

## **CONCEPTUAL AND HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK OF CONTINUOUS AND COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION**

**Dr. Nimisha Beri**

**Asst. Prof.**

**Lovely Professional University**

### ***Abstract***

*Education aims at making children capable of becoming responsible, productive and useful members of a society. Knowledge, skills and attitudes are built through learning experiences and opportunities created for learners in school. It is a very well-known fact that the evaluation practices carried out in schools aim to measure the knowledge and understanding outcomes of learners, neglecting the evaluation of skills and higher mental abilities. While one of the major areas of school education is towards the all-round development of the child, least attention is paid to the educative process involved and to the assessment of students' personal development. In recent years, there has been a growing concern for improving the quality of achievement of all learners at elementary and secondary level. In keeping with the above, reforms in the examination system are often recommended, sometimes discussed and rarely implemented. Introduction of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) is one of such reforms which have undergone a long journey. This article examines the concept continuous and comprehensive evaluation, its historical perspectives, its need*

*and importance, its features and role of teacher in implementing CCE in the landscape of Indian schools.*

It is a very well-known fact that the evaluation practices carried out in schools aim to measure the knowledge and understanding outcomes of learners, neglecting the evaluation of skills and higher mental abilities. While one of the major areas of school education is towards the all-round development of the child, least attention is paid to the educative process involved and to the assessment of students' personal development. In recent years, there has been a growing concern for improving the quality of achievement of all learners at elementary and secondary level. In order to bring about some quality improvement, the National Policy of Education (1986) recommended that minimum levels of learning (MLL) be laid down at each stage of primary education and that steps be undertaken in terms of teaching and evaluation to ensure that all students attain minimum levels of learning. As a follow-up, the MLL for each subject at primary level were stated in terms of competencies, which constituted an expected performance target lending itself to criterion-referenced testing which is continuous and competency based.

### **GENESIS OF CCE - HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES**

Examinations today are not as effective as they ought to be. So they urgently need to be reformed in order to bring about a qualitative improvement in education. Various commissions and Committees have felt the need for examination reforms. The Hunter Commission (1882), Calcutta University Commission or Sadler Commission (1917-1919), Hartog Committee Report (1929), the Report of Central Advisory Board / Sargent Plan (1944), Secondary Education Commission / Mudaliar Commission (1952-53) have all made recommendations regarding reducing emphasis on external examination and encouraging internal assessment through continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation. This aspect has been strongly taken care of in the National Policy on Education-1986 which states that "Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation that incorporates both scholastic and non-scholastic and non-scholastic aspects of evaluation, spread over the total span of instructional time" {8.24 (iii)}. Report on the Committee for Review of NPE-1986 – recommendation brought out by Government of India in 1991 lays down norms for "Continuous comprehensive internal evaluation and suggests safeguards against abuse of this evaluation system" {268 (iv)}.

Report on the CABE Committee on Policy brought out by MHRD, Govt. of India in January, 1992 has also referred to the provisions of NPE with regard to evaluation process and examination reforms and also suggested 'continuous and comprehensive internal evaluation of the scholastic and non-scholastic achievement of the students' (16.8)

The Kothari Commission report (1966) observed, 'on the completion of the course, at the end of the lower or higher secondary stage, the student should receive a certificate from the school also giving the record of his internal assessment as contained in his cumulative record. This certificate may be attached to that given by the Board in connection with the external examination.' (9.81). It further adds, 'This internal assessment or evaluation conducted by the schools is of greater significance and should be given increasing importance. It should be comprehensive, evaluating all those aspects of students' growth that are measured by the external examination and also, those personality traits, interests and attitudes which cannot be assessed by it' (9.84).

The National Curriculum Framework-2005 (NCF-05) also proposed examination reforms. In its Position Paper on Examination Reforms 2.8 (1), NCERT mandates that School based CCE system should be established to....

