

IMPROVING EVALUATION OF STUDENTS: A META-EVALUATION STUDY ON CCE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF STUDENTS EVALUATION STANDARDS

Binukumar Samson and Josu Solabarrieta

Student evaluation is essential for understanding what students are learning, how they are progressing, and how they can improve their performance. Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) is aimed at making a comprehensive evaluation of students' progress. However, it could only create a mixed response among the stakeholders. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the underlying dynamics and characteristics of student evaluation practices in India. Propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy are the core attributes of any student evaluation practice according to The Student Evaluation Standards. These standards were projected in the context of CCE. This survey covered 442 secondary school teachers predominantly in private CBSE schools of Kerala, investigating their judgment on the evaluation of students on these four attributes with reference to CCE practices. Statistical data analysis indicated the necessity of modifying certain aspects of student evaluation practices in schools.

KEYWORDS: Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE), Student Evaluation Standards, Stakeholder

INTRODUCTION

Plenty of research studies have been conducted on student evaluation practices in India but few have provided results leading to satisfaction with the evaluation practices, let alone CCE scheme. It underpins the need to develop a really continuous and comprehensive student evaluation scheme that can

Binukumar Samson, 
Researcher, University of Deusto, Bilbao, Spain
Email: binukumar.samson@opendeusto.es

Josu Solabarrieta,
Professor, Department of Educational Innovation and Organization, Faculty of Psychology and
Education, University of Deusto, Bilbao, Spain
Email: josu.solabarrieta@deusto.es

serve the diverse purposes of evaluation, especially in schools. One of the fundamental purposes of education is to help students make all-round development through their proper formation in schools. Student evaluation practice is one of the essential school effectiveness factors that help students make all-round development. Even though Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) scheme was expected to serve this purpose, it also underwent a complete transformation in a few years' time. It was a rollback of the student evaluation practices leaving some serious questions unanswered, moreover, causing confusion all over again in relation to the purpose of student evaluation. Besides, now, the government is mulling over to introduce a new curriculum with reduced content, so that students could accommodate both academic and extra-curricular activities. In this context, it can again cause confusion in the minds of stakeholders in relation to the evaluation of students, had not the norms and purpose of evaluation clearly expounded. Therefore, it is imperative to evolve a stable student evaluation practice on par with world-recognised standards that could help to achieve the real aims.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Student Evaluation Standards (SES) developed by the Joint Committee on standards have been contributing significantly to the analysis of student evaluation practices and its improvement towards a comprehensive evaluation of students in America and many other countries. They could be utilised as an ideal blueprint for improving the quality of student evaluation practices for schools in India too. SES has four basic attributes, namely, propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy unfolded in 28 standards that provide a working philosophy for student evaluation. They guide and govern student evaluations with practical suggestions for observing these principles (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, JCSEE, 2003).

The Student Evaluation Standards is the third set of standards developed by the Joint Committee. The previous two sets are The personnel Evaluation Standards (Second edition), published in 1988, and The Program Evaluation Standards (Third edition), published in 1994. These standards are the result of numerous studies made by experts from a wide range of specialists such as school accreditation, counselling and guidance, curriculum, educational administration, educational measurement, educational research, educational governance, program evaluation, psychology, statistics, and teaching. Even though these standards have been developed primarily for American schools, they can be used out of American context too, sometimes, requiring some contextual changes and modifications, as the Committee itself has stated.

Standards: Propriety, Utility, Feasibility, and Accuracy

An evaluation has to meet the conditions of propriety. Students evaluation should be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard for the student being evaluated as well as other stakeholders affected by the results (JCSEE, 2003). Findings should be honest and not distorted. Moreover, reports should convey balanced accounts of strengths and weakness (Stufflebeam, Madaus, & Kellaghan, 2000). The propriety standards (service to students, appropriate policies and procedure, access to valuation information, treatment of students, rights of students, balanced evaluation, and conflict of interest) are designed to protect the rights of all parties involved with an evaluation.

An evaluation should be useful. It should be addressed to the stakeholders, reporting to them relevant evaluative feedback clearly, concisely, and on time. Utility standards (constructive orientation, defined users and uses, information scope, evaluator qualification, explicit values, effective reporting, follow-up) help ensure the usefulness of student evaluation (JCSEE, 2003).

