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**Effective Classroom Teaching Learning** v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study has covered school based assessment, one of the major aspects in the classroom teaching learning process. The study examined assessment practices, use of outcomes of assessment, and linkage of school based assessment with stated objectives of national curriculum. It has also been attempted to discuss and relate assessment practices to the vision of child-centered education as stated in the education documents. Altogether 19 schools from 5 districts (Chitwan, Dadeldhura, Kaski, Morang, and Rasuwa) were included in the study. The data, information collected has been analyzed mainly qualitatively.

Major Findings

The findings of this study relate to the assessment practices, continuous assessment and use of outcomes of assessment.

Assessment Practices and Use

- In 90% of the visited schools two (half yearly and yearly) or three (first term, half yearly, and yearly) examinations were conducted. These periodic examinations were used mainly for summative purpose.

- Home-work, class-work, and classroom questions were the main tools used for the assessment in the classroom teaching learning. In about 20% of cases homework were sincerely corrected and feedback provided. Proper feedback was helpful in enhancing students' learning.

- Better students were found benefiting more from home-work, class-work, and classroom interaction than weaker students. This was due to teachers paying more attention to the students who submitted the work, or who volunteered to give an answer.

- The purpose of classroom questions was mainly (80% cases) to evaluate day's lesson. The main (76% cases) strategy of classroom question presentation was questions to individual student followed by questions to class and answers from group (42% cases), and questions to the class and indicate individual student to answers (10% cases).

- The teachers used to let students know whether they were right or wrong immediately by telling right or wrong verbally or through gesture. Better forms of feedback mechanism such as confirmation, emphasis, praise were used in 12% of the classes.

- Schools heavily rely on periodic examinations based on paper and pencil tests. In such tests coverage of curriculum objectives was found inadequate. For example among 13 sample schools coverage of curriculum areas in grade 3, Mathematics varied from 33% to 67% (with an average of 56%) and coverage of curriculum objectives varied from 26% to 45% (with an average of 35%). There were inadequate coverage of learning objectives of curriculum in case in Nepali Grade 2 and English Grade 5 as well.

- There were various reasons for inadequate coverage of curriculum objectives in the periodic tests. The main reasons were: test item preparation was mainly based
on textbook; lack of practice of consulting curriculum while developing test items; dominance of written test; dependency on 1 to 3 hours length of test.

**Continuous Assessment in Practice**

- Periodic and written examination along with pass/fail system was the usual practice in most of the CAS pilot schools as well.
- Lumping of the several of learning outcomes from curriculum into a single learning outcome indicator as well as spreading of one learning outcomes from curriculum into several learning outcome indicators have complicated continuous assessment in a number of instances. Such as there is lumping of 10 learning outcomes from curriculum in learning outcome indicator number 1; 8 in number 2 etc. in grade 1 Nepali. Similarly there is spreading of learning outcomes from curriculum 1, 2, 5, 20 into learning outcome indicators 1 and 2; curriculum objectives 37 and 38 into learning outcome indicators 1, 2, 3 and 4 (including 37 into 6).
- Continuous assessment and recording along with collection of students' sample works were generally lacking.

**Assessment in Terms of Child-centered Approach**

- Primary level curriculum and documents of BPEP and EFA state child-centered education in the primary level in Nepal. But classroom delivery was found dominated mainly by teachers' teaching than students' learning.
- Piloting of CAS as a tool for test without conjoining it with pedagogical intervention has not been able to bring about intended outcome.
- Child-centered education, continuous assessment, individualized instruction seem to have been embraced at the visioning level. Such a vision has yet to be described and illustrated at the classroom practice level.
- The development of competency based training (NCED, May 2000) indicates progressive development in the teacher training activities. It is essential to consolidate and streamline efforts and supports in accordance to classroom teaching learning vision. Content on CAS in the training is found to be useful in terms of child-centered approach whereas the objective for including item analysis in the training and its utility is not clear.

**Suggestions**

This study has come up with suggestions related to implementation of "Child-centered Education" in the primary level and linking assessment practices in bringing out improvement in teaching learning. Following are the major suggestions of this study:

**Envisage Child-centered Education**

- Organize a workshop (possibly with international participation) to clarify vision of child-centered education in primary level in Nepal in terms of
  - conceptual and theoretical clarity.
  - feasibility of child-centered education in the existing scenario.
- development of intervention strategy.
- teacher preparation.

- Create conducive classroom environment.
- Create awareness among parents, community, and other concerned stakeholders.

*Provide Focused Training*

- Identify and incorporate at least required minimum skills in the training.
- Emphasize discussion, demonstration, and practice during training.
- Include more of the contents related to criterion referenced test and informal methods of assessment including classroom questioning techniques.
- Incorporate regular follow up visit, on the spot demonstration as a part of training.

*Re-engineering Assessment Practices*

- Ensure that all the learning outcomes from curriculum are assessed by using appropriate assessment devices.
- Revise the policy of requiring three periodic examinations to initiate continuous and comprehensive assessment.
- Simplify currently piloted CAS form.

*Emphasize on Formative Assessment and Use*

- Devise assessment methods and instruments, which can be visible in recording of assessment outcome and planning on the basis of the outcome for individual child.
- Ensure frequent interaction between teacher and student with opportunity for the student to reflect in order to identify and correct learning difficulties.

*Ensure Meaningful Recording and Reporting of Students' Performance*

- Provision of recording of students' level of achievement, students' strength and weakness, repeatedly done mistakes and misconceptions, corrective measures etc.
- Ensure meaningful reporting of students' learning understandable to the parents either using description or numerical value or both or any other innovative devices.
- Assess students' learning as well as teacher effectiveness.

*Clarify Position and Utility of External Examination*

- Review terminal, external examination for evaluating effectiveness of school and teacher; measuring national level of achievement; identifying areas of curriculum improvement by using test in a sample.
- Ensure to check undue influence of external examinations.
Rethink Minimum Qualification for Entry in Teaching Profession

- Rethink qualification level and pre-service training for the entry in teaching profession.
- Set timeline for introduction of minimum qualification requirement.

Mitigate Over-burden of the Teachers

In long-term plan, it is important to maintain student teacher ratio and appropriate class size. For the time being following alternatives can be considered:

- Maintain manageable class size through measures such as alternate days school or multiple shifts with longer hour school and shorter hour teaching learning.
- Provide teachers with skills to manage workload.
Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Quality improvement, consequently improvement in the teaching learning has been one of the major focus areas of Basic and Primary Education Programme (BPEP). To enhance the quality of the classroom teaching learning various inputs have been provided. Among these inputs curriculum and curriculum materials (curriculum, content elaboration, teachers' guide, and textbook) related study was undertaken in the first phase, and transfer of training skills in the classroom delivery was covered in the second phase of this study. Another major input of BPEP to improve classroom teaching learning is the area of assessment. (See Appendix 1 for brief report on the follow up of FRP).

Assessment is one of the major elements in the teaching learning. It provides status of the achievement level of the students at the given point of time. It also provides information required of a teacher for further planning of the instruction. Assessment is intended not only for the promotion purpose, but also for supporting students to learn better. End of year examination fulfils much of the administrative requirements of grade promotion. For teaching and learning purpose periodic or even day-to-day basis assessment is required. In the third phase of this study, types and methods of assessment instruments and quality of these are examined to find out the assessment practices in the primary level. The study also examined use of assessment results to improve teaching and learning.

Continuous Assessment System (CAS) has been developed and piloted under BPEP II in the schools of five districts selected with the aim in planning and using learning intervention for each of the children on continuous basis. In order to improve evaluation system in primary level, master plan of BPEP II recommended to implement continuous evaluation of the students supported by liberal promotion policy. On the line of recommendation of BPEP II master plan, "Programme Implementation Plan" (PIP) for 1999-2004 recognized, "continuous assessment of student learning achievement is a key element of a quality improvement strategy". PIP emphasized continuous assessment strategies to form a part of an integrative set of teaching techniques. Similarly MTEF (2002/3-2004/5) recommended to expand CAS in all the primary grades. In this light this study examined the application of the CAS in the classroom situation.

Objectives of the Study

Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) provided the areas to be covered in this study which were the basis of the planning of this study. On the basis of the areas provided a proposal was developed. The study areas provided were:
- Assessment of levels of learning
- Linkage with national level of learning
- Practice on CAS and its application on improving teaching learning

Based on the above areas to be covered in this study, following research questions were formulated to clarify the focus of the study:
What types of assessment tools and methods do the teachers use in the classroom to assess learning outcomes of the students?

What is the practice of the teachers to assess the learning outcomes of the students in terms of stated objectives in the national level curriculum?

How is the CAS utilized in the classroom of the pilot schools? Is it used as intended?

What is the practice of the utilization of the outcomes of the assessment for the improvement of the teaching learning?

In order to address the focus areas provided by MOES and to answer the above research questions, the general objective of this study has aimed at the assessment practices in the primary schools. Specific objectives of this study were:

- to find out types and methods of assessment practices/instruments (including CAS) and purposes for using them,
- to assess utilization of the outcomes of the assessment practices with regard to improving classroom teaching and learning, and
- to examine linkage of school based assessment practices with stated curriculum objectives, i.e. national level of learning.

Methodology

Qualitative methods were employed in this study. Findings from the first round of field visit were shared with teachers, trainers, experts and institutions of MOES (DoE, CDC, NCED and others). Based on their comments and suggestions, second round of field visit was planned with specific questions for exploration and verification. Sharing of findings and suggestions was done in Kaski, Morang and Chitwan districts before finalizing this report. This study has adopted following approach:

Familiarization on Principles and Process of Teacher Training

One-day familiarization workshop with concerned personnel of Department of Education (DoE), Curriculum Development Center (CDC), Distance Education Center (DEC) and National Center for Educational Development (NCED) was conducted in order to understand support provided to the teachers in the area of assessment. This workshop was also helpful to develop study instruments, to devise process for the study, and to identify needs and information requirements of the concerned institution/departments of MOES.

