WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Influence of Curriculum Support Officers' Role in Capacity Building of Teachers on the Quality of Teaching in Public Day Secondary Schools in Kakamega County, Kenya

Lubanga Henry Akolo[1]*, Simon Kipkenei[2], Robert Wafula[3]

[1]Doctoral student, School of Education, Kibabii University, Kenya
[2,3]Senior Lecturer, School of Education, Kibabii University, Kenya

A B S T R A C T

The role of the curriculum support officer is to help the school reach its goals and adhere to its philosophy by supporting and helping teachers present a curriculum that is based on clear expectations for high quality learning outcomes and standards. Curriculum support officers help teachers be more productive, get the results that are wanted, and reach the educational goals set out in the National Policy on Education. The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of curriculum support officers' role in capacity building of teachers on the quality of teaching in public day secondary schools in Kakamega County. The Coaching theory was used to guide the work. Ex-post facto research method was used for the study. There are 5207 teachers and 425 school principals from 425 public day secondary schools and 37 curriculum support officers (CSOs) in Kakamega County who are the target group. A group of 13 curriculum support officers (CSOs) from 13 Sub-Counties, 52 Principals, and 521 teachers from 52 public day secondary schools were used in the study. To choose the curriculum support officers (CSOs) and administrators, purposive sampling was used. To choose the teachers from 52 schools in Kakamega County, random simple sampling was used. A plan for interviews and a closed-ended questionnaire with a Likert scale from 1 to 5 were used to get the information. The test-retest method, which used data from the pilot study, determined the reliability of the research instruments. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to measure the devices' internal consistency. Since the correlation coefficient was between 0.723 and 0.862, all the factors were thought to be pretty good since it showed a strong positive link between the results of the first test and the results of the second test. Percentages, means, standard deviations, relationships, and linear regressions were used to look at the data. The study found that capacity building of teachers by the curriculum support officers significantly influenced the quality of teaching in public day schools.

Keywords: Capacity Building, Curriculum Support Officer, Quality Teaching, Secondary Schools

1. Introduction

"Capacity building" for teachers refers to activities that help them gain new skills, attitudes, and information that will assist them in doing their duties. According to Taylor and Francis (2012), capacity building for teachers is a program that assists instructors in acquiring the skills, attitude, and information required by an organization, regardless of their current level of functioning. According to Jasman and McIlveen (2011), development and teacher skill building are related since development is the process of progressing from one level of skills and information to the next.

Capacity building refers to the process of obtaining, enhancing, and maintaining the necessary skills, knowledge, equipment, tools, and resources for efficient task completion (Çelik & Gür, 2019). The execution of plans becomes more important as education and learning systems gradually adjust to new social, economic, and digital requirements. Teachers use a number of strategies to connect with their students because they recognize the value of creating a strong student-teacher connection. This helps to retain pupils and encourages their best behaviour while also providing a feeling of purpose and community (Downey, 2020).

Deprez et al. (2021) define capacity development as "the process of developing and strengthening skills and instinctual abilities." It has a substantial impact on how organizations, particularly educational institutions, operate. Building teacher capacity is an important part of education that tries to improve educators' skills and knowledge in order to increase classroom productivity. Kumari's (2022) thoughts, which define capacity development as the process by which people and organizations acquire, improve, and preserve the essential resources required for effective work, emphasize the importance of such efforts. Ejekwu (2022) emphasizes the beneficial relationship between instructional effectiveness and teacher capacity improvement. She also emphasizes how professional development activities improve a teacher's capacity to succeed in the classroom.

Burgess (2019) emphasizes the importance of teacher performance in influencing student accomplishment, establishing the foundation for researching the relationship between teacher capacity building and student outcomes. Vidyalakshmi and Praveena (2022) describe teacher effectiveness as the amount to which a teacher may influence student learning through a variety of classroom behaviors such as resource allocation, classroom management, and

instructional strategies. This lends credence to Darling-Hammond's (2010) claim that an effective teacher sets high criteria for pupils' intellectual development while also transmitting knowledge and promoting initiative and excitement.