The feasibility standards (practical orientation, political viability, evaluation support) help to ensure that student evaluation is implementable as planned. Feasible evaluations are practical, diplomatic, and adequately supported (JCSEE, 2003). Overall, the feasibility standards demand evaluations to be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, politically viable, frugal, and cost-effective (Stufflebeam, Madaus, & Kellaghan, 2000).

Student evaluation should be accurate. It should report valid and reliable findings. It should present the strengths, weakness, and limitations of the evaluation's plan, procedures, information, and conclusions (Stufflebeam, Madaus, & Kellaghan, 2000). The accuracy standards (validity orientation, defined expectation for students, context analysis, documented procedures, defensible information, reliable information, bias identification and management, handling information and quality control, analysis of information, justified conclusions, and meta-evaluation) ensure that the evaluation will produce sound information about a student's learning and performance with appropriate follow-ups (JCSEE, 2003). Considering the amplitude of the standards, it might be difficult to recognise all of them in any evaluation practice. The overall set of 28 standards is very complete, wide and comprehensive. Some of them can be in conflict when they are taken into practice (e.g. validity orientation vs practical orientation). These facts have at least two relevant consequences. On one hand, meta-evaluations using them have a tendency to produce apparently a very critical picture, and readers should have this in mind when observing the whole meta-evaluation. On the other, stakeholders have to prioritise some standards at the expense of others in

certain moments. Cultural differences among countries are relevant in this prioritisation.

CCE Literature Review and Student Evaluation Standards

The present study reviews the results of some of the relevant literature of studies about CCE. As such, the results have been framed according to the standards and grouped in the existing categories of attributes i.e. propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy.

Propriety

Student evaluation should be conducted legally and ethically giving due regard for the well-being of the students being evaluated as well as other stakeholders affected by the results (JCSEE, 2003).

Several studies have outlined diverse beneficial effects of CCE implementation that have to do with a better adaptation to the diversity of students. Certain policies and recommendations of the new scheme gave much importance to the well-being of students corresponding to the propriety attribute. According to certain studies, CCE succeeded in promoting its focus on learning by doing. Thereby, students felt free from the burden of memorising many things for the sake of reproducing them in written exams (Kauts & Kaur, 2013; Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013). Some studies revealed that the grading system of evaluation put minimum examination stress, and thus, the students could perform and yield better results in academics (Ali, 2016; Rajshree & Kumar, 2013). Moreover, the new scheme highlighted that the prime aim of evaluation was to identify students' strengths and weaknesses to build upon the strength and to address the problems. Alike, 79.1% of teachers believed that CCE created opportunities for students to develop their interests, hobbies, etc., which led to the development of their self-esteem as a student. Thereby, students became more active and assertive in the classrooms (Sartaz, 2015; Kaur, 2014). Similarly, the new practice intended to create a student-centred classroom, where students received appreciation for their diverse talents apart from their academic performance. Besides, a democratic classroom could help students to shed their timidity and stand for their rights and welfare (Kauts & Kaur, 2013; Ashita, 2013; Rajshree and Kumar, 2013). In a similar thinking, CCE insisted on teachers that they should not be victims of emotional outburst and make unwelcome comments on students (Kauts & Kaur, 2013; Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013; Ashita, 2013). There was also a relevant suggestion for the well-being of students that the socio-economic situation of students needed to be counted in the assessment; hence, it was an influential factor in students' achievement (Ashita, 2013).

However, there was a reverse side to it on promoting too much in favour of students. In CCE, classroom activities could be misunderstood in the sense that teachers might utilise them to provide higher grades than the real performance of the students. It is likely that it could endanger the consistency, equitability, and fairness of the evaluation process and results. In the same manner, teachers could exercise internal assessment in a way to wield their autocratic attitude towards students even though it is unlikely in most cases (Gangadharrao, 2013; Kothari & Thomas, 2012; Ashita, 2013; Ali, 2016; Parmar, 2011). One study indicated the need to have further guidance for the practice to resist possible distortion in evaluation (Parmar, 2011).

