

Attitude of Secondary Teachers towards Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation CCE

Jaya Dimri^a, Geeta Khanduri^b

^aResearch Scholar, Department of Education, Hnbgu, India

^bAssociate Professor, Department of Education, Hnbgu, India

Abstract

Evaluation is a process of determining the degree to which educational objectives are being achieved. Evaluation is not only concern with goals, but also whether the goals are worth achieving. It is a continuous process and evaluation plays pivotal role in teaching learning process. In present study 80 secondary school teachers were selected to understand the attitude of secondary school teachers from Pauri District Uttarakhand and a self constructed questionnaire was distributed to school teachers for their responses about continues and comprehensive evaluation (CCE). Results indicated a positive attitude of teachers towards CCE. Results also showed some interesting facts i.e. a positive attitude of government school teachers' comparatively private school teachers'.

Introduction

Evaluation is a process of determining the degree to which educational objectives are being achieved. Evaluation is not only concern with goals, but also whether the goals are worth achieving. It is a continuous process. Evaluation plays pivotal role in teaching learning process. Teaching and evaluation are interdependent to each other. Evaluation is helpful to both teacher and student. The main purpose of evaluation is to help the child improve their achievement in academic areas and to develop life skills and attitude with reference to the larger context and canvas of life. In school system, the conduct of examination and evaluation for the promotion to next higher classes is a important activity. As child development is a continuous process, evaluation should be continuous. Examination is an indispensable part of the educational process. Examinations today are not as effective as they ought to be. Varies committee and commission have felt to need for examination reform. The Hunter Commission (1882), Sadler Commission(1917),Hartong Report(1929), the report of sergeant plane(1944), and NPE-1986 which states that "continuous and comprehensive evaluation that incorporates both scholastic and non scholastic aspects of evaluation, spread over the total span of instructional time." NPE-1992 has also referred to the provision of NPE-1986.The Kothari commission report (1966) also said that evaluation should be comprehensive. Evaluation in every aspect is important because everything else revolves around it. Properly and effectively planned evaluation can stimulate learner's learning. It could be of great help in building confidence and developing understanding among students. In this regard introduction of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) is considered to be a major step. CCE is supposed to make evaluation process joyful and more children friendly. Evaluation is significant in any educational system for determining the individual differences in attainment. Right of children to free and compulsory education Act, 2009 has been implemented since April 2010. According to this Act CCE should be implemented for each child till the completion of elementary education. Under RTE, CCE is a mandatory requirement which should be implemented in its true spirit. Learning, teaching and evaluation are interconnected, each informs other.

The national curriculum Framework-2005 also proposed examination reform. In its position paper on Examination Reform 2.8(1), NCERT mandates that school based Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) system should be established to....

1. Reduce stress on children
2. Make evaluation comprehensive and regular.
3. Provide space for the teacher for creative teaching
4. Provide a tool of diagnosis and for producing learners with greater skills.

The scheme of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) is an evaluation program introduced by CBSE in India. The main aim of CCE is to evaluate every aspect of child during their presence at the school. CCE method is claimed to being enormous change from the traditional chalk and talk method of teaching. The scheme of CCE is an effective tool to enhance the quality of teaching learning process in the school. The emphasis is now ensuring that child not only acquire the knowledge and skill but also the ability to use these competencies in real life situations. Thus the emphasis is now both on knowledge as well as on performance. The CCE to a school-based evaluation of students that covers all the aspects of a student's development. CCE encompasses the evaluation of both scholastic and co-scholastic aspects of pupil growth and is carried out on continuous basis spreading over the whole academic session. It not only counteracts the over emphasis on the development of intellectual abilities but also help in removing the tension and fear from the minds of students which they otherwise feel in examinations which are conducted on annual basis.