Analysis of Training Manuals and Materials of DoE, CDC, DEC and NCED Related to Assessment

Training manuals and materials related to assessment (including CAS materials) developed by DoE, DEC, NCED have been studied. Focuses of the assessment as communicated to the teachers during training or through other mediums were derived.
Classroom Observations

Classroom practices were observed during teaching/learning activities in order to record the type of assessment tools used, classroom questioning, and type of questions/items used. Four schools were visited and classroom teaching learning activities observed in Chitwan district to examine the practice of CAS. (See Appendix 2 for the form used for recording of classroom questioning).

Interaction with Teachers, Head Teachers, DEO, RP/SS, Trainers

Focus Group Discussions and interviews were conducted to collect perception of the stakeholders on assessment practices and use of assessment results.

Sharing of Findings and Suggestions

Preliminary findings and tentative suggestions were shared with expert groups and groups representing CDC, DoE, NCED, DEC and other related institutions of MOES. Draft of findings and suggestions was shared with the teachers, trainers and DEO personnel of Kaski, Morang and Chitwan districts before presenting the same to the expert group and Formative Research Advisory Group (FRAG). On the basis of inputs and comments provided from these sharing sessions report was finalized. The framework of the study is summarized in the following matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Tool/Techniques</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to find out types and methods of assessment practices/instruments (including CAS) and purposes for using them.</td>
<td>list down and narrate about the assessment tools and time frame for their use through interaction and observation describe the perceived use of assessment</td>
<td>classroom observation form interaction/ Focus Group Discussion (FGD)/interview schedules observation of record keeping and reporting (formal and informal)</td>
<td>listing and description of the range of assessment tools used by the schools in the primary level assessment and comparison of the intention of the assessment in the primary level and actual practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to assess utilization of the outcomes of the assessment practices with regard to improving classroom teaching and learning</td>
<td>find out how teachers use the outcomes of assessment to support students’ learning review literature/documents to summarize the teaching learning method focus and principles related to these methods</td>
<td>classroom observation checking Home-work/Class-work (HW/CW) interaction literature review</td>
<td>description of the teachers’ practices in utilizing the outcomes of assessment for improving students’ learning description of the method focused in the primary level description of the required supports to realize the intended methods for effective teaching learning in the primary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to examine linkage of school based assessment</td>
<td>examining school based assessment in connection with curriculum objectives</td>
<td>analysis of the test papers review and comparison of the</td>
<td>description of correlation between curriculum intention and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices with national level of learning (in terms of following up curriculum objectives)</td>
<td>comparison of curriculum objectives with test items for coverage, levels</td>
<td>curriculum and test items (classroom questions, HW, CW, written test papers)</td>
<td>practices description of fulfillment of the intended learning outcomes of the curriculum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample

This study included 19 schools of Chitwan, Dadeldhura, Kaski, Morang, and Rasuwa. The schools were mainly among the study schools of first and second phases of this study. Fifty classroom deliveries were also observed. (See Appendix 3 for the list of sample schools).
Chapter II

ASSESSMENT PRACTICES IN THE PRIMARY LEVEL

School is solely responsible to assess the performance of the students at the primary level. There is no national or district level examination in this level at present. In this chapter the schedules of the examination in the schools at the primary level, coverage in the test papers, and quality of test items are presented.

Schedules and Range of the School Based Assessment

MOES policy states requirement for at least three periodic examinations in a year. New curriculum (CDC, 2004) emphasizes continuous assessment for grades 1-3. These aspects are presented in the schedules of school based assessment section. Various types of assessment tools are utilized by the teachers for assessing learning outcomes which can be categorized as written, oral; class-work, home-work; and classroom questions. These aspects are presented in the range of school based assessment section.

Schedules of School Based Assessment

MOES policy requires that at least schools conduct three examinations in a year -- two term exams and one final exam. In more than 90% of the visited schools and schools invited in the interaction (altogether 40 schools) two (half yearly and yearly) or three (first term, half yearly, and yearly) were the examinations they conducted. Others were conducting monthly or unit tests as well. In the schools conducting first term examination, the first term was conducted in a classroom test fashion with few test items written on the blackboard, students writing the answer in their copy or page of the paper detached from their exercise copy. First term carries 10%, second or half yearly exam carries 30% marks and final exam 60% marks. Thus these exams are basically used for summative purpose with each of these exams carrying certain marks to be added for deciding the promotion of the students in the next grade. Teachers also used home-work and class-work, but there was no specified provision when and how frequent these assessment practices need to be. It was entirely on individual teacher's discretion.

Range of School Based Assessment

Formal examinations conducted by the schools are written examinations. Assessments on the basis of written works of the students were used by the teachers in case of home-work and class-work. Another method used for the assessment of learning outcome was classroom questions. These assessment practices were found to have been used for formative purpose in some cases and in some cases the essence of the formative use was found to have been lost due to weak feedback from the teacher. But these were not formally recorded and analyzed.

Home-work: During classroom observation, researchers collected home-work copies of the students randomly. These home-work copies were analyzed for coverage, checking of the home-work, and quality of feedback provided to the students. In all the observed classes students (about 120) were found to have maintained home-work copies. In more than 90% students were provided selected questions from the exercise of the textbook. An unobtrusive evaluation indicated that about 50% of the
home-work were left unchecked; in about 30% teacher had signed or given a mark (correct or incorrect) or had only a line drawn in the copy which could mean a correct or a cross mark. Only 20% of the home-works were sincerely corrected and some feedback provided. Feedback could play a major role in students' learning. For example, while correcting students' works the teacher has corrected the mistakes by writing the word "प्राथमिक" (Nepali word for primary). When the student was asked to write that word again by himself, he could do. Another mistake made by that student was in the word "हाँस" (Nepali word for duck). When the student was asked what was his mistake, he was confused where to put the nasalization symbol "ⁿ" -- above "ह" or above "न". The teacher had not explained to the student what his mistake was and what was he supposed to write in a correct way. Feedback was generally weak due to lack of teacher student interaction and opportunity for the students to reflect and ask further question after checking of the home-work.

Class-work: If any of the activities that students do in the classroom when asked by the teacher is to be considered as a "class-work", then the high proportion of class-work would be students reading and/or reciting by themselves, or repeating textbook matters after a lead student or after the teacher. Exercises or question answers as class-works were found to have been used in one third of the observed classes only. In the Mathematics classes, usual practice was to solve one or more problems on the blackboard and ask students to do other problems of similar type from the textbook. As students do the class-work and submit it to the teacher for correction, they were able to get immediate feedback in most of the cases. It was also observed that active and better performing students used to benefit more from these class-works as in most of the occasions teacher used to attend the students who would have completed and wanted to submit the work. In 12 (out of 50) of the classes teachers were found checking class-work of all the students one by one, and in 4 of the classes teachers were found to have checked class-work randomly due to lack of time. None of the teachers were found asking students to share their corrected copies so that students whose work teacher was unable to correct, due to lack of time, could also benefit.

Classroom Questioning: Classroom question during teaching learning activities was another important formative assessment tool used by teachers. It was observed that the more the teacher was trained (with respect to number and duration of the training), the more they ask questions in their classroom delivery. In about 54% classes observed, the teachers were found reviewing previous day's lesson. For the review, in 27% of the classes, the teachers explained to the students what was covered in the previous day, what was the topic and what s/he was going to cover that day. The main concepts and/or contents of the previous day was summarized in 27% classes. In 46% of classes teachers were found not reviewing the previous day's lesson. They asked students to turn certain page or lesson of the textbook and started the day's lesson. Use of classroom question for reviewing, linking, evaluation of the day's lesson, motivating students was used less frequently by the teachers as given in table number 1. Asking question for reviewing previous day's lesson was found in 16% of the classes. In about 12% of the classes, teachers asked questions to link previous day's lesson with the new, that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>% (n=50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review previous lesson</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link previous lesson with new lesson</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start new lesson</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate day's lesson</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate students</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
day's lesson and in 8% of the classes they asked questions related to new lesson as assessing students’ entering behavior. Question to motivate students and arouse their interest in the day's lesson was used in 10% of the classes only. Though frequency and distribution of the questions in the classroom differed, in 80% of the classes teachers were found asking question to the students to evaluate day's lesson. Thus teacher's main purpose for asking questions was to evaluate day's lesson.

If any utterance which seeks an answer is to be termed as a question as defined by Galton, Simon, and Croll (1980, p. 85), various types of classroom questions could be identified. These questions are rhetorical, yes/no answer type, answers requiring repetition, factual answers, imaginative and/or reasoned responses, closed questions, open questions, etc. The classes where paraphrasing was used, teacher used to ask several rhetorical questions, i.e. question for which an answer is not expected (Fossard, 1994, p. 34). During paraphrasing of the textbook content, teachers used to ask questions, but hardly waited for the answer and carried on with the reading and repeating the textbook contents. During paraphrasing, questions requiring yes/no answer (such as do you understand, is it so or not, do you also do the same thing, etc.) were asked. Questions asked during paraphrasing have little instructional values as teacher neither expects an answer nor provides any feedback if there is any answer at all. More than 90% of the classroom questions, where teachers entertain an answer, were the questions that required students to either repeat textbook content or supply the facts and figures. Similarly there were high proportion of closed questions. Only few of the teachers asked questions that required imaginative and/or reasoned responses. These were mostly open type questions.