Utility

Evaluation of students should be useful for all stakeholders in a way that is informative, timely, and influential (JCSEE, 2003).

CCE was influential in many ways for students. It facilitated their effective learning and all-round development and the consequent corrective measures (Sonawane & Isave, 2012). Students had more options under the new system and encouraged them to choose subjects based on their interest while not losing the importance of academia. Some studies revealed that the grading system of evaluation put minimum examination stress, and thus, the students could perform and yield better results in academics (Ali, 2016; Rajshree & Kumar, 2013). CCE enhanced the reflective skills of students enabling them to understand different concepts better and aided students in forming a healthy attitude towards learning. Besides, it promoted creativity and honed students' skills as they had more opportunities to learn their syllabi in line with the popular scientific principle of "learning by doing. Alike, 79.1% of teachers believed that CCE created opportunities for students to develop their interests, hobbies, etc. Similarly, it led to the development of their self-esteem as a student. Thereby, students became more active and assertive in the classrooms (Sartaz, 2015; Kaur, 2014). Rao (2006) mentioned that students' personal and social qualities were nurtured in these classrooms. Kaur added that it was a potent tool for improving educational delivery mechanism, which could be an alternative solution for providing quality education (Kaur, 2014). Moreover, the new scheme took away the burden of accumulating everything they had learned over the whole year and regurgitating it in a three-hour examination towards the end of the year (Sartaz, 2015; Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013). Kaur (2014) even termed CCE as a potent tool for improving educational delivery mechanism and therefore, it could be an alternative solution for providing quality education. Some studies observed that the new system regularised students' study habits and increased their regularity for classes. Altogether,

these reasons might have encouraged students to opt for the continuity of CCE in schools (Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013).

Teachers could also improve on various dimensions as a result of the implementation of CCE in schools (Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013). As CCE was an extensively and pedagogically sound assessment system, teachers could exercise various activities to assess scholastic and co-scholastic domains of students (Singh & Pany, 2016). The continuity aspect enabled teachers to divide the course content into meaningful segments and prepare the blue print of instructional strategy (Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013). The formative assessment that included a few unit tests, oral tests, field works etc. was being conducted simultaneously in class hours, which facilitated both teaching and learning with minimum burden (Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013). Moreover, teachers' efficacy improved due to the training and practice received for CCE, especially their skill in questioning and using various tools in classrooms (Rao, 2009). Majority of teachers (82.32%) expressed their confidence in CCE. According to teachers, CCE brought about a paradigm shift in teaching from exam-oriented to application oriented. Moreover, a big number of teachers (75.4%) viewed that the introduction of CCE assisted in planning effective teaching strategies, which in turn, gave insight into the methods and remedial measures in resolving individual learner's problems. Teachers (66.1% against 43.9%) preferred CCE (continuous, comprehensive, and grading) to the old evaluation system (annual exam dominated system) because the new system served better the purpose of student evaluation (Kaur, 2014; Saxena & Namedeo, 2012). Above all, CCE generated more opportunities for employing different teaching aids and techniques in par with the level of students' needs and tastes (Sartaz, 2015). All these factors equally raised the overall standard of schools as well (Sonawane & Isave, 2012).

In contrast with the above views, there were studies that reported some negative sides of CCE practice as well. For example, a study revealed that 51% of the teachers were of average, while 34% of the teachers were below average in their evaluation skills. Only 11.3% of the teachers had shown above average performance in their evaluation of students (Rao, 2009). Another study highlighted that formative feedback was not provided to students, besides remedial instructions were discussed in PTA meetings or mentioned in the diary alone. Some teachers did not care to prepare their own evaluation tools for providing individual attention to students as per the level (Sonawane & Isave, 2012). A different criticism was that the increased project work and presentations put students as well as teacher under more pressure. Similarly, the minute microscopic examination of behaviour increased the stress on students at least in some cases, which could result in the artificial behaviour of

students. Apart from it, having no special time for co-scholastic activities in a number of schools also generated pressure upon students (Saxena & Namedeo, 2012). Those teachers with limited competences could scarcely make any impact on the success of CCE, especially on providing remedial measures, preparing various records, evaluation of group work etc. (Gangadharrao, 2013; Parmar, 2011). The defiant attitude of some teachers towards CCE rejected to apprehend that teaching is neither a process of transmission of knowledge nor learning a process of acquisition of knowledge (Kumar & Pasricha, 2014). Finally, it seemed that teachers perceived assessment predominantly around improving student learning by teaching for exams regardless of internal and external conditions. CCE was not actually being implemented in a purely formative fashion because each assessment; despite its formative timing, was used as a cumulative, summative evaluation (Brown, 2015).