In CCE pattern, students are given certificate by the schools in which besides scholastic areas, co-scholastic areas are also included. This was recommended to schools with the objective of facilitating holistic learning. Now the details of record book carries-

Part 1- Scholastic Areas

Part 2- Co- Scholastic Areas

Part one consists of the evaluation of the scholastic areas. Assessment is indicated in grades. Each term will have formative and summative assessments. Generally summative assessment is carried out at the end of a course of learning. It is usually a graded test. Summative assessment certifies the level of achievement at a given point of time. It is actually assessment of learning, taken by students at the end of a unit or semester to know the "sum" of what they have or haven't learned. This is considered to be the most traditional way of evaluating student's progress. Formative evaluations strengthen or improve the object being evaluated -- they help form it by examining the delivery of the program or technology, the quality of its implementation, and the assessment of the organizational context, personnel, procedures, inputs, and so on. Summative evaluations, in contrast, examine the effects or outcomes of some object -- they summarize it by describing what happens subsequent to delivery of the program or technology; assessing whether the object can be said to have caused the outcome; determining the overall impact of the causal factor beyond only the immediate target outcomes; and, estimating the relative costs associated with the object.

Formative evaluation includes several evaluation types:

- **needs assessment** determines who needs the program, how great the need is, and what might work to meet the need
- **evaluability assessment** determines whether an evaluation is feasible and how stakeholders can help shape its usefulness
- **structured conceptualization** helps stakeholders define the program or technology, the target population, and the possible outcomes
- **implementation evaluation** monitors the fidelity of the program or technology delivery
- **process evaluation** investigates the process of delivering the program or technology, including alternative delivery procedures

Summative evaluation can also be subdivided:

- **outcome evaluations** investigate whether the program or technology caused demonstrable effects on specifically defined target outcomes
- **impact evaluation** is broader and assesses the overall or net effects -- intended or unintended -- of the program or technology as a whole
- **cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis** address questions of efficiency by standardizing outcomes in terms of their dollar costs and values
- **secondary analysis** re-examines existing data to address new questions or use methods not previously employed
- **meta-analysis** integrates the outcome estimates from multiple studies to arrive at an overall or summary judgement on an evaluation question

Part two deals with co-scholastic areas where students are assessed in four parts-

- Life skills
- Work education
- Visual and performing arts
- Attitude and values

The desirable behaviour related to learner's attitude, life skills; interest, values, co-curricular activities and physical health are included in co-scholastic areas. The process of assessing the students' progress in achieving objectives related to scholastic and co-scholastic domain is called comprehensive evaluation.

Review of related literature

Sharma, K. (2013) studied that attitude of teachers towards continuous and comprehensive evaluation. For this purpose the sample of 100 teachers were purposively selected. The objectives of the study were to know the attitude of teachers toward CCE in relation to locality, gender and nature of school. The findings were female teachers had significantly better towards CCE. The study was indicating that private school had significantly better attitude towards CCE. And urban teachers had significantly better attitude towards CCE. The overall result indicates that there were significant difference between the attitude of school teachers towards CCE in relation to locality, gender and nature of school.

Jaiswal, S. (2010) conducted a study on the study of teacher's attitude toward new evaluation system. The objectives were to study the attitude of Para-teachers and teachers and teachers towards the evaluation system, to know the attitude of male and

female teachers towards this system. It was found that there was a remarkable difference in the attitude of Para-teachers and teachers as well as difference was also found between the attitude of male and female teachers. Para teachers were unaware about many of the practices in the school. **Sharma, S. (2004)** worked on Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation and presented a theoretical framework for making evaluation joyful and more children friendly. The main findings of this study were: (1) The criterion of 80% has been suggested for basic skills which are pre-requisites for higher objectives, (2) the observation record helps the students to find out the similarities and difficulties among various things, (3) Teachers direct observation provides ample opportunity to notice numerous, significant abilities and attitudes, (4) Checklists are helpful for evaluating the students when they are doing activities in classroom. To evaluate both the process and the product of learning various tools of education –diagnostic test, checklist, portfolio, criterion references test, student record observation, and Teacher observation were used.

Agrawal, M. (2000) worked on Quality school through continuous and comprehensive evaluation, and find out that the quality of a school is recognized by the standard of learning that students achieve. Evaluation of student achievement thus plays an important role in making a school a quality school. Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation can be the only effective scheme which can help tabs both on the levels of students' achievement in scholastic areas and heir development in non- scholastic areas. It can help improve the quality of school in a number of ways like using feedback of evauation to improve the quality of not only learning but instruction and instructional material; improving the quality of tests; developing all round personality of students by taking into account the socio-personal, interest; and attitude. The present study focuses on the need for through training of teachers and also involvement of administrators for implementation of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation.

Objectives of the study

1. To study the attitude of teachers towards continues and comprehensive evaluation.
2. To compare the attitude of teachers towards continuous and comprehensive evaluation on the basis of gender, locality, institution and TET.

