural experiences that I had in Project TEACH gave me stories to tell to my students. I will remember these stories in my heart.”*

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Upon the analysis of the results it can be concluded that Project TEACH is a successful international training program. The different activities provided developed the participants English Language Proficiency and helped them enrich their pedagogical knowledge. Thus, it can be deduced that the methods utilized in the program could be a good model for international training program in ASEAN context and even in other countries. Figure 1 is the suggested framework of the model designed for international teaching program.





Figure 1. Project TEACH Framework

A successful training model ensures that what was learned in the training can be utilized by the participants in the work place [20]. Project TEACH as an international training model ensures that the activities experienced by the participants are work-relevant. Project TEACH also considers the different goals of the ASEAN educational programs and attempts to help support them. Project TEACH is highly encouraged by the Philippine Normal University to other ASEAN institutions that seek to improve their teacher English language proficiency, pedagogy and cultural sensitivity.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Philippine Normal University, "Concept Note on the ASEAN Teacher Education Network (AsTEN)," 2015.
- [2] <https://www.env.go.jp/en/earth/ecoasia/workshop/bluebook/chapter1-1.html>
- [3] H. Vanayak, *et al.*, "Understanding ASEAN: Seven things you need to know," 2014.
- [4] J. Amador and J. Teodoro, "A united region: the ASEAN community 2015," *Foreign Service Institute Insights*, vol. 1, pp. 1-3, 2014.
- [5] M. Suryodiningrat, "Looking for Common Values, a Community Driven ASEAN," 2004.
- [6] ASEAN State of Education Report, "The ASEAN Secretariat Public Outreach and Civil Society Division," Jakarta, Indonesia, 2013.
- [7] Declaration of ASEAN Concord II (Bali Concord II), "Regional Security in Southeast Asia: Beyond the ASEAN Way," ISEAS – Yusof Iskah Institute, pp. 276-283, 2005.
- [8] J. Picardo, "Why students need a global awareness and understanding of other culture," 2012.
- [9] UNICEF. "Defining Quality in Education," (UNICEF/PD/ED/00/02). NY: United Nations Children's Fund, 2000.
- [10] C. Findlay, *et al.*, "Trade Policy in Asia: Higher Education and Media Services," Singapore, World Scientific Publishing Company, Pte. Ltd., 2014.
- [11] T. Göetz, *et al.*, "Pains and Gains of International Mobility in Teacher Education," Rotterdam, Sense Publishers, 2011.
- [12] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, "International mobility in higher education," 2010.
- [13] J. Knight, "Higher Education Crossing Borders: A Guide to the Implications of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) for Cross-border Education," Paris, UNESCO the Division of Higher Education, 2006.
- [14] P. Killingley and J. Ilieva, "Opportunities and Challenges in the Internationalisation of the Philippine Higher Education Sector," 2015.
- [15] The Economist, "Who's No1? Really?" 2013.
- [16] Asian Scientist, "TOEFL: Singapore Third Worldwide In English Proficiency Test," Top In Asia, 2011.
- [17] M. Larsen, "Globalisation and internationalisation of teacher education: a comparative case study of Canada and Greater China," *Teaching Education*, pp. 1-14, 2016.
- [18] E. T. Powel and M. Renner, "Collective Evaluation Data: End of Session Questionnaire. Program Development and Evaluation," University of Wisconsin, 2009.
- [19] C. T. Chacón, "Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela," *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 21, pp. 257-272, 2005.
- [20] Choy S., *et al.*, "Continuing Education and Training: Needs, Models and Approaches," in: Billett S., *et al.*, "Supporting Learning across Working Life," Professional and Practice-based Learning, Springer, Cham, vol. 16, 2016.

An Assessment of Project Teacher Exchange for ASEAN Teachers (TEACH) .... (Ma. Lourdes S. Agustin)

**BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS**

Ma. Lourdes Santiago Agustin is an Associate Professor at Philippine Normal University. She served as the Director for the Institute of Teaching and Learning of the said university. As the director, she designed the program Project TEACH and headed its implementation. Prof. Agustin is currently finishing her degree on PhD in Knowledge Management at Bangkok University in Thailand.



Darryl Roy Montebon is an Assistant Professor at Philippine Normal University. He teaches science, education and research courses at the university. He also served as the Director for Campus Development at the said university. At present, he is having his sandwich program for his degree PhD by Research in Science Education at the University of Saskatchewan in Canada.