Feasibility

Feasibility standards ensure that student evaluations can be implemented as planned. They should be practical, diplomatic and adequately supported (JCSEE, 2003).

It was essential to equip the teachers with essential skills and competencies for the effective practice of CCE, especially in relation to the internal assessment (Rao & T, 2009; Chopra & Bhatia, 2014). Besides, teachers should be provided with sufficient teaching materials to conduct CCE in daily classes and to tackle the problems they faced while implementing CCE (Saxena & Namedeo, 2012; Parmar, 2011; Kothari & Thomas, 2012; Ashita, 2013). Principals and the teachers had to develop an action plan for an entire academic year, which should consist of the scheme of various scholastic and non-scholastic activities including the scope of remedial teaching. In addition, teachers should be careful to prepare annual plans based on the curriculum and syllabi other than being textbook centred that could satisfy the multitalented talented students in a class. Unfortunately, some studies indicated that it was not a common practice among teachers (Kumar & Pasricha, 2014; Chopra & Bhatia, 2014). ICT equipment and software could be made available, and if needed, teachers should be trained to use them. It was important since the manual generation of report cards was both time consuming and prone to committing errors, and especially when schools had to send student's performance data for classes IX and X electronically to the Board at the end of the academic session. It was a duplication of effort and stressful for teachers (Joshi, 2013; Kumari, 2012; Gangadharrao, 2013; Parmar, 2011).

Various studies indicated that certain factors impaired the feasibility of CCE.

For example, lack of formation for implementing CCE effectively, large number of students in classes, inadequate infrastructures, lack of teaching materials, lack of or poor application of modern technologies, increased volume of work, etc. (Ashita, 2013; Chopra & Bhatia, 2014; Kumar & Pasricha, 2014; Kothari & Thomas, 2012). According to Anitha's study, most of the teachers were unaware of the concept of CCE and there was only a moderate acceptability of CCE, particularly among the government schoolteachers (2014). In the new scheme, teachers' workload increased because they had to prepare various tools and schemes of marking for all subjects. In fact, some teachers had already considered CCE as a hectic process (Sonawane & Isave, 2012). Big number of students in classrooms subsequently added more work and responsibility to teachers, which probably affected the efficacy of evaluation as well (Rao, 2009; Gangadharrao, 2013). Some of them thought that they hardly had time for class preparation, as they had to dedicate a good portion of their time for record maintenance and reporting students' progress. Kaur's (2014) study reported that major proportion (83.5%) of teacher participants in the study believed that CCE had increased their workload manifold and stress had been shifted from students to teachers. This affected negatively not only in the academic performance, but also in their updating on the contemporary world (Brown, 2015; Saxena & Nemedeo, 2012). Moreover, they were unable to pay individual attention to students even though it was required for the proper grading of students (Sartaz, 2015). Nevertheless, contrary to the above views, a few studies observed that teachers (73.5%) had confidence in their competency to evaluate students as per CCE regulations. They also reported satisfaction over the effectiveness of the formative training to familiarise them with the nuances of CCE implementation (Kaur, 2014; Singhal, 2012).

Accuracy

Accuracy standards ensure that a student's evaluation will produce not only sound information about his/her learning and performance, but also lead to valid interpretations, justifiable conclusions, and appropriate follow-up (JCSEE, 2003).