Teachers were found using various strategies to present questions in the class -- indicate an individual student and ask question; ask question to the whole class and class answer in chorus; ask question to the whole class or group and individual volunteer to answer; or question to the whole class and indicate individual student to answer. Question presentation strategy is tabulated in table number 2 where occurrence of any form of question presentation strategy in the class once was given weightage of one irrespective of their frequency of occurrence. Among those four question presentation strategies, asking question to an individual student was common among the teachers (76% of classes). One by one most of the students or all of the students in the class were asked to recite lines of a poem (Nepali), or write numerical on blackboard (Mathematics), spell the words and/or tell the meaning (English), define the term (Health and Environment). In such cases most of the activities were focused on the repetition of the answer or copying of the same letter, or reciting the same line. Another common practice of the teachers (42% of classes) while presenting the question was asking question without indicating any of the students and answer was given by the class in chorus or by any of the student who was ready to volunteer. During the interactions with DEO personnel (Resource Persons and School Supervisors), trainers, and teachers they viewed 'question to the class and indicating individual student for the answer' as the best strategy for presenting the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Classroom question presentation strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question to individual student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question to the class without indicating anyone specifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question to the class and indicate individual student to answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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classroom question. They opined that this would require all the students to think about the answer expecting s/he might be asked. This strategy would be helpful in enhancing teaching learning. But in practice only in 10% of the observed classes the teachers used this strategy. Advanced planning and purposeful use of the questions in the classroom delivery was practiced by few (10%) teachers only. Sharing her experience one of the teachers said, "In my experience I found that what question to ask to whole of the class or only to certain students need to be pre-planned. Usually I ask questions to the weaker students, firstly to give more attention to them, and secondly to ensure that if they can answer, good students can answer…". She has developed such a skill from her intuition rather than by way of training.

During classroom observation sequencing of classroom questions was also noted down. Observation item was as following:

Item. If the student fails to answer, teacher
I) Repeats same question to the student
II) Simplifies the question for the student
III) Provides hints to the student if s/he fails I and II
IV) Asks same question to others without considering I-III
V) Asks others if the student fails I-III
VI) Immediately supplies right answer without considering I-V
VII) Supplies answer if students fail I-V.

Question presentation strategy of the teachers was mainly questioning to the individual student and in more than 80% of individual questions the questions ended up either with right answer by the student or by the teacher. Thus teacher jumped up to step VI in these cases. Second frequently used approach was asking other students if a student failed to answer, i.e. jumping to step IV. Only few teachers (12% of the classes) used to simplify and/or rephrase the question or provide the hints so as to encourage the student answer the question. Even less number of these teachers go up to step VII.

Letting students know whether they were right or wrong was mostly used for providing feedback. For the right answer teacher would keep silent and move to another student or tell right and ask question to another student or praise the right answer. In cases when the student provided a wrong answer teacher would say that student is wrong and should study hard or tell the right answer immediately or scold the student. Feedback mechanism such as confirmation, emphasis, elaboration, praise (Dillon, 1990, pp. 96-97) were used in 12% of the classes only.

Coverage of Curriculum Objectives in the School Based Assessment

The general assessment practice of the schools is to conduct two or three exams in a year and decide whether a student should be promoted or not to the next grade. Assessment practices for the formative purpose, as described above, are very weak. Test papers are also set to be used in the schools of a Resource Center (RC) as well or a school can also set test paper by itself. In this section the coverage of the national level curriculum objectives in the test papers used by the schools is examined.
Coverage of Curriculum Objectives

In the Nepali language subject of grade 2 final examination, the test paper set in the RC level in Dadeldhura district. There were 10 questions and 44 sub-questions in the test paper. These questions covered only 6 of the curriculum objectives out of 39 objectives. Such inadequate coverage of the curriculum objectives was also found in the first terminal and half yearly exams as well.

In another case in Kaski district, one of the RCs provided its schools test papers for both half yearly and yearly exams. There are 42 curriculum objectives from 8 areas in grade 3 Mathematics. The coverage of curriculum areas and objectives in the test paper of grade 3 Mathematics used by one of the RCs is presented in table 3 (see overleaf).

The table indicates that a number of areas and objectives of the curriculum might not be assessed in the exam even set in the RC level. For example in table 3, 50% of curriculum areas as well as 67% of the curriculum objectives of the grade 3 examination in Mathematics has not been covered in the yearly exam nor were these areas and objectives covered in the half yearly examination.

There was not adequate coverage of the curriculum areas and objectives in the test papers on one hand while on the other, there were test items included in the test papers, which were actually related to the curriculum objective of the lower grade. For example, in the test paper of the Mathematics of one of the RCs of Kaski district (table 3), there were 50% of the test items carrying 61% of the weightage in terms of marks in the half yearly exam related to the curriculum objectives of the lower grade. In case of yearly exam, there were about 39% of the test items carrying 50% of weightage related to the curriculum objectives of the lower grade.
Table 3: Coverage of curriculum objective in Mathematics, Grade 3 of one of the RC level examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of objectives in the curriculum</th>
<th>Number of curriculum objectives covered in half yearly exam</th>
<th>Number of curriculum objectives covered in final exam</th>
<th>Number of curriculum objectives not covered in the exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of number concept</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fundamental mathematical operations (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Measurement, weight and currency (time, length, area, capacity, volume, weight, currency)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fraction, decimal, percentage, unitary method (fraction, decimal, unitary method)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chart and graph</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Algebraic expression and equation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Geometry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Set</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such inadequate coverage of curriculum objectives could be observed in the school based assessment across the grades and subjects. For example in the test of Mathematics, Grade 3 coverage of the curriculum areas varied from 33% to 67% (with an average of 56%) and coverage of curriculum objectives varied 26% to 45% (with an average of 35%) among 13 sample schools (please see table 1 in Appendix 4 for details).

Similarly, in the test of Nepali, Grade 2 coverage of the curriculum areas varied from 30% to 70% (with an average of 39%) and coverage of curriculum objectives varied from 18% to 25% (with an average of 20%) among the 10 sample schools (please see table 2 in Appendix 4 for details). None of the schools (6 of them used test papers prepared at the resource center level) had listening and speaking component in the Nepali language test. All of these schools had also left out pronunciation and use of dictionary in the test they have prepared. Similar was the case in English language test. None of the sample schools used to conduct test for the listening and speaking component in Grade 5. In the test of English language, Grade 5 coverage of the curriculum areas was 50% (reading and writing) in all the sample schools and coverage of curriculum objectives varied from 18% to 29% (with an average of 24%) among the 7 sample schools who provided test papers of English language, Grade 5 (please see table 3 in Appendix 4 for details). While sharing the findings, the teachers of one of the resource centers of the Kaski district informed that they used to conduct listening and speaking test for the English language at their schools. When the RP of that RC was later asked about the practice, he informed that schools are asked to conduct listening and speaking test for English language. As schools used to conduct the test, some of the school might not have conducted listening and speaking test --
specifically due to negligence. That might have been the reason for the no test for listening and speaking in the sample school in this study from that RC.

*Reasons for Inadequate Coverage of Curriculum Objectives*

There were various reasons pointed out by the teachers, trainers, and DEO personnel for the inadequate coverage of curriculum areas and/or curriculum objectives in the test papers prepared. Observations and analysis of test items also pointed out various reasons for inadequate representation of the curriculum in the test paper. These reasons were:

Test construction based on textbook: Usual practice of the school or the resource center was to construct test items based on the textbooks. The textbook might cover contents related to the objectives of the lower grades to provide linkage and revision, whereas some of the contents in the textbooks are provided as fillers. What actually is the emphasis in the curriculum could not be discerned by consulting textbook only. This was also the main reason for covering test items, which were actually related to lower grades and actual curriculum objectives related to the concerned grade were inadequately covered.

Curriculum objectives not covered in the textbook were left out in the test: There was lack of practice to consult curriculum and/or available specification grid while constructing a test. Some of the teachers expressed their skepticism during interaction that curriculum need to be the source of test item development. For them textbooks and textbook exercises were the sources of test item development. As some of the curriculum areas and/or objectives were not covered in the textbooks, these were not included in the tests. For example, set builder notation in grade 3 Mathematics, Dictionary in grade 2 Nepali language are covered in the curriculum, but not in the textbooks and also not covered in the tests.

Written test as a method of evaluation of learning outcome: The tests developed by schools and RCs were mainly paper and pencil tests. Project works, assignments, observation etc. were rarely used as a method for evaluation. Higher level curriculum objectives and curriculum objectives emphasizing a change in the behavior of the students are left out as these cannot be easily tested by paper and pencil method.

Lack of specification grid: The DEO personnel pointed out the lack of specification grid for grades 1 to 4. They had the opinion that the RCs, which consulted specification grid for grade 5, had developed more curriculum representative test. However they also shared that a number of schools did not have specification grid and a number of those schools and RCs which had specification grid were not using them to construct tests. In one of the schools the researcher asked about the use of specification grid. The teacher replied that they did not have specification grid and he thought he had not seen one before. When he was shown a copy of specification grid, he remembered such a document was in the office cupboard and he brought out one clean, new and unused specification grid out from the office cupboard.