- a. reduce stress on children;
- b. make evaluation comprehensive and regular;
- c. provide space for the teacher for creative teaching;
- d. provide a tool of diagnosis and for producing learners with greater skills.

The NCF - 2005 has also recommended several reforms regarding paper setting, examining and reporting (P. – 114) : "The focus should shift to framing good questions rather than mere paper setting... we need to be able to increasingly shift towards school-based assessment, and devise ways in which to make such internal assessment more credible. Each school should evolve a flexible and implement able scheme of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE), primarily for diagnosis, remediation and enhancing of learning."

On 27th August 2009, Govt. of India adopted a new act "Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (RTE). This law came into force for the entire country (except Kashmir) w. e. f. 1st April, 2010. Section 29(2) mandates that the academic authority, while laying down the curriculum and the evaluation procedure under sub-section (1), shall take into consideration the following, namely –

- a) conformity with the values enshrined in the Constitution;
- b) all round development of the child;
- c) building up child's knowledge, potentiality and talent;
- d) development of physical and mental abilities to the fullest extent;
- e) learning through activities, discovery and exploration in a child friendly and child-centered manner;
- f) medium of instructions shall, as far as practicable, be in child's mother tongue.

- g) making the child free of fear, trauma and anxiety and helping the child to express views freely;
- h) comprehensive and continuous evaluation of child's understanding of knowledge and his or her ability to apply the same.
- i) No child shall be required to pass any Board Examination till completion elementary education

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation published three sets of standards for educational evaluations. The Personnel Evaluation Standards was published in 1988, The Program Evaluation Standards (2nd edition) was published in 1994, and The Student Evaluations Standards was published in 2003. Each publication presents and elaborates a set of standards for use in a variety of educational settings. The standards provide guidelines for designing, implementing, assessing and improving the identified form of evaluation. Each of the standards has been placed in one of four fundamental categories to promote evaluations that are proper, useful, feasible, and accurate.

#### The Personnel Evaluation Standards

- The propriety standards require that evaluations be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of evaluates and clients involved in.
- The utility standards are intended to guide evaluations so that they will be informative, timely, and influential.
- The feasibility standards call for evaluation systems that are as easy to implement as possible, efficient in their use of time and resources, adequately funded, and viable from a number of other standpoints.
- The accuracy standards require that the obtained information be technically accurate and that conclusions be linked logically to the data.

#### The Program Evaluation Standards

- The utility standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will serve the information needs of intended users.
- The feasibility standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal.
- The propriety standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the welfare of those involved in the evaluation, as well as those affected by its results.

- The accuracy standards are intended to ensure that an evaluation will reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features that determine worth or merit of the program being evaluated.

### The Student Evaluation Standards

- The Propriety standards help ensure that student evaluations are conducted lawfully, ethically, and with regard to the rights of students and other persons affected by student evaluation.
- The Utility standards promote the design and implementation of informative, timely, and useful student evaluations.
- The Feasibility standards help ensure that student evaluations are practical; viable; cost-effective; and culturally, socially, and politically appropriate.
- The Accuracy standards help ensure that student evaluations will provide sound, accurate, and credible information about student learning and performance.

The National Policy on Education (1986) and the Programme of Action (1992) followed by the National Curriculum Framework of School Education (1986 and 2000) reiterated the need for developing the personal and social qualities in learners. They stressed the point that the evaluation should be comprehensive in nature, wherein all learning experiences pertaining to scholastic, co-scholastic and personal and social qualities are assessed.

The scheme of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation was recommended by many National Commissions and Committees like Radhakrishnan Commission (1948–49), Secondary Education Commission (1952–53), The Education Commission (1964–66), National Policy on Education (NPE 1986) etc. Thus keeping these recommendations in the consideration the Ministry of Human Resource Development has recently brought in the scheme of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation as a part of Examination Reforms Programme with the aim of developing the holistic profile of the learner through CCE.