The TSC Act of 2012 emphasizes the TSC's role in monitoring teacher certification, registration, and ongoing professional development in Kenyan education (Republic of Kenya, 2012). This legislative framework emphasizes the importance of capacity building, especially given Kenya's changing educational environment. The Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD), the Kenya Education Management Institute (KEMI), the Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT), and the Center for Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education in Africa (CEMAS) are the primary organizations that provide teacher capacity development (Republic of Kenya, 2019). Understanding how teacher capacity building influences instructional delivery and, ultimately, teacher effectiveness is crucial as the education sector evolves.

Muhammad, Nafiu, and Mirembe (2023) investigated how teachers' capacity-building approaches affected students' quality of instruction in Muslim public primary schools in Uganda's Namutumba district. The specific objectives were to determine the influence of teacher mentorship on students' quality teaching at Muslim-funded public elementary schools in the Namutumba District, as well as the effect of in-service training methodologies and teacher collaboration on student quality teaching. The inquiry was conducted using a descriptive survey design. The cluster sampling approach was used to select 134 teachers from the schools for the study, while the DEO and ten (10) Head teachers were picked through a census. Data for the study were collected using a standardized interview guide and questionnaire. The study concluded that Muslim primary schools in the Namutumba district improved their students' teaching quality as a result of in-service training, classroom collaboration, and coaching tactics. The study concluded with the following recommendations to help all teachers benefit and be able to assist students in improving their performance: school administration should establish academic committees where teachers discuss students' difficulties and strategies for helping students improve; and school management should identify teachers' competencies in their subject areas and assign them the responsibility of coaching other teachers.

Ejekwu (2022) investigated the relationship between teacher effectiveness and capacity development in public elementary schools in Rivers State's East Senatorial District. For this study, a correlational research design was used. The study's population consisted of 4,012 primary school teachers, 420 of whom were chosen to participate. The study's findings revealed that there was a substantial relationship between teacher effectiveness in public elementary schools and mentoring and coaching. Elementary school principals should promote and encourage school-based in-service training led by trained resource persons, according to recommendations based on the study's findings. This demonstrates that capacity building is an important component of teacher development.

According to Jones (2019), CSOs can use curriculum advancement strategies like pilot programs, professional development sessions, and grant programs to help teachers improve their performance and engage students more effectively in the classroom. According to Rooze and Peremans' (2020) research in Belgium, the most successful CSO initiatives were creating relationships with teachers, providing mentoring and professional development opportunities, and boosting collaboration between schools and districts. The authors conclude that CSOs play an important role in Belgium's educational support infrastructure, assisting in curricular advancement and subject-specific knowledge improvement.

A study conducted in Ivory Coast by Lewis, Tia, Djedje, and Lando (2013) found that CSOs assisted to increase teacher capacity and deepen teachers' grasp of the new curriculum. The CSOs' professional practices to increase teachers' grasp of the new curriculum have received little attention in Kenya's education sector. The government is dedicated to providing quality education and training as a human right to all Kenyans in compliance with Kenyan law and international standards, such as the EFA objective and SDG4. Over the last decade, the cumulative dropout rate in secondary education has been as high as 37%, with a repetition rate of 14% between standards 1 and 7. Secondary survival rates have likewise been low, at 40% (Republic of Kenya, 2005). The ERS policy framework thus provides the reason for significant adjustments to the current education system in order to ensure that all Kenyans have access to quality lifelong education and training.

TSC provides a sufficient legal foundation for teacher professional development. Section 11(e) of the TSC Act requires the Commission to "facilitate professional development for teachers in the teaching service." Section 35(1) of the Act, 2012 states that "the Commission shall take all necessary steps to ensure that persons in the teaching service comply with the teaching standards prescribed by the Commission under this Act". Section 35 (2) states that the Commission shall: require every registered teacher to undertake career progression and professional development programs as may be prescribed by regulations made under this Act; require every registered teacher to obtain a teaching certificate as prescribed by regulations made under this Act; enter into agreements with any institution, body, department, or agency of the Government pursuant to its functions and powers prescribed under this Act.