Lack of sample test papers: DEO personnel strongly suggested for developing good test papers such as test papers in the national assessment test and providing such test papers to the school as samples. The samples of such test papers along with description of test development procedures would be helpful resources for the teachers and RCs.
Length of test: Teachers as well as DEO personnel were critical to the remark that test developed by the schools and RCs were not representative of the curriculum. Their main concern was to see how a course covered in a period of one year could be covered in a test of 1 to 3 hours length. This issue was discussed during interaction sessions with the teachers and DEO personnel. Obviously neither it is possible to test whole of the course within 1 to 3 hours nor it is appropriate to cram students in fixed periodic exams. When they were asked what other methods they use to find out if students have achieved learning outcomes of the curriculum not covered in the periodic exams, there was no other methods used. But they suggested class-work, home-work, and teacher's own evaluation on the basis of observation can be used for the evaluation of the students. Specifically these could be helpful for evaluating learning outcomes related to behavioral part of the students.

**Test Items in the School Based Assessment**

This study does not intend to analyze the overall quality of test items used in the school based assessment. The general appearance (in terms of face validity) of the test papers displays following strength and shortcoming in the test items:

**Strength**

Test items arranged generally from simple to complex: But such an arrangement was not undertaken consciously by most of the teachers. They usually arrange test items beginning from the first lesson of the textbook. As textbook content is usually arranged from simple to complex, test items too should usually be from simple to complex even if textbook content were followed.

Use of pictures in the test papers: Pictures were used in more than 90% (24 out of 26 test papers) of the English language test papers collected from the sample schools. In Mathematics questions related to graphs and geometrical shapes were included in about 50% of the test papers. In other subjects, pictorial questions were either not included or were very few in number. Another strength in the use of pictures in the test papers was that pictures were used more in the lower grades (I and II) than higher grades.

Use of printed papers: More than 90% of the schools have printed their test papers. The remaining schools have test papers hand written with carbon copies or photocopies. For the first term exam over 90% of the schools had questions written on the blackboard.

Space for writing the answer within the test papers: In more than 60% of the test papers there were spaces provided in the test papers. Such provision seemed to be student friendly than requiring students to read questions in one sheet and provide answers in another.

RC-wise test papers: Most of the schools were sharing expenses to develop and print test papers to be used within their RC. Schools seemed to be motivated in the RC-wise test papers primarily to reduce the cost of the printing. For the construction of the tests, individual teachers from the RC school were given responsibility. However, RC-wise planning, discussion, moderation were lacking for the construction of quality test items.


**Shortcomings**

Some of the test papers lacked correct format: Such as in the matching item options corresponding one to one were given in more than 90% matching items in the test papers collected from the sample schools.

Requiring students to copy questions from the test paper: In about 40% of the test papers there was no space provided to write the answers. Students were required to copy the question first to write the answers. Teachers also shared their experience that students used to make mistakes in copying the questions, which automatically make their answer wrong specifically in Mathematics.

Not enough space for writing the answers: In some of the test papers space provided for writing the answers was not enough.

Test items from textbook exercise: A number of questions in the test papers were borrowed from textbook exercises.

Emphasis on recall: There was more emphasis on recall type of questions.

Inadequate coverage of curriculum areas and objectives: There was inadequate coverage of curriculum areas and objectives in the test papers set in the schools.

Use of written test in grade 1: Mostly written test papers were used. Students were supposed to read and comprehend the instruction. Reading out the instruction for the students was done in 50% the sample schools only. Otherwise teachers used to read out the instruction for the student only if s/he asked for. Such practice mismatched with the type of test item set such as "Write from A to M", "Fill in the blanks: a b ..... d ..... f ..... h ..... j k ........".
Chapter III
CAS: INTENTION AND PRACTICE

BPEP Master Plan for 1997-2002 (MOE, 1997) identified several problems regarding students achievement evaluation -- lack of evaluation of students' performance on affective domain; teachers were as passive implementers of assigned roles; lack of support to the teacher for continuous evaluation of the students; limited reporting as well as the use of the outcome of the students' evaluation; and feeble nature of accountability in primary education system. In order to improve evaluation system in primary level, master plan of BPEP II strongly recommended to implement continuous evaluation of the students supported by liberal promotion policy. On the line of the recommendation of BPEP II master plan, its "Programme Implementation Plan " (PIP) for 1999-2004 recognized, "continuous assessment of student learning achievement is a key element of a quality improvement strategy". PIP emphasized continuous assessment strategies to form a part of an integrative set of teaching techniques. March 2003 Joint Review Mission stated, "the future direction of CAS would only be decided after a full evaluation of the pilot programme". CAS has been implemented in the five districts on pilot basis from 2000/01 session. MTEF (2002/03-2004/05) suggested to extend CAS to the national level and up to grade 5 as well.

As developed in the BPEP II programme CAS is not only to give away to formal and periodic type of student assessment practice, but also to cater individual student to achieve curricular goals through continuous assessment, planning and using learning intervention for each of the children on continuous basis. Thus CAS has to fulfill the requirement of assessing students' achievement and cater as a teaching learning method that emphasize individualized instruction. In this context CAS has following common strategies (Nyachhyon and Webber, 2001):

- The class teacher uses all the learning outcomes of the curriculum as the basis of the teaching and assessment of the students.
- The teacher assesses the students along with the teaching. There is no separate periodical examination.
- The class teacher keeps the student progress records using a set of learning indicators.
- The class teacher keeps the student progress record in the portfolio.
- All the students are promoted to the next grade.

Observation of the CAS piloting by Nyachhyon and Webber found gaps between the intention of the CAS and its practice at the schools as shown in the following matrix:
CAS as intended and practiced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS as intended</th>
<th>CAS as practiced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' assessment during teaching, no periodical examination.</td>
<td>Teachers used to conduct end-of-trimester tests in order to justify the allocation of ratings in the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher applies various informal methods appropriate for CAS.</td>
<td>Use of formal paper and pencil test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of students' works (examples and/or model works) in students' portfolio.</td>
<td>Student portfolio used as the piece of card that is used to store the student progress sheet. Teachers did not know what to include and why to include works of students in the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The portfolio should be shared and be available to guardians.</td>
<td>Sharing of students' progress as reported in the portfolio was non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A study carried out by CDC (July 2003) about the practice of CAS in the pilot districts brings forth several findings, which negate with the intention of CAS. For example the report found out that the schools were conducting periodic examinations as they used before the introduction of the CAS. The achievement indicated in the portfolio was higher compared with the achievement test score of the students. While the average score in portfolio was about 2.6 or more (out of 3) the average score in achievement test was from 47.7 to 60.2. Also there was no correspondence in the portfolio score and achievement score. For example, in Chitwan district the portfolio rating was 2.7 and achievement score was 60.2 whereas in Surkhet district the portfolio rating was 2.9 and achievement score was 47.7. The report also pointed out other problems on the way of implementation of the CAS -- overcrowded class; difficulty for the teachers to match lesson goals with that of the students' progress report; maximum use of textbook and minimal use of other curriculum materials; teachers not using the outcomes of assessment for improving instruction.

In this study, two of the schools of Chitwan district were visited specifically to observe the use of CAS during classroom delivery and to interact with the teachers and DEO personnel about the practice and utilization of the CAS in the schools. Following aspects were observed during classroom observation and interaction:

- In one school the learning achievement of the students was not recorded in the CAS learning outcome record book nor in the students' portfolio. It was noted down in separate registers or in separate sheets of paper. The reason for using separate sheet, as given by the teacher, was due to delay of receiving of improved CAS form. They had planned to copy the record in the CAS form from the sheets they were using. But there was no up-to-date record on the performance of each student with respect to the learning outcomes in the register.

- One of the teachers used to put mark on three categories of learning for one and all at a time. This would indicate all the students to have been in the same level all the time. Which is very rare. Another frail aspect in this case was that curriculum objectives seem to be achieved in a parallel fashion than building on vertical basis. Actually the teachers had the confusion in three levels of marking -- three ticks if a student completely knows, two ticks if student knows most of the work and a single tick if the student requires the teacher's support to complete the work. The general practice of classroom delivery was teaching the whole class as a homogeneous group with completing one lesson and covering another lesson in a
sequential manner. Such an approach did not allow the teacher to reflect how an individual student was doing and plan what support s/he required on individual basis. There was a considerable discrepancy on the intention in the outcome of CAS recording and classroom practice. Even though there was a lack of understanding and the utilization of CAS, the teacher had to put marks on CAS record file for the sake of record.

- There were only a few sample works of the students kept in students' portfolio -- of about 7 students only in the visited two schools. The works were drawing, paper works etc. Otherwise there was no sample work of the students collected and kept in the portfolio.

- Even in the CAS piloted schools written and periodical tests were the basis for assessing the performance of the students. They were given numerical marks and/or scores and marks were recorded in 'Marks Ledger' as done in the non-CAS schools. The reason for maintaining marks ledger in the CAS schools as given by the teachers and head teachers was to avoid the complaints of the parents. The parents are used to periodic and written examinations and they would prefer to see their wards marks maintained in the register so that they could see the register whenever they asked for. They viewed that it was difficult for the parents to understand the records maintained in the CAS form.

- One of the RCs has developed some test items in the slips that teachers could use to assess the performance of their students with respect to the learning outcomes in the CAS form (see appendix 5 for the sample items). There were also usual test papers used but with a different name in the CAS schools (see appendix 6 for the sample test papers). It can be argued that such a test item and/or test paper is also a method used to assess the performance of the students with respect to the learning outcomes. But these test items and/or test papers were the sole method used by the teachers whether they maintain the CAS form, portfolio or not.

- Terminal, half yearly, yearly exams were conducted in the CAS piloted schools as well. Schools were found maintaining mark ledgers on the basis of periodic, formal type of test and promoting their students if they got pass marks on their usual criteria. The students were given a pass/fail status even in grades I to III and thus liberal promotion policy was not followed in these CAS schools.