Hypothesis of the study

1. There is no significant difference between male and female teachers towards continuous and comprehensive evaluation.
2. There is no significant difference between rural and urban teachers towards continuous and comprehensive evaluation.
3. There is no significant difference between government and private teachers towards continuous and comprehensive evaluation.
4. There is no significant difference between TET pass and not TET pass teachers towards continuous and comprehensive evaluation.

Methodology

Descriptive survey method was used for the present study. 80 secondary school teachers were selected as a sample through multidimensional sampling method from

Pauri District, Uttarakhand. There were nine Blocks in Pauri District, Three Blocks were selected randomly and 80 secondary school teachers selected from the list provided by Block Education (BEO) offices. A self constructed questionnaire was distributed to school teachers for their response to CCE. Mean, Standard Deviation, t-test were used for statistical analysis.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics of Attitude of teachers towards CCE

Table 1.1

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| | Statistic | Statistic | Statistic |
| ATCCE | 80 | 39.84 | 5.531 |
| ATFA & SA | 80 | 49.35 | 6.323 |
| ATCSALK | 80 | 46.25 | 5.683 |

Table 1.1 showed the no. of cases, mean and standard deviation of attitude of teachers towards different dimensions of continuous and comprehensive evaluation. The average score of attitude of teachers CCE were 39.84 and Std. Deviation were 5.531. The mean score of attitude of teachers towards formative assessment and summative assessment were 49.35 and Std. Deviation was 6.323. Mean and standard deviation of attitude towards Co-scholastic area of curriculum were respectively; 46.25, 5.683.

Table 1.2

Difference between male and female school teachers towards CCE

| | gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | df | T | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-----------|--------|----|-------|----------------|----|-------|-----------------|
| ATCCE | Male | 49 | 39.51 | 5.909 | 78 | -.663 | .509 |
| | Female | 31 | 40.35 | 4.923 | | | |
| ATFA & SA | Male | 49 | 49.24 | 6.085 | 78 | -.186 | .853 |
| | Female | 31 | 49.52 | 6.782 | | | |
| ATCSALK | Male | 49 | 45.96 | 5.912 | 78 | -.573 | .568 |
| | Female | 31 | 46.71 | 5.362 | | | |

It was found that there was no significant difference between male and female teachers towards all three dimensions of CCE. The 49 male teachers and 31 female teachers demonstrated a non significant difference for the attitude towards all three dimensions of CCE respectively; .509, .853 and .568. Therefore it can be concluded

that the mean score difference between male and female is not significant. It showed a similar attitude of male and female towards CCE.

Table 1.3

Difference between rural and urban school teachers towards CCE

| | locality | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | df | T | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-----------|----------|----|-------|----------------|----|------|-----------------|
| ATCCE | Rural | 51 | 40.12 | 5.705 | 78 | .598 | .551 |
| | Urban | 29 | 39.34 | 5.273 | | | |
| ATFA & SA | Rural | 51 | 49.65 | 6.471 | 78 | .555 | .581 |
| | Urban | 29 | 48.83 | 6.130 | | | |
| ATCSALK | Rural | 51 | 46.35 | 5.621 | 78 | .214 | .831 |
| | Urban | 29 | 46.07 | 5.885 | | | |

Table 1.3 demonstrated the difference between rural and urban teachers towards CCE. 51 rural teachers and 29 urban teachers showed a non significant difference towards all three dimensions of CCE respectively; .551, .581 and .831. The mean differences between rural and urban teachers were not significant and also showed a similar attitude towards CCE.

Table 1.4

Difference between government and private school teachers towards CCE

| | Institution | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | df | T | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-----------|-------------|----|-------|----------------|----|-------|-----------------|
| ATCCE | Government | 41 | 41.10 | 4.657 | 78 | 2.136 | .036 |
| | Private | 39 | 38.51 | 6.104 | | | |
| ATFA & SA | Government | 41 | 51.41 | 6.124 | 78 | 3.160 | .002 |
| | Private | 39 | 47.18 | 5.848 | | | |
| ATCSALK | Government | 41 | 46.76 | 5.589 | 78 | .815 | .418 |
| | Private | 39 | 45.72 | 5.804 | | | |

Table 1.4 showed a significant difference between government and private teachers in the case of attitude towards CCE and attitude towards formative assessment and summative assessment respectively; .036 and .002. The mean score of government school teachers significantly higher than private school teachers in the case of attitude towards CCE and formative & summative assessment. A non significant difference (.418) also showed for attitude towards co scholastic areas between government and private school teachers. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a different attitude

between government and private school teachers towards CCE and formative and summative assessment.