Teachers should discuss the evaluation process in the classrooms and conduct it accordingly. Teachers should provide in-depth guidance to students about the selection of various projects and activities. It was necessary to do crosschecking or validate some part of the exercise of chosen evaluation tools, tests, practical and experiments to ensure the accuracy of the report. Besides, they should be careful about conducting formative evaluation in an informal atmosphere only (Gangadharrao, 2013). Teachers had to collect enough

documents and systematically analyse them not only for understanding students' strength and weakness, but also for awarding grades to them (Kumar & Pasricha, 2014). Afterward, they should store the documents for further references in future if needed. Teachers had to observe these measures while implementing CCE for ensuring the accuracy of evaluation (Kumar & Pasricha, 2014). Besides, more uniformity should be brought in the assessments of students, which was lacking as per many reports (Kothari & Thomas, 2012).

Since the examination pattern spread uniformly throughout the academic year, teachers had good opportunity to explore students' inborn talents. The holistic judgment could pave way for a fair and logical evaluation if teachers utilised the opportunity appropriately. Instead of the traditional perception of evaluation, CCE aimed at discovering what the learner understood or could do rather than checking a predetermined information through evaluation. Sometimes, to make an honest and reliable evaluation, teachers might maintain a more flexible attitude towards evaluation in such a way that the socio-economic background of students as well as the facilities provided by the schools needed to be considered in the evaluation. Thus, the evaluation reports could become more reliable and informative (Ashita, 2013). Schools should ensure that assessment were transparent, futuristic oriented with the scope for their future aspirations (Chopra & Bhatia, 2014). Thereby, parents and students could welcome the valid results whole-heartedly, which would boost the confidence of students and make them motivated for working harder. Thus, the overall reliable results might enable to alleviate certain criticism towards CCE, especially in relation to internal assessments and its scoring scheme (Ali, 2016).

Honesty and unbiased attitude of teachers were basic requirements for making accurate evaluation of students' performance (Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013). There were some serious criticisms against CCE as continuous assessment was not followed systematically because teachers were found not following a uniform model of recording of assessment in a number of schools. Moreover, they were merely recording the documents mechanically to satisfy the supervising and inspecting authorities (Rao & T, 2009; Parmar, 2011), or lack of daily record maintenance and daily feedback were threat for the validity of the quality of evaluation (Sonawane & Isave, 2012; Rao & T, 2009). A few studies observed that CCE failed to enhance educational quality for not implementing CCE in the way it was envisaged. Added to it, various modes that used for recording pupil's performance in scholastic and co-scholastic areas demanded more talent and versatility than mere teachers' subject knowledge (Saxena & Namedeo, 2012). For example, teachers did not evaluate students using different assessment methods; instead, they conducted

frequent class tests putting more stress upon students, which was not ideal for a comprehensive evaluation. On the other side, there were reports saying that teachers relied too much on project works in a harmful way that that students might concentrate more on projects works just for scoring “grades” without seriously happening any learning. It also had the disadvantage of that the siblings or parents could do these projects for the students. It could be even an outsourced project (Saxena & Namedeo, 2012). Consequently, the students' potentials remained unidentified, which in turn made them unfit for today's workplace as well. Above all, students would be inadequately prepared for the rigors of higher education (Ashita, 2013; Sonawane & Isave, 2012). Lack of quality question papers or competency-based lesson plans minimized the effectiveness of evaluation, especially with regard to follow-up activities and remedial instruction (Rao & T, 2009). There were instances that students' achievement on the quarterly and mid-terms exams were reported without indicating the competencies assessed for continuous evaluation in various subjects and co-scholastic areas (Rao, 2009). The real problem was that such cases could diminish students' seriousness for informal evaluation (Gangadharrao, 2013).

The approximate adaptation of the research results into the standards unfolds not only the pros and cons of the student evaluation practice, but also underpins the relevance of an in-depth study in the perspective of The Student Evaluation Standards. The study could definitely reveal more facts about the practice, especially when literature review disclosed that certain standards of the evaluation were prevalent in the practice while others were missing. Therefore, the results drawn out of this study could be beneficial for the improvement of the student evaluation practice in India. In order to conduct the study, data were collected from teachers investigating their judgment on the evaluation of students through these core attributes with reference to CCE. To put it concisely, the study attempted to look at the student evaluation practice (CCE Scheme) through the lens of The Student Evaluation Standards.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample

Population of the study was the CBSE secondary schools from Kerala (India) and 25 schools were randomly selected from the southern, northern, and central zone of Kerala. These 25 schools were predominantly private in nature. There were 442 participant teachers altogether (69 male and 373 female).