- The teachers used to rank students (1st, 2nd, 3rd etc.) in the CAS piloted schools. Such comparisons of students by students in the group/class were also promoted by inclusion of contents related to norm referenced tests (such as item analysis) in the teacher training manuals.

The research team shared their findings with the teachers and DEO personnel of the concerned districts. In their opinion the findings based on the two schools of Chitwan were also applicable to the majority of the schools in the district. The DEO personnel suggested the research team to observe two more schools, which were following CAS in an appropriate manner. Therefore two more suggested schools were visited and concerned teachers interviewed regarding their practice on CAS. Both of these schools have maintained their students' portfolio individually as well as composite forms for whole of the class. The way teachers have marked and explained the marking in the learning outcome, teachers seemed to have followed the recording appropriately. However one of these schools conducted final examination with set written examination and promoted or retained students on the basis of final examination. Five of the students in grade 2 and 7 students in grade 3
were failed in the class on the basis of the final examination. Whereas another school had maintained portfolio and composite form and converted students' performance into three categories --best, average, low. In this school all the students from grades I, II, and III were automatically promoted to the next grade, but still there was the practice of ranking 1st, 2nd, and 3rd student in the class. These findings suggest that the teachers do not generally understand the principle of CAS. The teachers did not appropriately understand CAS as a practice by which teachers manage their classes:

- adopting techniques of student centered active teaching-learning,
- judgment based on students' interaction, work in the class,
- assessing students individually all the time,
- identifying strengths and weaknesses of the students, and
- recognizing that no two students are alike and have the same capacity to learn.

Sharing session was organized in the Kathmandu, which was participated by personnel from CDC, NCED, DEC, and various sections of DoE. CDC personnel also viewed that CAS as intended was not being practiced in the majority of the CAS pilot schools. The finding of internal monitoring by CDC has also been similar -- periodic examinations have been used as a basis for promotion and liberal promotion not followed.

It was also observed that the piloting of CAS intervention emphasized and promoted it as an administrative process focused on testing method rather than a pedagogical method to assess students level of learning on continuous basis and to plan further learning of the students. There was a lack of conjoining of CAS with pedagogical intervention to help children learn the best and at the optimum level.

While analyzing forms used in CAS, in some instances, it was found complex and difficult to use. There was lumping of several learning outcomes of curriculum into a single learning outcomes indicator such as the lumping of 10 learning outcomes from curriculum into learning outcome indicator number 1; 8 learning outcome from curriculum into learning outcome indicator number 2; and so on in grade 1 Nepali. There was also one curriculum objectives spread among two or more learning outcomes such as spreading of curriculum objectives 1, 2, 5 and 20 into learning outcome indicator 1 and 2; curriculum objective 37 into 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6; curriculum objective 38 into 1, 2, 3 and 4. Such lumping and spreading of learning objectives from curriculum confused the teachers when they had to assess and register the outcomes of the assessments. It has confused the teachers and complicated the assessment. It has also complicated the utilization of outcome of assessment for the improvement of students' learning.
Chapter IV

USE OF OUTCOMES OF ASSESSMENT

The intention of assessing students learning achievement is not only to pass or fail them, but also to plan further instruction and provide required support to the students. Assessment should lead to further instruction and maximize learning opportunities to the students. In this regard these aspects were covered in this study: types of assessment tools employed, analysis of outcomes and use of results. These are presented in the following paragraphs:

- Home-work and class-work: Generally home-work and class-work were given, but their frequency was less. Even less was the checking of home-work and class-work and providing feedback to the students so the students had less opportunity to correct their own mistakes. Comparatively between these two works, class-work was checked more often and feedback provided immediately. While checking the sample of exercise copies of the students about half of the HW/CW was found not checked. These were just left untouched by the teacher. Even in the places where teacher has put some mark various forms of checking were found. The general practice was -- signature only, tick only, crossing only. These forms of students' work checking was not fruitful for the students. They could not find out whether they had done right or wrong. If wrong, what was the mistake and why that was a mistake. Crossing the wrong answer and writing the right answer was practiced by few (about 12% of cases) teachers only.

The teachers used to provide feedback to their students verbally more in CW than in HW. A few of the students also used to ask further question for clarification when they were provided feedback verbally at the classroom. But further planning for the instruction either for the class as a whole or for the individual students were not found.

- Classroom questioning: Teachers used classroom questions mainly to evaluate the day's lesson. Students were provided feedback whether their answers were right or wrong. The teachers mostly asked recall types of lower level questions based on textbook content they have covered in the class rather than higher levels of questions. Pre-planning for what question to ask was lacking and purpose of the question was unclear. Correspondence of the classroom question with the curriculum objective was depended upon the correspondence of the textbook content with the curriculum. This indicated that teachers largely ignored the curriculum objectives and/or learning outcomes while framing the classroom questions. In case of classroom questioning as well there was lack of further planning of teaching learning by using the outcome of the classroom questions.

- Periodic examinations: Periodic examinations (terminal, half yearly or yearly) were used for summative purpose. On the basis of the marks obtained students pass or fail. In all the schools marks ledger was maintained. Seven of the schools provided report cards and others announced the result orally and notify the pass/fail status for the individual students on the notice board. The outcomes of the periodic examinations were not analyzed and used for formative purpose.

- Reporting: Reporting was based on arbitrary pass mark -- 32%. Certain percentages of marks were added from first term, second term and final exam. Marks obtained by the individual students and full marks of the subject were
reported where report cards were used. In the report cards there was no provision for teacher's remark related to further planning of teaching learning for the teacher or for the student. (See Appendix 7 for sample report cards).

- CAS: CAS is supposed to assess the performance of the students formatively on the learning outcomes and plan further teaching learning on the basis of the outcomes of the assessment. In this respect CAS becomes more of a teaching tool than an assessment tool. In practice opposite was the true -- CAS was used as an evaluation tool rather than a continuous support tool for the learning of the students. Another semantic problem in CAS was in understanding the word 'continuous assessment' as 'more frequent test' sense. For example a study (NCED, 2003, p. 45) reports that, "It was seen that the teachers evaluated the classroom activities towards the end of class (34.4%) followed by the same in the middle of the class (26.2%). In other words, the teachers were found to have carried the spirit of continuous evaluation in the classroom as it is already observed that they had evaluated students' performance both in the middle and towards the end of the class." The general understanding of the teachers was also that the more frequent test was meant for continuous assessment and the test was supposed to be what they have been using so far -- a paper and pencil test.

Both in CAS schools and non-CAS schools, the teachers took assessments for determining the achievement status of the students. A score is assigned to the student and that is the end of the purpose of the assessment for most of the teachers. The teachers do not feel obliged for taking any further initiatives if one student lags behind or whole of the class lags behind. The teachers' job for them is to go along the lessons in the textbook, complete the course and take the exam to pass or fail a student for what s/he merits. Such narrowly defining job of the teachers by teachers themselves puts them out of the responsibility of the under achievement of their students. This also indicates the lack of accountability and feeling of responsibility.

Another major hurdle in the utilization of outcomes of assessment for further learning of students is the restricted understanding of the assessment/evaluation. To assess or to evaluate or to give examination means assigning marks/scores to the answer(s) provided by the students to the question asked. When marks/scores are assigned these need to be judged whether they are satisfactory or not against some arbitrary cut off score. This cut off score determines who passes and who fails.

There is also a lack of adequate practice of analyzing the outcomes of the assessments and reporting them appropriately. Announcing the result as pass/fail status or telling the rank (1st, 2nd, 3rd, pass and fail) is the usual practice in the schools. Schools providing result card also limit themselves reporting marks obtained against the full marks for the subjects in the grade. Those marks do not tell enough about how a student fares compared to others in the class or against the set of intended learning outcomes. Descriptive reporting was largely lacking. Composite score put behind the information in shadow what students were lagging behind and what they have already achieved. Such information could have been utilized for the further planning of the learning for the students.

Thus it was found that the purpose of assessment was never understood: whether it is for improving students' achievement; it is for deciding promotion into next grade, or it is for defining national level of students' achievement. Rather assessment always has been taken as some kind of test, and a test is to make some one pass or fail.
Chapter V

TEACHING LEARNING IN PRIMARY LEVEL

Assessment practice is linked with teaching learning practices. Not only what is taught, but also how it is taught is also important to determine when, how, and what to assess. It is important to understand what the school or education hopes to achieve for its pupils. Spooncer (1983, p. 15) views, "... without this there cannot be harmony between what is taught and how it is tested." Educational goals shape instructional strategies. For example, the goal may be to have students master the essential elements or the emphasis may be on the needs, interest, and abilities of students. Such educational goals determine the assessment strategy as curriculum, assessment and pedagogy are inter-linked (Wilmot, 2001). Wiles and Bondi (1993, p. 105) views, "When an educational programme is perceived as primarily the mastery of skills and cognitive data, standardized achievement tests can be used exclusively to determine progress. When education is defined more broadly, measures of achievement become personal and more affective in nature." Educational goals set and instructional strategies used also determine the assessment focus (broad or narrow), dimension (knowledge, skills, personal development), and interpretation (criterion-referenced or norm-referenced) (Wiles and Bondi, 1993, pp. 103-106).

The Vision

The structure of Nepalese school education system comprises five years of primary education -- grades 1 to 5. The main aim of primary education is to develop the innate ability of each individual child through child-centered education. At this level emphasis is given to simple reading, writing and mathematical skills for use in everyday life. The importance of honesty, independence and hard work is also stressed. Specifically the objectives of the education of the primary level are:

- to develop the habit of exploration through curiosity.
- to create interest in arts and culture.
- to develop the ability to communicate and exchange ideas, both orally and in writing.
- to develop the necessary mathematical skills to solve practical everyday problems.
- to develop positive awareness of health issues in everyday life.
- to develop awareness of the importance of the environment.
- to develop a cooperative and responsible attitude and an appreciation of social norms.
- to create responsible citizens who are proud of their nation and are devoted to national unity. (MOES, 2001).