Clause 13 of the CBA between TSC and Teacher Unions goes even further to reinforce, 'In recognition of the fundamental shift in policy in public service and with a view to promote, enhance, and maintain high performance standards in the teaching service, parties hereby agree that the Employer shall implement continuous Teacher Professional Development Programmes and a Performance Evaluation system for bona fide members of the Union (CBA 2021-2025)'.

To that purpose, in accordance with Regulation 48 (1) of the CORT, parties emphasize that every teacher who is a member of the Union must participate in the Professional Teacher Development Programmes specified by the Commission from time to time. In accordance with Regulation 49 (1) of the CORT, the parties agreed that every Union member who successfully completes a TPD programme as described above will be awarded a teaching certificate by the Commission as proof of compliance. At the time of this study, the TPD policy was still in its early stages, hence there was no data to link it to quality teaching and learning. Again, the legal framework emphasizes the necessity of teacher professional development while omitting the function of the CSO.

Despite enormous resource allocation and notable successes, the sector continues to face significant problems. Some of these difficulties include access, equity, quality, relevance, educational resource management efficiency, education cost and funding, gender and regional inequities, and teacher quality and utilization (Republic of Kenya, 2012). Banz and Junge's (2020) study in Kakamega County found that successful CSOs improve the quality and outcomes of classroom education. As a result, seeking the direction and support of a CSO can help instructors decrease their workload while also providing their pupils with the finest available learning opportunities. However, further study is needed because Banz and Junge (2020) and other researchers have not examined how certain CSOs' curriculum advancement techniques effect teacher subject performance.

2. Results and Discussions

2.1 Influence of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on quality teaching

The objective of this study was to determine the influence of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on quality of teaching in public day secondary schools in Kakamega County. In this regard the study was guided by the null hypothesis, **H_O:** There is no statistically significant influence of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on quality teaching in public day secondary schools in Kakamega County.

To achieve this objective, the study sought the views of the principals through interview and teachers through questionnaires on the influence of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on quality teaching on quality teaching in public day secondary schools in Kakamega County. Table 1 show the variables used in the study.

Table 1. Descriptive of independent variables

Var.	Variable Label	Ordinal Scale
Var a	Has enhanced your teaching ability by promoting active learning and reflection in the implementation of learning and teaching strategies in your subject area.	Scale
Var b	Encourages and promotes collaborative lesson planning for teacher capacity building.	Scale
Var c	Encourages and promotes peer observation for teacher professional development	Scale
Var d	Has encouraged and attended to lesson observation in your subject area	Scale
Var e	Regularly organizes and provides you with opportunities to attend in-service training in your subject area	Scale

Table 1 describes the five factors utilized to answer the study's objective. The five variables were measured using an ordinal scale. The data on variables were analyzed, presented, and discussed in sections 2.2.

2.2 CSOs' capacity building of teachers

The study sought to establish the extent of CSOs'role in capacity building of teachers. The views of teachers on how curriculum support officers (CSOs) have promoted the listed aspects of capacity building were sought on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The data obtained was transformed from five-point Likert (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Not sure, Agree and Strongly Agree).

Table 2. CSOs' capacity building of teachers

Attributes of **CSOs' capacity building of teachers (n=343)**	**SA**		**A**		**NS**		**D**		**SD**		**Mean**	**Std.**
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**N**	**%**		
Has enhanced your teaching ability by promoting active learning and reflection in the implementation of learning and teaching strategies in your subject area. (Var a)	83	24.2%	134	39.0%	31	9.0%	47	13.7%	48	14.0%	2.71	0.953
Encourages and promotes collaborative lesson planning for capacity building teacher. (Var b)	27	7.2%	43	11.5%	12	3.2%	138	37.0%	123	35.9%	2.07	0.478
Encourages and promotes peer observation for teacher professional development (Var c)	38	10.2%	92	24.7%	18	4.8%	109	31.8%	86	23.1%	3.38	1.231
Has encouraged and attended to lesson observation in your subject area (Var d)	42	11.3%	98	26.3%	9	2.4%	93	27.1%	101	29.4%	3.44	0.685
Regularly organizes and provides you with opportunities to attend in-service training in your subject area (Var e)	67	18.0%	64	17.2%	11	2.9%	100	29.1%	101	29.4%	2.99	0.87

KEY: SA- Strongly Agreed, A- Agreed, NS- Not sure, D- Disagreed, SD- Strongly Disagreed.