Instruments Used

Taking into account the nature of data, the study employed Statistical Software for Social Sciences (SPSS) for data analysis. According to Cohen, et.al, numerical analysis could be performed using software like SPSS (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). The study used survey questionnaire mode for the data collection. The questionnaire had self-made questions to understand whether the four fundamental attributes i.e. accuracy, feasibility, propriety, and utility were actualised in the practice of CCE. The questionnaire consisted of a total number of 45 questions. Each statement had six options such as strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree to indicate their level of agreement (from 1 to 6).

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Propriety: Generally, teachers agreed with the view that the present practice could succeed in making teaching-learning process supportive to the well-being of students. According to 53% of teachers, the new scheme assisted students to get over the mugging up habit and reduced the societal pressure upon students in a considerable level ($M=4.64$, $SD=1.05$). Alike, teachers (25% somewhat agree & 49% agree) considered the evaluation processes as fair and equitable ($M=4.58$, $SD=1.17$). Besides, evaluation was termed (54% agree & 24% strongly agree) as more balanced for including non-scholastic performance in evaluation ($M=4.97$, $SD=.97$). Moreover, they (49% agree & 25% strongly agree) viewed that students became bolder in expressing themselves in classrooms ($M=4.86$, $SD=1.01$). In general, propriety made an agree level with a score of 4.60.

Utility: According to teachers (49% agree & 22% strongly agree), teaching and learning became more effective because of remedial teaching ($M=4.74$, $SD=1.06$). Similarly, teachers (47% agree & 22% strongly agree) stated that CCE was more effective in taking remedial steps for the progress of students ($M=4.76$, $SD=1.06$). Besides, altogether 92% teachers opined that they attempted to evaluate every aspects of students learning ($M=4.77$, $SD=.91$). Thereby, teachers (61 %) viewed that parents and students could avail sound information from the evaluation report ($M=4.70$, $SD=.794$). Teachers (62% agree & 26% strongly agree) considered them as competent for teaching ($M=5.10$, $SD=.71$). Some teachers (6% strongly agree, 19% agree, & 21% somewhat agree) had some difficulties in the arithmetic and computer part when assigning grades ($M=3.29$, $SD=1.42$, where a higher score indicates experiencing more difficulties), therefore there could be quite many having difficulties in this aspect. The total utility score was 4.43.

Feasibility: Teachers (agreed 44% & strongly agreed 13%) opined that CCE processes were not complicated ($M=4.43$, $SD=1.16$) and CCE brought in (56% agree & 24% strongly agree) flexibility in selecting different activities and tools ($M=4.96$, $SD=.89$). Alike, while PTA meeting (42% agree & 22% strongly agree) helped to win parents' cooperation ($M=4.69$, $SD=1.08$), different workshops equipped teachers (49% agree & 26% strongly agree) to practice CCE ($M=4.85$, $SD=1.04$). However, parents' lack of awareness of CCE procedures (43% agree & 13% strongly agree) complicated the CCE implementation ($M=4.43$, $SD=1.14$). This practice interfered (agreed 47% & strongly agreed 16%) with regular teaching and learning activities ($M=4.56$, $SD=1.13$). There was (45% agree & 15% strongly agree) a lack of time and resources ($M=4.49$, $SD=1.14$) and teachers viewed (somewhat agree 28% & agree 19%) that evaluation not only became complicated ($M=3.48$, $SD=1.36$), but also (somewhat agree 29% & agree 28%) confused the preparation of various activities due to CCE ($M=3.71$, $SD=1.33$).