The continuous and comprehensive evaluation was initiated based on the recommendations to reform evaluation practices in school education by National curriculum for elementary and secondary education – a framework (1988). Therefore it is desirable to examine the viewpoints presented in the framework with respect to evaluation. The framework emphasizes the following.

1. Defining minimum levels of learning at all stages of education while evaluating the attainment of children
2. Attaining mastery level in all competencies.
3. Broadening the scope of learners' assessment by way of including the assessment of psychomotor skills and socio-emotional attributes.

4. Aiming at qualitative improvement in education through valuation.
5. Using grades instead of marks
6. As feedback mechanism for the benefit of teachers, learners and parents providing timely corrective measures for improving attainment level of students.
7. Using various tools, techniques and modes of evaluation such as paper, pencil test, oral testing, observation schedules, rating scales, interviews and anecdotal records, individual and group evaluation methods at different stages.
8. Maintain comprehensive student portfolios based on observational and situational tests.
9. Reducing undue emphasis on paper pencil tests in evaluation process.
10. Using more and more informal means of testing to reduce the anxiety and fear of the examinees.
11. Laying more stress on informal and child friendly methods of testing.
12. Recording of evidences regarding psychomotor skills related to co-scholastic areas such as work experience, art education and physical education.
13. Preparing a profile of the growth and development of every learner.
14. Evaluation of the key qualities like regularity and punctuality, cleanliness, self-control, sense of duty, desire to serve, responsibility, fraternity, democratic attitude and sense of obligation to environmental protection.
15. Participatory and humane evaluation.
16. Continuity of evaluation through periodical assessment of learning to be utilized for diagnosing the areas of difficulty and arranging remedial instruction.
17. Demystification of evaluation process for making it transparent by taking parents and community into confidence.
18. Communication of the evaluation outcomes in a positive manner.
19. Developing competence for self-evaluation keeping in view the maturity level of children.

### **GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF CCE:**

The CCE scheme should be simple, flexible, and implementable in any type of school from the elite one to a school located in rural or tribal areas. Keeping in view the broad principles of the scheme, each school should evolve a simple suitable scheme involving its teachers, and owned by the teachers. In order to improve the teaching learning process, Assessment should be both Formative and Summative. Formative assessment is a tool used by the teacher to continuously monitor student progress in a non-threatening, supportive environment. It involves regular descriptive feedback, a chance for the student to reflect on the performance, take advice and improve upon it. It involves

students' being an essential part of assessment from designing criteria to assessing self or peers. If used effectively it can improve student performance tremendously while raising the self-esteem of the child and reducing the work load of the teacher. Formative assessment is thus carried out during a course of instruction for providing continuous feedback to both the teachers and the learners for taking decisions regarding appropriate modifications in the transactional procedures and learning activities.

Summative assessment is carried out at the end of a course of learning. It measures or 'sums-up' how much a student has learned from the course. It is usually a graded test, i.e., it is marked according to a scale or set of grades.

Connecting knowledge to life outside the school, ensuring that learning is shifted away from rote methods, enriching the curriculum to provide for overall development of children rather than remain textbook centric, making examinations more flexible and integrated into classroom life and nurturing an over-riding identity informed by caring concerns within the democratic polity of the country are the main guiding principles of CCE (NCF 2005, p. 5).

To make CCE effective, some weight to school-based assessment (SBA) should be given in the school-leaving certificate issued by State Education Boards, wherever the board examinations are still being conducted. It is recommended for internal grading with external moderation (through random but mandatory sampling) by the board. In other words, designated samples of internally assessed work must be sent to the board in each subject. The same applies to practical examination also.

It would be reasonable to regard continuous assessment in the context of school as a continuous updating of teachers judgments about learners that permit cumulative judgments about their performance to be made. Some important points to be considered for implementing continuous and comprehensive evaluation are:

1. Careful examination of the course, and specification of competencies to be attained by the learners in terms of knowledge, understanding, application (analysis, synthesis, evaluation for higher grades) and skill performance.
2. Knowledge and ability to construct assessment tools that are criterion based appropriate for assessing the competencies.
3. Careful planning of the competency based teaching procedures. There should be congruence between teaching and assessment without which assessment would become distorted.
4. Comprehensive evaluation of competencies as well as personality traits and attitudes.
5. The maintenance of records.