Child-centered education as emphasized in the aims of primary education system in Nepal, has been re-stressed in other major documents as well. Mid Term Review (March 2002) viewed a link between CAS activities and teacher training into a single activity focusing on 'Student Centered Learning'. Concept paper entitled "Further Support on Basic and Primary Education in Nepal 2004 - 2009" emphasizes,
The qualities of classroom learning experiences need to develop further, away from treating the students in classes as homogeneous units, and away from rote learning. The focus of teaching learning methodology will be on student centered active learning with teachers being aware of each students' level at all times through using a wide range of formal and informal techniques (MOES, p. 13).

The above statement has been carried on to the core document of "Education for All 2004–2009" MOES, 2003. It is important to understand what is meant by child centered-education. Wiles and Bondi provided an example of child-centered vision,

**Philosophy Statement**

We desire in each school, kindergarten through adult education, a programme that will focus on the individual student to provide learning experiences in the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor areas.

**Programme Concepts**

A programme of individualized instruction will be implemented.

A basic diagnostic-perspective approach to teaching will be used.

A variety of materials, both commercial and teacher-made, will be used.

A flexible schedule will be implemented.

Instructional assistants will perform teaching, planning, and clerical tasks.

Instructional leaders (teachers) will serve as facilitators of programme planning and implementation.

A facility that provides as much flexibility in programming as possible will be promoted. (1993, p. 110).

Terms such as child-centered education, individualized instruction, continuous assessment has yet to be described or illustrated in an easily understandable conceptual level to a teacher and a layman in the curriculum materials and the training. A manual developed for curriculum developers 'primary curriculum development in Nepal' by Opifer Ltd under Finnish technical assistance tried to list down principles of child-centered approach as:

- All children are equal and should be treated with love and respect.
- Put children first, by responding to their needs and building on their knowledge.
- Children are unique individuals, with different needs, interest and abilities.
- Children come to school already knowing many things.
- Children learn at different rates, i.e. they have their own pace.
- Children are curious and inquisitive.
- Children learn best through concrete, hands on experiences.
- The learning environment should stimulate children's development.
- Different children learn in different ways and a variety of strategies are necessary to cater for the needs and interests of individual children in interesting ways. (June 2002).

Classroom delivery practices that could be usually observed is whole class teaching emphasizing on rote memorization of the textbook content. Second phase of this study has raised the issue -- what does all this mean – child-centered/student-centered/child focus/joyful learning and how are these applicable in the classroom
situation in the Nepalese context? (CERID, 2003). These terms were found to have been loosely defined and also not referenced and related in the training manuals. The training and the prevailing classroom practice focus have been on teaching rather than on learning. Embracing child-centered approach Kilpatrick developed a four-stage learning from real situation through topics,

- The children specify what they want to know, ask questions, and devise ways of finding out.
- They consult books and develop an action plan.
- They execute that work.
- They present findings to others, review, and make judgments (Pollard and Bourne, 1994, p. 189).

Rousseau emphasized the fact that a child should be free to learn from direct experience. Dewey advocated that children pursuing their own studies would be motivated to speculate, observe, gather information, and test out guesses or hypotheses to solve their own problems. (Pollard and Bourne, 1994, p. 189). It has also been advocated that if it is not children's experiences and interests that direct the curriculum content, their experiences and interests need to be considered by the teacher. A child-considered pedagogy takes account of children's experiences and interests, but decision is made by the teacher. In the view of Collins, Insley and Soler, These curriculum mediums, many of which are directly relevant to children's experiences and interests are, nevertheless, teacher-led decisions. In terms of progressive pedagogies this approach could be described as a 'child-considered' approach rather than the child-centered education' rhetoric which espouses a curriculum content generated by the direction of children's interests, the range of children's interests, the importance of children of a multi-sensory, 'hands-on' engagement and the necessity to differentiate the pace of learning relevant to their age and achievement level. (2001, p. 152).

Similarly terms such as individual attention, and individualized instruction are confused with whole class teaching followed by individual monitoring.

Individual attention occurs when the teacher interacts privately with a single child. By contrast individual work takes place when all the children have different tasks, frequently drawn from a wide range of curricular areas. When individual work is in progress the teacher is almost bound to favor individual attention as well because no two children are doing the same thing. (Boydell, 1978, pp. 66-67).

Individualized instruction requires a teacher to work on a personal, one-to-one basis with each student and tailor instruction to specific needs and abilities of the learner. It is also necessary that learners be free to work alone at their own pace; and pace, medium of presentation, study style, context, evaluation technique are adopted to the needs of each individual students. (Chauhan, 1979, p. 59). As for continuous and comprehensive evaluation it is also suggested to divide into suitable units with well defined objectives and assess students' attainment on each unit (NCERT, 2003). Even though child-centered/student-centered/child focus/joyful learning as well as continuous assessment are used in training manuals, there is a lack of clear explanation of these theories as well as plans and activities to accomplish these.

This research study tried to outline the vision of a primary classroom teaching learning the teachers and DEO personnel have. The vision of a primary classroom is the same -- child-centered, student centered, based on learners' interest and capacity,
joyful/interesting learning to the students, develop inner capability of the child and so on. There is also similarity in the understanding of the required assessment practices. They viewed in such a classroom teaching learning, there should be evaluation along with the teaching learning and teaching learning be based on the outcome of the assessment. Teaching learning activities need to be based on the where the student is, and formative and other forms of assessment tools than solely paper and pencil need to be employed. At the level of using these terms it is fine. DEO personnel could use the right terms and be more articulate, but teachers also jot down these themes in their own ways. The vision of the people, at least in the use of terms is clear from center to the school level. The gap is in the conceptual clarity and understanding of the principle and practicing in the classroom. When asked what kind of activities could be there in a child-centered teaching learning, there were then confusions. Even when asked what a CAS form would look like in a heterogeneous group and in a homogeneous group they could not explain clearly in the CAS piloting schools as well. As for the teacher preparation, positive steps have been taken toward child centered-education vision.

Recently adopted pre-service as well as basic training curriculum of NCED has identified the competencies for teacher training and has emphasized activity based and guided practical activities as training modality. These are essential to visualize teaching learning in a primary level classroom. Several of the objectives set are related to student-centered learning which is emphasized in BPEP documents such as MTR, March 2002, EFA and also in various training packages. Next step is to weave these in the student-centered learning vision.

The Practice

The classroom teaching learning activities in the primary classrooms of Nepal are largely teacher dominated with emphasis on teaching than students' learning. Rote memorization of the textbook content is the focus.

In the teacher training child-centered education has not been elaborated in terms of classroom practices. There are inconsistencies in what has been covered in the training and what is required in a child-centered/individualized instruction in some of the cases. For instance, in 10 months' in-service as well as in 10 day recurrent training packages 'item analysis' has been included in the content. If criterion referenced assessment practices are emphasized in the child-centered/individualized instruction then providing content useful for the norm-referenced test is not much useful. These aspects need to be reviewed.
Chapter VI
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION

BPEP and EFA documents stress and put forward child-centered education as vision and intention regarding teaching learning in the primary level in Nepal. Vision is the first step for the realization what one wishes and wants. But there need to be the plan, programme, and appropriate activities to translate vision into practice. It is also important to understand what it is that we want to achieve. This calls for answering - what we mean by child-centered education in the context of Nepal; how we are going to consolidate our efforts to achieve child-centered education; what assessment tool(s) we are going to employ and for what purpose; and what need to be the qualification and readiness of the teachers for this purpose. These four questions are discussed here.

Child-centered Education in the Context of Nepal

The existing practice in the primary level in Nepal is teacher teaching mostly lecturing and expecting students to read by heart and recall what is taught in their assigned classes on the basis of the class routine planned for the year at the beginning of the school session. The content to be covered is already fixed in the textbook. Textbook is the mostly used curriculum material by the teachers. Teachers follow the content and the sequence of the lesson as provided and arranged in the textbook. Two or three periodic examinations are the main evaluation tools used by the schools and these tools are used for summative purpose. Single national level curriculum, whole class teaching and mainly paper and pencil methods of assessment is in practice. From such teacher centered educational approach if it is aimed at child-centered education, it need to be an educational theory or system that emphasizes the pupil and his or her individual characteristics as central in conducting instruction instead of focusing on subject matter, external authority, and educational requirements. Curriculum need to be constructed according to the pupils’ interests and needs.

It is not easy to change teacher-centered practices to child-centered one in a short duration and in an easy way. Child-centered education needs to be a long-term vision with a number of intermediary steps. This will require starting with what is immediately possible such as providing access to the materials (blackboard, learning materials, reference books/reading materials etc.) to the students and progressively increasing involvement/participation of the students in learning to employing students’ interest, ability and need as the basis for teaching learning activities. Such changes also need to be furnished with the required expertise in the teachers, suitable physical environment in the schools and parental support. This requires to clarify: 1) what is aimed at for achieving (by stating child-centered education); 2) what will be the best possible time frame to achieve a child-centered education system; 3) what intermediary steps should be taken; 4) what support needs to be provided to the teachers; 5) what physical/infrastructure developments and materials need to be provided to the schools to adopt child-centered education successfully. It will be the best option to organize a workshop (possibly with international participation) to discuss and plan a child-centered education in the context of Nepal. However it will be good to consider a logical approach in developing teaching learning from 'child-considered' pedagogy leading to "child-centered" approach in a systematic manner.
Consolidating Efforts to Achieve Child-centered Education

The efforts needed to put into and providing needed support for achieving a child-centered education will be largely determined when the child-centered education vision is clearly stated. Such visioning of a primary level classroom teaching learning can be stated as:

Child-centered learning in which

- teaching learning will be based on the children's interest, experience.
- children will have the freedom to choose their own activities.
- children learn by their own style and pace.
- instruction will be individualized where it is possible that children are at different levels and engaged in different tasks, attaining different curricular objectives.
- activity-based, project work will be designed according to the interest and experience of the children.
- in order to cater individual needs of the children, CAS will be used to record what they have learnt and where they are for the learning goals set at any given point of time.
- etc.