Source: Field Data 2024.

According to Table 2, the majority of teachers (58.2%) believe that CSOs have improved teachers' abilities by encouraging active learning and reflection in the application of learning and teaching practices in their subject area.

In total, 83 (22.3%) teachers highly agreed, while 134 (35.9%) agreed. Approximately a third (n=125, 33.5%) of respondents disagreed. This means that CSOs improved teachers' abilities by encouraging active learning and reflection in the application of learning and teaching methodologies in their subject area. Given that many secondary schools are located in remote areas of the county, CSOs may have failed to visit these schools on a regular basis, resulting in more than 30% of teachers disagreeing that CSOs had improved teachers' abilities by encouraging active learning and reflection in the implementation of learning and teaching strategies in their subject area.

Regarding the claim that CSOs facilitate and promote collaborative lesson planning for teacher capacity building. The majority of teachers (72.9%) disagreed that CSOs facilitated and promoted collaborative lesson preparation for capacity building. This is a clear indication that the CSOs did not encourage or promote collaborative lesson planning for teacher capacity building. Teachers' disagreements could have stemmed from misconceptions caused by a mismatch between what CSOs wanted and what teachers perceived. Some teachers may believe that the efforts already existed but had proven useless to them, resulting in an overall disagreement in some aspects.

According to Table 2, the majority of teachers (56.5%) disagreed that CSOs encouraged and attended lesson observations in a specific subject area. However, 37.6% of teachers agreed that CSOs supported and participated in lesson observation in a specific subject area. This revealed that CSOs did not place a high priority on lesson observation.

The majority of teachers (58.5%) also disputed that CSOs consistently arranged and provided chances for teachers to attend in-service training in their subject areas. This meant that CSOs did not consistently organize or provide chances for teachers to attend in-service training in their subject areas.

Table 3. Teachers' Response on CSOs' capacity building of teachers

Statements on CSOs**' capacity building of teachers (N = 372)**	**Mean Statistic**	**Std. Deviation (SD)**	**Skewness**		**Kurtosis**	
			Statistic	**Std. Error**	**Statistic**	**Std. Error**
Has enhanced your teaching ability by promoting active learning and reflection in the implementation of learning and teaching strategies in your subject area. (Var a)	2.71	.871	1.253	.097	.536	.298
Encourages and promotes collaborative lesson planning for teacher capacity building. (Var b)	2.07	0.478	1.842	.097	.435	.298
Encourages and promotes peer observation for teacher professional development (Var c)	3.38	1.231	-1.692	.097	.452	.298
Has encouraged and attended to lesson observation in your subject area (Var d)-	3.44	0.685	1.752	.097	.511	.298
Regularly organizes and provides you with opportunities to attend in-service training in your subject area (Var e)	3.99	0.87	-1.125	.097	.378	.298
Composite values	**3.15**	**0.749**	**0.609**	**.097**	**0.501**	**.298**

2.3 Descriptive statistics of CSOs' capacity building of teachers

In this section the mean index and standard deviation on the responses of the teachers on capacity building were computed. The study used the following mean scale: 1.0-1.8 = Strongly agree; 1.9-2.6 =agree; 2.7-3.4 = Not sure; 3.5-4.2 =Disagree; 4.3-5.0 = Strongly Disagree. The transformed values were later used in carrying out more parametric tests.