Accuracy: Teachers (21% somewhat agree & 56% agree) used to explain clearly to students how they reached to each evaluation conclusions ($M=4.63$, $SD=.968$). They evaluated only relevant aspects 52% disagreed to that that they might have evaluated irrelevant things sometimes ($M=3.29$, $SD=1.48$). The evaluation procedures were well documented (22% somewhat agree & 58% agree), ($M=4.74$, $SD=.880$) and there was consistency (24% somewhat agree & 49% agree) in teachers' approach to evaluation ($M=4.42$, $SD=1.12$), which made the results more reliable (23% somewhat agree & agree 47%), ($M=4.42$, $SD=1.19$). Additionally, teachers (agree 53% & strongly agree 14%) viewed that they made unbiased evaluation of students ($M=4.67$, $SD=.949$). Moreover, they (58% agree & strongly agree 18%) evaluated their own performance frequently to improvise their evaluation practice ($M=4.43$, $SD=.895$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

From the Perspective of Propriety Standards: CCE could ensure the well-being of students in a number of ways. The results were in line with some other studies that CCE not only decreased the mugging up habit of students (Kauts & Kaur, 2013; Singh, Patel, & Desai, 2013), but also reduced the exam pressure upon them (Ali, 2016; Rajshree & Kumar, 2013). Alike, the inclusion of non-scholastics performance in the assessment made the evaluation more balanced, which also promoted the assertive nature of students (Sartaz, 2015; Kaur, 2014; Ashita, 2013). In general, well-being of students was recognised in the scheme.

From the Perspective of Utility Standards: The study highlighted that both teaching and learning became more effective and remedial teaching played a

significant role in it (Singh & Pany, 2016; Sonawane & Isave, 2012; Sartaz, 2015; Kaur, 2014). Teachers evaluated every important aspects of students learning with adequate information (Singh & Pany, 2016; Sartaz, 2015; Rao & T, 2009). Therefore, the evaluation report carried sufficient information regarding students' strength and weakness for the future planning. Alike, teachers considered themselves as competent for implementing CCE effectively even though certain studies indicated the other way (Rao & T, 2009; Parmar, 2011; Kumar & Pasricha, 2014). Additionally, the study found that some teachers faced difficulties in arithmetic and computer part when assigning grades in general.

From the Perspective of Feasibility Standards: The findings demonstrated that the CCE processes were not complicated, rather it enabled teachers to select various activities and tools for teaching. Besides, the formative training of teachers (Kaur, 2014; Singhal, 2012) and PTA meetings worked in favour of CCE. However, there existed some confusion over the preparation of various activities. Lack of time and resources remained as major concerns for the practice (M & K. S., 2015; Ashita, 2013; Chopra & Bhatia, 2014; Kumar & Pasricha, 2014; Kothari & Thomas, 2012). CCE also interfered with regular teaching and complicated the evaluation practice.

From the Perspective of Accuracy Standards: Generally, teachers considered only relevant aspects for evaluation. The proper documentation of the evaluation procedures and the consistency in teachers' approach along with the unbiased attitude towards evaluation increased the reliability and the influence of the results (Kumar & Pasricha, 2014). Besides, regular metaevaluation of their performance assisted teachers in improving on their evaluation practice. Nevertheless, some studies showed that a number of schools did not follow continuous assessment systematically and lacked a uniform model for the recording of assessment (Rao & T, 2009; Parmar, 2011) while some others failed to in maintain daily records or give daily feedback (Rao & T, 2009). Even there were schools that concentrated too much on projects works for securing good 'grades' without seriously happening any learning (Saxena & Namedeo, 2012) and thereby students were not prepared for the rigors of higher education. (Ashita, 2013; Sonawane & Isave, 2012).

In most critical analysis exercises of educational practice, there is a tendency to focus preferably on weaknesses. It also happens in meta-evaluation studies. When reading evaluation standards and using them to judge the practice using the available information, there is a tendency to highlight issues that are more negative. There can be an underlying assumption about the need of identifying elements that could suggest directions for improvement. As a result, meta-

evaluation reports can depict over-critical perspectives about the real quality of the evaluation practice that is analysed.

Therefore, the prevalence of critical elements in this report does not mean at all that we should give an overall unfavourable judgement about the reality of CCE implementation. It is more adequate to use it as a reflection tool for planning improvement.

In fact, CCE did not lack policies, but it had certain drawbacks in the realm of implementation, which minimized its efficacy to a certain level. Therefore, new evaluation practices should address the concerns revealed in the study giving due regard for contextual factors, so that students can dream bigger for themselves and for their country.