Clarifying what it is aspired for would be helpful to develop action steps and consolidate efforts towards achieving the vision. At present there are discrepancies present in a number of supports provided to the teachers and practices if these supports and practices are to be analyzed in terms of child-centered education vision. The main discrepancies are related to these aspects: 1) provision of single national level curriculum and single textbook while in a child-centered education curriculum is constructed according to the interests and needs of the pupils (Hawes, 1932) with variety of resources and activities; 2) emphasis on norm referenced test while in a child-centered approach criterion referenced test is used with formative emphasis (Craft, 1996, pp. 92-93); 3) dominance of whole class teaching while individualized or group teaching is to be used in case of differentiated levels of students learning (Craft, 1996); student promotion on the basis of periodic, summative evaluation while students are to be provided with support on continuous basis to maximize learning.

There is a need for streamlining the efforts and supports to achieve a child-centered education. For this a revision or development in curriculum, curricular materials, teacher training, and support to the school/teacher might be required. For example a number of objectives of “Primary Teacher Training Curriculum” (NECD, May 2000) is related to child-centered approach, but some of these objectives are not explicit with respect to the child-centered approach. In this curriculum following objectives need to be more clearly stated if the teachers are to be prepared for a child-centered approach:
Teacher training curriculum and child-centered approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach primary school subjects following a systematic process of planning</td>
<td>The objective seems to emphasize lesson preparation for the whole class teaching. It is also useful to prepare a lesson for planning instruction according to the need and capability of the individual child while it is required. Planning unit with individual child is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesson, selecting appropriate methods, selecting and preparing relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials and using continuous assessment schemes (CAS).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct and use evaluation tools to assess students' progress vis-à-vis</td>
<td>'Construct and use evaluation tools' might imply developing formal written test only. While it is necessary to emphasize informal method and spontaneous evaluation opportunities as well for evaluation in the CAS. It is necessary for the teachers to be able to use diagnostic method to identify learning difficulties of the students. Teachers need to be provided evaluation/testing skills related to criterion referenced than norm referenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected learning outcomes, and provide feedback to the students, and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use reward and punishment in reinforcing children's learning.</td>
<td>PUNISHMENT! that too in the primary level? Punishment should not the objective of a teacher training programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is necessary to provide training focused on the teaching learning approach we want to employee in our system. That will lead to identifying required skills in the teachers to provide them with skills through discussion, demonstration and practice for lasting impact.

**Improving School Based Assessment**

Evaluation should be a continuous process and an integral part of teaching learning practices. It should establish interaction between students and teacher to maximize learning of the students. It should not be merely a separate procedure to be used on periodic interval for the purpose of determining the achievement level of the students in terms of marks or grades. But in practice it is not so. Therefore heavy relaying of the school/teacher on periodic examination (2 or 3 exams in a year) should be discouraged and methods such as home-work, class-work, project work, group assignment, material collection, observation of students' activities, classroom questions etc. should be emphasized. Although some of these techniques are being practiced by some teachers, but always against some percentage of marks allotted for that subject. Approaches such as "competency-based" and "developmental continuum" (ACEID, 1997, p. 260; ACEID 2000, p. 58,) also need to be reviewed.

In order to make it possible to use variety of assessment tools and use the result for formative purpose, it is also necessary to mitigate teacher with over burden of the period per day or week, which in most of the schools where there are not enough teachers is commonly full periods each day. It is also necessary to mange the size of students in a class where it is over crowded. In this respect teacher rationalization is important so that appropriate student teacher ratio could be maintained and appropriate class size could be retained. These would take some time to achieve. It is also important to try out alternative solution to make a class in a manageable size such as alternative days school, multiple shift with longer hour school and shorter...
hour teaching learning. The long term vision should be provision of adequate number of classes with appropriate student teacher ratio.

Many of the teachers used to enter without any pre-service training in the teaching force in Nepal. Still a high percentage of teachers are untrained. In the context of Nepal in-service training assumes vital role in preparing teacher for classroom teaching learning. There are in-service training programs too. These involve mainly 10 month package or various modular training of 10 days’ duration. On the one hand there are many aspects in which teachers need to be provided training and on the other hand there is a limited time for the training. In this context it is necessary to identify knowledge and skills that will directly be relevant and usable in the classroom teaching learning. Immediate use and relevancy of the contents such as item analysis in the training package (DoE, 2057; NCED, 2060 Biashakha) need to be reviewed for the possibility of replacing these contents with more relevant and useful ones for the classroom teaching learning and child-centered approach.

Another vital tool for the teachers is the classroom questioning technique. Through questioning, discussion, indirect questioning and dialogue with individual student or in group, the teacher can evaluate and identify what portion of the lesson the student has understood, which portion is more difficult for him/her and which portion is confusing and needs teaching again. The teacher can identify any severe learning difficulties/problems of a given student. The teacher can find out the mistakes being made by students and interpret the reason for mistakes. Asking a student about a problem and listening to the explanation of the process used can provide the teacher with excellent information about the nature and cause of the error or difficulties. The art of questioning is vital for a good teacher (UNESCO, 2001, p. 43). But classroom questioning is not given adequate scope in the training packages of NCED, DoE or DEC. In the revision of the training manuals classroom questioning techniques need to be covered adequately.

It is important to use assessment in a formative way to help student learn best. For this, the recording of outcome of assessment and instruction planning on the basis of outcome of assessment need to be made visible. Students' portfolio and continuous recording need to be emphasized. Process, outcome and use of assessment need to be communicated with students, parents and other concerned bodies and persons. For this simplifying and expanding of CAS forms will be required by sorting out problems of lumping up and spreading of curriculum objective(s) in the learning outcome to be assessed. Simplified record forms of the students' with less administration details should be used.

It is also important to clarify position and utility of external examination whether there will be any external terminal examination at the primary level or not. Decision on external examination needs to be based on the information that it can provide to judge effectiveness of school and teacher; measuring national level of standard; and identifying curriculum areas for improvement.

**Teacher Quality and Readiness**

Whatever improvement and changes are brought will be able to bring forth intended improvement to the extent that teacher are ready and are qualified to adopt and practice the required skills for the change. In this context it is necessary to review required qualification for primary level teacher as SLC. Will SLC level work if our vision is a child-centered education? A policy level workshop to decide minimum
level of qualification for the entry in the teaching force need to decided with the time frame plan to implement the plan. It is necessary because Bachelor level qualification with pre-service training might be desirable, but it is not feasible at the moment. But this can be a long-term plan for example in 15 years or so with specific time bound plan.
Chapter VII

SUGGESTIONS

This study has come up with the suggestions regarding implementation of "Child-centered Education" in the primary level and linking assessment practices in bringing out improvement in teaching learning.

Envisage Child-centered Education

It is essential to envisage child-centered education with regard to vision of child-centered education in the Nepalese primary schools' classrooms. This will require:

- conceptual, theoretical clarity in order to establish what it is aimed at to achieve (by stating child-centered education).
- assessing feasibility of implementing child-centered education in the existing scenario to identify if other support are required.
- working out best possible time frame to achieve child-centered education and follow/maintain it.
- action plan with intermediary steps to fulfill the target of child-centered education. Such a plan need to state what existing supports relate to child-centered education, what support/activities are in near future plan and what support/activities are in long term plan.
- consolidation and streamlining of efforts and supports (curriculum, curriculum materials, teacher training, assessment practices including CAS) converging in child-centered education.
- preparing teachers to implement child-centered education by identifying skills and resources required for child-centered education.
- creating conducive classroom environment such as appropriate class size, manageable teachers' workload, display, availability of required materials, sitting arrangement, space with appropriate design, learning corner, appropriate furniture etc.
- awareness to the parents, community and other concerned stakeholders so that they readily accept and support child-centered approach.

It is suggested to organize a workshop (possibly with international participation) to discuss and plan a child-centered education in the context of Nepal.

Provide Focused Training

Once objectives are set and action plan with intermediary steps are prepared, teachers need to be prepared to achieve objectives and planned steps. For this:

- state teacher training objectives in terms of child-centered education if teachers are to be prepared for this.
- identify minimum skills required for the successful implementation of set objectives and planned steps.
- emphasize discussion, demonstration and practice of skills during training by using training as a model.
- emphasize on Criterion Referenced Test and informal techniques of assessment such as classroom questions, project, group work etc. in the training.
- ensure that teachers are provided with test item development techniques and enable them to develop test item in proper format and levels matching curriculum objectives.
- ensure regular visit, feedback and if required on-the-spot demonstration as a part of training.

Re-engineering Assessment Practices

On the line of EFA programme emphasis on teaching learning (child-centered) and continuous assessment it is essential to reorient assessment practices. For this:

- ensure that all the learning outcomes from curriculum are assessed.
- use variety of assessment devices appropriate to assess curriculum objectives.
- revise the policy of requiring three term exams (as stated in Education Act) to initiate continuous and comprehensive assessment.
- simplify presently piloted CAS record forms to make it user friendly and to ensure continuous assessment.