Their responses and mean values are given in Table 3 above. The results reported in Table 3 demonstrate that the variable of CSOs' capacity building for teachers had a weighted mean of 3.15, with values ranging from the mean by 0.749. It implied that the teachers were unsure about the current condition of capacity building for CSO functions. As a result, CSO involvement in teacher capacity-building in public day secondary schools in Kakamega County was either insufficient or infrequent.

The teachers were unsure whether the CSOs improved teachers' abilities by encouraging active learning and reflection in the implementation of learning and teaching strategies in their subject area (mean = 2.71, standard deviation = 0.781).

The teachers agreed that the CSOs fostered and promoted collaborative lesson planning to improve teacher capacity (mean = 2.07, standard deviation = 0.478).

The result was the same for the assertion that CSOs welcomed and promoted peer observation for teacher professional development (mean = 3.38, standard deviation = 1.231).

Teachers were also unsure whether CSOs supported and attended lesson observations in specific topic areas (mean = 3.44, standard deviation = 0.685).

However, teachers disputed that CSOs consistently organize and give chances for teachers to attend in-service training in their subject area (mean = 3.99, standard deviation = 0.87).

It is clear that capacity building takes a lot of time to organize and has a cost, making it infrequent. Most teachers' capacity had not been strengthened in most areas by the CSO. In addition to capacity building organized by KEMI, CEMASTEA, and KICD, public day secondary schools rely on subject "experts". Professional development helps teachers learn new teaching methods and strategies, allowing them to deliver the curriculum more effectively. Training allows teachers to create better assessment tools and procedures that can more properly gauge and support student learning or quality teaching on the part of the teachers.

2.4 Pearson correlation of CSOs' role in capacity building of teachers and the quality of teaching

To determine the association between CSOs' capacity building for teachers and quality teaching. Table 4 presents the study's findings.

Table 4. Pearson correlation of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on quality teaching

Var	M	SD	KCSE_Avg	Var4a	Var4b	Var4c	Var4d	Var4e	Var4f
KCSE_Avg	3.912	1.234	1						
Var4a	2.71	.871	.724**	1					
			.000						
Var4b	2.07	0.478	.682**	.428**	1				
			.000	.036					
Var4c	3.38	1.231	.567**	389**	.025	1			
			.024	.041	.485				
Var4d	3.44	0.685	.551	-186	.312	.275	-.024	1	
			.000	.421	.057	.511	.872		
Var4e	3.99	0.87	.623	262	.003	-.351	.328	-.101	1
			.000	.086	.362	.068	.089	.739	

Note: **. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) Var=Variables M=Mean SD= Standard Deviation KCSE_Avg = KCSE mean score from 2019 to 2023

Table 4 shows a substantial positive association ($r=0.724$, $\rho < 0.0001$) between CSOs' enhanced teachers' ability to promote active learning and reflection in the implementation of Var a learning and teaching strategies and excellent teaching ($\alpha=0.05$).

This research suggests that CSOs' participation in improving teachers' abilities by encouraging active learning and reflection in the application of learning and teaching strategies is positively related to excellent teaching. Var b, which supports collaborative lesson planning for teacher capacity building, showed a substantial positive connection with quality teaching ($r=0.682$, $\rho < 0.0001$ at $\alpha= 0.05$). This means that when CSO facilitates and promotes collaborative lesson planning for teacher capacity building, it improves quality of instruction. Var c (encourages and supports peer observation for teacher professional development) showed a moderate positive link with quality teaching in KCSE ($r=0.567$, $\rho =0.24$) at $\alpha= 0.05$). This was read as implying that academic achievement improves when CSOs promote and encourage peer monitoring for teacher professional development. The majority of respondents were unsure whether to disagree or agree, resulting in a moderate connection.

The variable Var d (Has encouraged and attended lesson observation in your subject area) has a moderate connection ($r=.551$, $p=0.000$) at $\alpha=0.05$. This demonstrates that great teaching enhances academic success at the KCSE when CSOs support and attend lesson observations. Var e (Regularly arranges and provides opportunities for in-service training in your subject area) had a good correlation ($r=.623$, $p=0.000$) at $\alpha= 0.05$. This suggests that great teaching enhances academic success at KCSE when CSOs give teachers with opportunities to attend in-service training in their subject area.