Table 1.5

Difference between TET pass and TET not pass teachers towards CCE

| | TET | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | df | T | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|-----------|--------------|----|-------|----------------|----|--------|-----------------|
| ATCCE | TET PASS | 28 | 37.14 | 5.075 | 78 | -3.405 | .001 |
| | TET NOT PASS | 52 | 41.29 | 5.256 | | | |
| ATFA & SA | TET PASS | 28 | 46.89 | 5.692 | 78 | -2.646 | .010 |
| | TET NOT PASS | 52 | 50.67 | 6.299 | | | |
| ATCSALK | TET PASS | 28 | 44.89 | 5.685 | 78 | -1.582 | .118 |
| | TET NOT PASS | 52 | 46.98 | 5.599 | | | |

Table 1.5 showed a significant difference between TET pass and TET NOT pass teachers for attitude towards CCE and formative and summative assessment respectively; .001 and .010. The mean score of TET not pass school teachers significantly higher than TET pass teachers. A non significant difference (.118) also found in the case of attitude towards co scholastic areas of curriculum. Therefore it can be concluded that there is a different perception between TET not pass teachers and TET pass teachers towards CCE and formative and summative assessment.

Findings

1. There was no significant difference between male and female teachers for attitude towards all the dimensions of continuous and comprehensive evaluation (CCE).
2. There was no significant difference between rural and urban teachers for attitude towards all the dimensions of continuous and comprehensive evaluation (CCE).
3. There was a significant difference between government and private school teachers in the case of CCE and formative assessment.
4. There was no significant difference between government and private school teachers in the case of co scholastics areas of curriculum.
5. There was a significant difference between TET pass and TET not pass teachers in the case of CCE and formative and summative assessment.
6. There was no significant difference between TET pass and TET not pass teachers in the case of co scholastics areas of curriculum.

Conclusion

Continuous and comprehensive evaluation (CCE) is a process, which evaluate the student's performance and the role of teacher become important in such process. CCE provide a holistic criteria to evaluate student's performance but the evaluation is depends on teacher's objectivity and their knowledge about CCE. This study focused to know the attitude of teachers towards CCE and it was found that teachers have a good degree of knowledge about CCE and they evaluate student's performance in holistic manner. Some new facts also found i.e. attitude of TET not pass teachers is

better than TET pass teachers and government school teachers gathered a good knowledge comparatively private school teachers.

References

1. Agarwal, M. (2000): "Towards Quality School Through Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation", Journal of Indian Education, Vol. xxv, (2).
2. Jaiswal, S. (2010). A study of teachers' attitude towards new evaluation system. International, Research Journal; Research Analysis & Evaluation, 1 (3&4), 78.
3. Kothari Commission Report, (1964-1966). Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi, India.
4. National Council for Educational Research and Training (NCERT), (2013). Academic Support to States/UTs in CCE Implementation at the Elementary Stage (Eastern Zone): A Report. Department of Elementary Education, New Delhi, India.
5. National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), (2011). National Study on Ten Years School Curriculum Implementation. Department of Teachers Education and Extension, Aurobinda Marg, New Delhi.
6. National Curriculum Framework, (2005). National Curriculum Framework-2005. Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi, India. Retrieved from <http://www.ncert.nic.in/rightside/links/pdf/framework/english/nf2005.pdf>
7. National Policy on Education, (1986). Govt. of India, Dept. of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi. Retrieved from http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/document-reports/NPE86-mod92.pdf
8. Right To Education, (2009). The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, India
9. Sharma, K. (2013). "Attitude of teachers towards Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation". Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies, 1, (1), 1570-1585.
10. Sharma, S. (2004): "Conducting Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation and Assigning Grades in Elementary Schools", Journal of Indian Education, Vol. xxx(3).
11. Yashpal Committee, (1993). Learning Without Burden: Report of the National Advisory Committee. New Delhi, Ministry of Human Resource Development, India.