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Pn Lok Yim Pheng
Setiausaha Agung
Kesatuan Perkhidmatan Perguruan Kebangsaan Malaysia
Kuala Lumpur

Tuan,

ULASAN KEPADA SURAT RAYUAN BAYARAN IProBI DIPANJANGKAN KEPADA PENSYARAH IPG MELALUI NUTP

Dengan hormatnya saya merujuk perkara di atas.

2. Pihak English Language Teaching Centre, Malaysia (ELTC) mengambil maklum mengenai kandungan emel daripada Kesatuan Perkhidmatan Perguruan Kebangsaan Malaysia (NUTP) berkaitan pembayaran Insentif Profisensi Bahasa Inggeris (IProBI).

3. Pihak ELTC ingin merakamkan setinggi-tinggi penghargaan kepada pihak NUTP atas segala kerjasama dan sokongan yang diberikan dalam pelaksanaan semua program di bawah KPM.

Sekian, terima kasih.

“BERKHIDMAT UNTUK NEGARA”

Saya yang menurut perintah,

(Dr. Ranjit Singh Gill)
Pengarah
English Language Teaching Centre
Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia

NUTP MALAYSIA
UNTUK
PERHATIAN SUA

Tarih : 18 DEC 2014
Maça : 85
T.T.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents of the email</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a DG 48 lecturer at this campus. All English language lecturers were instructed to sit for the Cambridge Proficiency Test. Jabatan Bahasa IPG Kampus has 16 English language lecturers. Out of this, 15 of use achieved either C1 or C2 bands respectively.</td>
<td>All English language officers (DG) in the Ministry of Education sat the Cambridge Placement Test (CPT) in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was informed recently that English language teachers in schools who got these results were paid their CPT/APTIS incentives.</td>
<td>The incentive allowance – iProBI - is given to English language teachers teaching in both primary and secondary schools if they obtain a band C while teachers on Band B have to attend the Pro-ELT course. Lecturers in IPGM do not attend the Pro ELT course if they obtain a band B and they are also allowed to sit the Apts several times. This option is not available to teachers unless they attend the 10-month Pro-ELT course, where they are required to sit the Apts at the end of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wonder why lecturers in IPGM have not been treated with this incentive. We train pre-service as well as in-service English language teachers. Some of us have also volunteered as the SISC+ Master Trainers.</td>
<td>The job scope and service terms of IPGM lecturers differ from those of school teachers. For instance, unlike school teachers, IPGM lecturers are paid when they conduct lectures for courses offered in their respective IPGs during the school holidays. Similarly, unlike school teachers, IPGM lecturers enjoy an extra week of holidays during the mid-year semester break. The MoE wants all its English Language teachers to have a high level of proficiency in the language. The iProBI is meant to incentivize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please address this issue as the practice of double standard in our education system is unbecoming of educationists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the significant differences in the job scope of school teachers and IPGM English lecturers, the issue of double standards does not arise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>