The findings in Table 4 are consistent with those of Burgess (2019), who highlights the importance of teacher performance in affecting student achievement, paving the way for future study into the relationship between teacher capacity building and student outcomes. Capacity building comprises increasing instructors' skills, knowledge, and resources, as well as improving variable interaction. This, in turn, improves the quality of instruction in the

classroom. Quality teaching is characterized as the effectiveness of instructional methodologies, appealing lesson plans, and strategies that can satisfy the needs of a diverse group of students. Understanding best practices and consistently refining one's teaching methods are critical for high-quality instruction. The relationship between the two variables is that capacity building enhances a teacher's ability to provide high-quality instruction, which improves individual students' performance on national assessments such as the KCSE.

2.5 Hypotheses testing and Analysis of the Study Model

The objective of this study was to determine the influence of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on quality teaching in public day secondary schools in Kakamega County. To achieve this objective, the study formulated and tested the null hypothesis; **H_0:** There is no statistically significant influence of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on quality teaching in public day secondary schools in Kakamega County

The hypothesis was established to determine the extent to which CSOs' capacity building for teachers affects quality teaching in schools. The simple linear regression model was then utilized to determine how the independent factors affected the result variable. Before performing linear regression analysis on this data, the researcher verified that the assumptions were not violated. Table 5 summarizes the model's results.

Table 5. The Regression Model Summary for effects of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on students' quality teaching

Model Summary					
Model	R	R- Square	Adjusted R- Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	p-value
1	.529[a]	.486	.398	.12763	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), CSOs' capacity building of teachers

b. Dependent Variable: students' quality teaching

Table 5 shows the R value (r =.529), demonstrating a moderate positive link between the two variables: CSOs' capacity building of teachers and quality teaching in public day secondary schools. The R-Square coefficient of determination (R^2 = 0.398) indicates how much variability in excellent instruction can be explained by teacher capacity improvement. In this situation, the corrected R square value indicates that 39.8% of the variability in quality teaching may be attributed to teacher capacity building. This means that 60.2% of the unexplained variation can be attributable to factors other than those considered in this model. Table 6 shows the ANOVA findings.

Table 6. ANOVA Test for influence of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on students' Quality teaching

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	254.235	1	342.253	203.254	.000[a]
	Residual	124.325	342	2.356		
	Total	271.54	343			

a. Predictors: (Constant), CSOs' capacity building of teachers

b. Dependent Variable: students' quality teaching

Table 6 shows if the model is a significant predictor of students' quality teaching. Table 6 displays ANOVA results of F=203.254 with 1 and 342 degrees of freedom, where F is significant at p<0.05. Given this finding, it may be assumed that the regression model accurately predicts the extent to which CSOs' capacity building of teachers influenced quality teaching in day secondary schools. The regression equation for this output is F (1,342) = 203.254 (p <.0001). This is a sign of a positive association, which means that the model's independent variables are favourably connected with the dependent variable. This suggests that increasing teacher capacity in day secondary schools improves classroom teaching quality, resulting in higher KCSE student grades. This often means that the model's predictions are accurate and that the relationships discovered are likely to be significant. Furthermore, the Regression Coefficient (Table 7) shows how (CSOs' capacity building of teachers), the predictor variable, contributes to the model.

Table 7. Regression Coefficient for the influence of CSOs' role in capacity building of teachers on students' Quality teaching

Coefficients						
Model		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	***T***	**Sig.**
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	Constant	12.23	.854		43.321	.000
	CSOs' capacity building of teachers	.098	.127	.82	7.326	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), CSOs' capacity building of teachers

b. Dependent Variable: students' quality teaching

The regression coefficient results are presented in Table 7. It is the equation that tells you how much the value of the dependent variable (students' quality teaching) changes when the independent variable (CSOs' capacity building for teachers) changes by one unit.