6. Requirement of knowledge and skills of evaluation, commitment, and assistance to provide remedial teaching on part of the teacher.

Schools of the future will need to develop in their learners the ability to take risks, to be adaptable, to be flexible, to cope with constant change and become lifelong learners. In this context, learners become dynamic leaders with teachers as enablers.

## **WORLD WIDE ACCEPTANCE OF CCE**

There is unequivocal support for the continuous/formative assessment across the world. Bell and Cowie (2001) define formative assessment as the process used by teachers and students to recognize and respond to student learning in order to enhance that learning, during the learning. Black and Wiliam (1998b) define assessment broadly to include all activities that teachers and students undertake to get information that can be used diagnostically to alter teaching and learning. Under this definition (Boston, 2002) assessment encompasses teacher observation, classroom discussion, and analysis of student work, including homework and tests. Assessment becomes formative when the information is used to adapt teaching and learning to meet student needs. Feedback given as part of formative assessment helps learners become aware of any gaps that exist between their desired goal and their current knowledge, understanding, or skill and guides them through actions necessary to obtain the goal (Ramprasad, 1983; Sadler, 1989). Through teacher-student interactions during learning activities (Newman, Griffin, & Cole, 1989) that formative assessment is done and that students receive feedback on what they know, understand, and can do. Black and Wiliam (1998a) conducted an extensive research review of 250 journal articles and book chapters to determine whether formative assessment raises academic standards in the classroom.

Research studies have also shown that students who understand the learning objectives and assessment criteria and have opportunities to reflect on their work show greater improvement than those who do not. (Fontana & Fernandes, 1994; Frederikson & White, 1997). Formative assessment is seen as a crucial component in teaching for conceptual development (Bell, 1995). Black and Wiliam (1998b) view that efforts to strengthen formative assessment produce significant learning gains and apparently help low-achieving students, including students with learning disabilities, even more than it helped other students. Teachers (Boston, 2002) generally need to undertake or participate in some summative assessment as a basis for reporting grades or meeting accountability standards. However, the task of summative assessment for external purposes remains quite different from the task of formative assessment to monitor and improve progress. Assessment can be considered formative only if it results in action by the teacher and students to enhance student learning (Black, 1993).



## **PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH CCE:**

Singhal, P. (2012) conducted a study entitled “Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation – A Study of Teachers’ Perception”. The results of the study revealed that the teachers faced the following problems while executing CCE at school level :

- a) Large number of students in classes: The results revealed that most of the teachers find it difficult to execute CCE in large classes as they are not able to give individual attention in such classes.
- b) Lack of appropriate training: Other constrain for the smooth execution of CCE was stated as lack of appropriate training among the school teachers.
- c) Lack of seriousness amongst the students: Further the teachers reported that there was lack of seriousness amongst the students regarding CCE as they were aware of the fact that they will pass without making enough efforts in academics.
- d) Financial Constraints: Likewise many teachers stated that CCE was time consuming and there were many financial constrains associated with it that does not suit the pocket of every student.
- e) Lack of adequate infrastructural facilities and teaching materials: Teachers felt that there was lack of adequate infrastructural facilities and teaching materials that made execution of CCE a difficult task in the classrooms.
- f) Increased volume of work: Teachers were over burdened with the increased volume of work that affected their teaching effectiveness in the classrooms.

## **MEASURES FOR THE SMOOTH EXECUTION OF CCE**

Some important points to be considered for implementing CCE smoothly are :

- a. Due to large number of students in classes teachers may find it difficult to execute CCE as they are not able to give individual attention in such large classes. That’s why the number of students in classes should be limited to 30–40.
- b. Teachers may lack proper training. So the state should provide adequate training to conferences, meetings, workshops in the concerned area.
- c. Proper infrastructure facilities and teaching materials should also be provided to facilitate teaching learning process in government schools.
- d. Careful examination of the course, and specification of competencies to be attained by the learners in terms of knowledge, understanding, application (analysis, synthesis, evaluation for higher grades) and skill performance.