REFERENCES

- Ali, M. (2016). The effect of continuous comprehensive evaluation (CCE) pattern on the academic achievement of secondary level students. *International Journal of Advancement in Education and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 28-34.
- Anitha, T. S. (2014). A comparative study on the opinion of government and private school teachers of Chittoor district towards Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation. *Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(10), 1052-72.
- Ashita, R. (2013). Beyond testing and grading: using assessment to improve teaching- learning. *Research Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(1), 2-7.
- Brown, G. T. L., Chaudhry, H., & Dhamija, R. (2015). The impact of an assessment policy upon teachers' self-reported assessment beliefs and practices: a quasi-experimental study of Indian teachers in private schools. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 71, 50-64.
- Chopra, V., & Bhatia, R. (2014). Practices of teachers in implementing Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation an exploratory study. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies, Trends & Practices*, 14(1), 16-32.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London U.A: Routledge.
- Gangadharrao, K. M. (2013). An innovative evaluation technique for the betterment of school education. Paper presented at the *International Conference on Current Issues in Education and Social Science*, Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281277930>.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2003). *The student evaluation standards: How to improve evaluations of students*. United States:

Retrieved from <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/004292810>.

- Joshi, P. S. (2013). Study of Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation Scheme at elementary school from Buldhana district, Maharashtra (India). *International Educational E-Journal, {Quarterly}, -II, 2(2)*, 54-57.
- Kaur, K. (2014). Teachers and students' perspectives on Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation. *Global Journal for Research Analysis, 3(10)*.
- Kauts, S. D., & Kaur, V. (2013). Perception and attitude of teachers from rural and urban background towards Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation at secondary level. *Educationia Confab, 2(5)*, 72-81.
- Kothari, R. G., & Thomas, V. M. (2012). A study on implementation of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation in upper primary schools of Kerala. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies, Trends & Practices, 2(2)*, 168-176.
- Kumar, J., & Pasricha, A. (2014). Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation: emerging concerns in assessment. *Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies, II(X)*, 1148-1156.
- Kumari, S. (2012). An analysis of ICT integrated Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation System at secondary level in Sai International School, Bhubaneswar. *International Educational E-Journal, 1(5)*.
- NCERT. (2005). *National curriculum framework - 2005*. New Delhi: NCERT. Retrieved from <http://www.ncert.nic.in/rightside/links/pdf/framework/english/nf2005.pdf>.
- Rajshree, & Kumar, P. (2013). A comparative study of stress of class X students under grading and numerical marking system of evaluation. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 3(3)*, 1-4.
- Rao, M. P. (2009). *Effectiveness of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation over the evaluation practices of teachers*. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/1795891>.
- Rao, P. M. (2009). Continuous assessment in classroom: prospects for improvement. *NCERT Educational Journals, 37(1&2)*, 36-47. Retrieved from <http://www.ncert.nic.in>.
- Sartaz, M. (2015). Cognizance of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) among schoolteachers. *Indian Journal of Applied Research, 5(6)*, 488-490.
- Saxena, P., & Namedeo, R. P. (2012). Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation: a challenge before teacher, *24(3)*, 2016.
- Singh, A., Patel, J., & Desai, R. (2013). Attitude of student teachers towards Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation with reference to gender, caste and habitat. *Educationia Confab, 2(1)*, 65-80.

- Singh, N., & Pany, S. (2016). Continuous and comprehensive evaluation: a paradigm shift in evaluation. *Online International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, VI(Special Issue), 139-147.
- Singhal, P. (2012). Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation: a study of teachers' perception. *Delhi Business Review*, 13(1), 81-99. Retrieved from <http://internationalseminar.org>
- Sonawane, S., & Isave, M. (2012). Study the Continuous Comprehensive Evaluation Scheme at secondary school. *International Educational E-Journal*, 1(2), 1-6.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (2000). *Evaluation models viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (Second Edition. ed.). Hingham: Springer.10.1007/0-306-47559-6 Retrieved from <http://lib.myilibrary.com>