The data in Table 7 reflect a model. Y (quality of student teaching) = 12.23 + 0.098 X_1 + ε (teacher capacity building). Where Y represents the estimated value of the dependent variable and X represents the value of the independent variable. The regression coefficient results show that a unit (1) improvement in teacher capacity building leads to a 0.098 unit (9.8%) increase in student teaching quality.

The regression results in Tables 6 and 7 reveal that CSOs' capacity building for teachers explained a large share of the difference in students' quality teaching, R^2= 0.398, *F* (1,372) =203.254 p< .0001). Based on this evidence, the study rejected the null hypothesis, H_0, that *"there is no statistically significant influence of CSOs' capacity building of teachers on students' quality teaching in public day secondary schools in Kakamega County".*

The findings in Table 7 support Ejekwu (2022) assertion that there is a positive link between instructional effectiveness and teacher capacity building. These findings are important for policy and practice because teacher capacity building activities are critical given the changing nature of knowledge and information in the modern world. Teachers' capacity building programs can give them with a thorough and effective way to keep current on the latest teaching practices. Overall, capacity building promotes teacher effectiveness. In support of the findings in Table 7, Lewin (2011) says that training for secondary school teachers is arranged and carried out by curriculum support officers, demonstrating that training is a key component of developing teachers' skills and abilities. Essentially, this means that improving teachers' abilities is intended to help them obtain a variety of skills, attitudes, and information that will assist them in their employment. The findings in Table 7 support Jasman and McIlveen's (2011) hypothesis that performance and teacher skill development are linked.

The findings in Table 7 tallies with the FGD sentiments of curriculum support officers;

''Teachers in my zone at least one teacher from every school are trained on the new teaching approaches to cop up with emerging issues with regard to curriculum implementation. However, because of finance resources its challenging to hold regular trainings'.

One of the Principals noted;

'There have been a lot of skill building programs at the sub-county to help teachers learn new ways to teach. We expect our school to do well in the national examinations this year'.

3. Conclusion

According to the study's findings, public day secondary schools in Kenya continue to have low quality teaching among their students, with an average student achievement of a "D" grade. These results reflect insufficient attention of CSOs' teacher capacity building role.

4. Recommendations

Based on the study conclusion, the curriculum support officers should develop innovative methods for teacher training that could assist them get the knowledge and abilities necessary to provide high-quality educational services

References

Burgess, S. (2019). Understanding teacher effectiveness to raise pupil attainment, IZA World of Labor, ISSN 2054-9571, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA), Bonn, https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.465

Çelik, Q.,T.,& Anderson, S. (2021).Effect of Capacity Building of Teachers on Performance of the Students in Higher Institutions of Learning in Turkey. Journal of Education, 4(6),43-52.

Ejekwu, P. O. (2022). Capacity building and teachers' effectiveness in public schools in Rivers East Senatorial District of Rivers State. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357575391

Jasman, A. and McIlveen, P. (2011), "Educating for the future and complexity", On the Horizon, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 118-126. https://doi.org/10.1108/10748121111138317

Kumar, P. (2015). Effect of curriculum support officers' input on subject-teacher's performance in India. *International Research Journal of Education and Sciences*, 2(2), 7-17.

Lewis, M., Tia, Y., Djedje, B., & Lando, G. (2013). The impact of curriculum support officers on curriculum advancement, teacher performance, and student outcomes in the Ivory Coast. *International Review of Education*, 59(2), 255-267. Literacy Boost, Dendi Ethiopia: End line II. Save the Children, Washington DC.

Muhammad, A. N., Nafiu, L. A., &Mirembe, R.(2023). Teachers' Capacity Building Strategies and Pupils' Quality teaching in Muslim Public Primary Schools in Namutumba District of Uganda. Research Journal of Education, ISSN(e): 2413-0540, ISSN(p): 2413-8886, Vol. 9, Issue. 3, pp: 15-22, 2023, URL:

https://arpgweb.com/journal/journal/15, DOI: https://doi.org/10.32861/rje.93.15.2