- e. Knowledge and ability to construct assessment tools that are criterion based appropriate for assessing the competencies.
- f. Careful planning of the competency based teaching procedures. There should be congruence between teaching and assessment without which assessment would become distorted.
- g. Comprehensive evaluation of competencies as well as personality traits and attitudes.
- h. The maintenance of records.
- i. Requirement of knowledge and skills of evaluation, commitment, and assistance to provide remedial teaching on part of the teacher.
- j. Other issues that the teachers need for are financial support and detachment of extra duties other than teaching as it puts unnecessary burden on already busy teachers.

## REFERENCES:

- Bell, B. (1995). Interviewing: A technique for assessing science knowledge. In S. Glynn & R. Duit (Eds.), *Learning Science in schools: research reforming practice*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beverley, Bell and Cowie, Bronwen. (2001) The characteristics of formative assessment in science education, *Science Education* 85:536-553.
- Black, P. (1993). Formative and summative assessment by teachers'. *Studies in Science Education*, 21, 49-97.
- Black, P. and Wiliam, D. (1998b). Inside the balck box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80 (2): 139-148. (Available online: <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kbla9810.htm>)
- Black, P., and Wiliam, D. (1998a). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5 (1): 7-74.
- Boston, Carol (2002). The concept of formative assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 8.(9). Retrieved July 16, 2010 from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=9>
- CBSE (2009). *Teacher's Manual On CCE*. New Delhi : CBSE.
- CBSE (2010). "Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation Manual for Teacher, Classes VI-VIII", New Delhi : CBSE.
- Fontana, D., and Fernandes, M. (1994). Improvements in mathematics performance as a consequence of self-assessment in Portuguese primary school pupils. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 64 (3): 407-417.
- Frederiksen, J.R., and White, B.J. (1997). Reflective assessment of students' research within an inquiry-based middle school science curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Government of India (1986). *National Policy on Education*. New Delhi : MHRD, Department of Education.

- MHRD (1986). National Policy on Education, Department of Education. New Delhi : Govt. of India.
- NCERT (1988). National Curriculum for Elementary and Secondary Education – A Framework (Revised Version). New Delhi : Publication Department, NCERT.
- NCERT (2000). National Curriculum for School Education. New Delhi : Publication Department, NCERT.
- NCERT (2000). National Curriculum Framework for School Education. New Delhi : NCERT.
- NCERT (2003). Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation, Teachers Handbook for Primary Stage. New Delhi : NCERT.
- NCERT (2005). National Curriculum Framework – 2005. New Delhi : NCERT.
- NCERT (2006). Position Paper on Examination Reforms, NCF 2005. New Delhi : NCERT.
- NCERT (2006). Position Paper on Examination Reforms. New Delhi : NCERT.
- NCERT (2008). Executive Summary of National Focus Groups Position Papers, NCF 2005. New Delhi : NCERT..
- Newman, D., Griffin, P., & Cole, M. (1989). The construction zone: Working for cognitive change in school. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. Behavioral Science, 28 (1): 4-13. Rating scale: [http://www.ehow.com/how\\_5675497\\_create-rating-scales-education.html](http://www.ehow.com/how_5675497_create-rating-scales-education.html)
- Sadler, D.R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. Instructional Science, 18 (2): 119-144.
- Singhal, P. (2012). Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation – A Study of Teachers' Perception. Delhi Business Review, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Jan. – June). pp. 81 – 99.
- Srivastava, K. S. (1989). Comprehensive Evaluation in School. New Delhi : NCERT.
- WBBSE (2009). Foundation Paper on C. C. C. E., Sarva Sikshya Abhiyan Cell. Kolkata : WBBSE.