Emphasize on Formative Assessment and Use

Thrust of child-centered education and continuous assessment is on helping student learn. Assessment to be helpful in students’ learning needs to be of formative nature with continuous use of assessment outcome. For this:

- devise assessment methods and forms which can be visible in the form of recording of the assessment outcome and planning on the basis of assessment for an individual child.
- ensure that student and teacher interact frequently to identify and correct learning difficulty and student has chance to reflect. Recording of follow up in the students’ portfolios can help in this.

Ensure Meaningful Recording and Reporting of Students’ Performance

Recording and analysis of assessment outcome is important for proper use of assessment to improve students’ learning. For this:

- make provision in the students’ portfolios or other recording forms to record -- students’ strength and weakness; repeatedly done mistakes, misconceptions and corrective measures/supports; level of students' achievement with respect to learning outcomes.
- make provision for recording and reporting of students' progress and improvement in learning.
- make provision for teacher and parent meeting to discuss students' learning and exchange of ideas to improve students' learning.
- use students' portfolios to assess students' performance and composite form to assess the performance of the teacher.
- ensure meaningful reporting of students' learning understandable to the parents either using description or numerical value or both or any other innovative devices.

**Clarify Position and Utility of External Examination**

It is important to clarify the position of the end of year examination and terminal, external examination -- whether these will be completely abolished or retained in some form and for certain uses. In this respect:

- review terminal, external examination for the evaluating effectiveness of school and teacher; measuring national level of achievement; identifying areas of curriculum revision/improvement etc. A test in a sample can fulfill these purposes.
- ensure checking undue influence of external examination (if such provision is decided) in classroom teaching learning.

**Rethink Minimum Qualification for Entry in Teaching Profession**

Child-centered approach and continuous assessment requires higher level of knowledge and skill than traditional type teacher dominated, rote memorization approach. In this context:

- rethink what level of qualification and initial/pre-service training will be required for entry into teaching profession such as B. Ed. with training in primary level course.
- set timeline for gradual introduction of minimum qualification requirement by analyzing the availability of required human resources.

**Mitigate Over-burden of the Teachers**

Over crowded class and requiring to attend all or most of the periods in the school are two major causes of over-burden to the committed teachers. Planning, assessing and replanning requires teachers' devotion and also consumes time. It is essential to maintain student teacher ratio and appropriate class size. These might take time and could be achieved in a long-term plan. For the time being to mitigate over-burden of the teachers:

- maintain class to a manageable size. In the crowded school measures such as alternate days school; multiple shifts with longer hour school and shorter teaching learning hour can be helpful.
- provide teachers with the skills to manage workload such as dividing classes as teacher assisted class and monitor assisted class; 4/5 periods a week for a subject; checking objective/one single right answer type question (HW/CW) on blackboard or reading out or checking one (or few) student's work who in turn checks others' work.
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Appendix I

BRIEF REPORT ON FOLLOW UP OF FRP

The major theme of this study was classroom teaching learning in the three years of formative research. In the first year the study concentrated on "classroom delivery" with focus on use of curriculum materials, in the second year the study concentrated on "transfer of training skills in the classroom delivery", and in this year the focus was on "school based assessment". Though the major theme of the study remained on classroom teaching learning, the focus of the study changed over the three years. As mostly same schools were covered in the three years, the research team had the opportunity to follow up if any changes have occurred or any of the action steps implemented. It has been possible to capture some of the interventions that have been initiated which were suggested in the first and second phases of this study. These are the following:

- Higher level objectives in the curriculum: One of the findings of the first phase of this study was that higher level of objectives were not adequately covered in the classroom delivery. Lack of clarity on how to assess higher level, habit formation type of curriculum objectives were also reported.

- In the new curriculum CDC (BS 2059) has incorporated the assessment method(s) appropriate for each of the curriculum objectives.

- Structured textbook: The first phase of this study reported that textbooks were the main curriculum materials used by the teachers for classroom delivery compared to curriculum, curriculum elaboration, teacher guides and other materials. Therefore the study recommended to develop structured textbooks to be used by both students and teachers or to develop handbook for teachers and textbooks for students in the place of variety of books for the same purpose.

- On going research study initiated by Research Division of DoE is focussing on what components need to be there in a textbook including unit test and what should be the format of the textbook at the primary level.

- Teachers' guide on sale: One of the reasons indicated in the first phase of this study was for the less use of teacher guide in the classroom delivery was due to the unavailability of the teachers' guide in the schools. The study suggested to provide schools with teachers' guides at least for once.

- Though teachers' guides are not provided to the school free of cost, these are now on sale. These are available in the Sajha bookshops (visited in Kaski and Morang) for purchase. But teachers/schools/and most of the DEO personnel were not aware about the availability of the teachers' guides on sale.

- More activity based teacher training: The study indicated existing training to be more formal education type of training delivery which lacked demonstration, discussion and practice. It was suggested to conduct training focussing on demonstration, discussion and practice.

Based on this recommendation more practice based teacher training manual was developed for Mathematics recurrent training.

- Teacher training monitoring: Second phase of this study found weak monitoring and feedback to be one of the major reasons for less transfer of training skills in
the classroom delivery. It was recommended to monitor the utilization as well as a part of training.

NCED has initiated monitoring of the training activities at the time of training delivery (at the PTTCs and private PTTCs). Monitoring of utilization of training skills at the classroom level is still not covered as a part of training component.

- Position paper for grade one entitled "Review on Grade One Status and Proposal for the Joint Review Meeting of BPEP II December 2002" (Aaltonen, 2002) has reflected on the recommendation of first phase of this study related to structured textbook, establishing an objective accountability system.
### Classroom Observation Form (Classroom Questioning)

Name of the school, address:  
Name of the teacher:  
Sex: M/F:  
Grade:  Subject:  Topic:  
Number of the students: enrolled  present at the day of observation:  
Schedule of classroom organization (tick): grade/multi-grade/subject/mixed

1. **Teacher's purpose of Questioning**
   - Review previous lesson  
   - Link previous lesson with new one  
   - Start new lesson  
   - Evaluate day’s lesson  
   - Motivate students  
   - Others  

2. **Questioning method**
   - **Verbal**  
   - Written: Use blackboard  
   - Exercise copy  
   - Exercise book  
   - Textbook  
   - Others  
   - Pictorial  
   - Others  

3. **Format of the Question**
   - **Short Question/Answer**  
   - Extended Q/A  
   - Activity  
   - Repetitions  
   - Others  

4. **Question presentation**
A student at a time

Question to the class and

Indicate individual student to answer

Question to the class without indicating

Anyone specifically

5. If the student fails to answer, teacher

Repeats same question to him

Simplifies the question to him

Provides hints

Ask same question to others without considering I-III

Ask others only if the student fails

Immediately provides answer without considering I-V

Provides answer if student fails I-V

6. Reinforcement

Immediate

Delayed

None

Praises right answer

Criticizes wrong answer

7. Level of Question: Answer requires

Factual statement

Understanding

Higher

NOTE: Questions asked by the teacher in the classroom is copied in a separate page for later analysis of the level.
Appendix III

LIST OF THE SAMPLE SCHOOLS

Chitwan
1. Malpur Lower Secondary School, Malpur
2. Dibyajyoti Secondary School, Divyanagar
3. Adikabi Bhanubhakta Secondary School, Narayangarh
4. Ra. Pra. Vi., Nadipur

Dadeldhura
1. Ghatal Secondary School, Nuwakiot
2. Janjyoti Primary School, Adityapur
3. Mastabajinath Primary School, Dandabari
4. Ra. Pra. Vi., Khalanga

Kaski
1. Chandika Primary School, Batulechour, Ambare
2. Mahendra Primary School, Nagdada
3. Mahendra Lower Secondary School, Nayabazar, Pokhara

Morang
1. Bal Lower Secondary School, Rani, Biratnagar
2. Raghupati Primary School, Biratnagar - 22
3. Sushikshya Nikunj Primary School, Hatkhola
4. Kanchanbari Lower Secondary School, Kanchanbari
5. Sukuna Higher Secondary School, Sukuna

Rasuwa
1. Bhimali Primary School, Bhimali
2. Saraswati Primary School, Thade
3. Dhunche Secondary School, Dhunche
### Appendix IV

**COVERAGE OF CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES IN THE TEST PAPERS OF THE SCHOOLS**

Table 1: Coverage of curriculum objective in Mathematics, Grade 3 of the sample schools (terminal and final exams combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of objectives in the curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge of number concept</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fundamental mathematical operations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(addition, subtraction, multiplication,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>division)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Measurement, weight and currency</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(time, length, area, capacity,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volume, weight, currency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fraction, decimal, percentage</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(unitary method)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fraction, decimal, unitary method)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chart and graph</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Algebraic expression and equation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Geometry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Set</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage coverage</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Coverage of curriculum objective in Nepali, Grade 2 of the sample schools (terminal and final exams combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of objectives in the curriculum</th>
<th>School 13</th>
<th>School 23</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 43</th>
<th>School 5</th>
<th>School 6</th>
<th>School 7</th>
<th>School 8</th>
<th>School 9</th>
<th>School 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१. भाष्क सीप</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ. सुनाइ</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ. पढाइ</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई. लेखाइ</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२. भाष्क सीप विकासका क्षेत्र</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>क. उच्चारण</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ख. बोध (शुरुत र पठन)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ग. कार्यमुलक व्याकरण</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घ. शब्दकोश</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३. शब्दभण्डार</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४. बाक्यमा शब्द सङ्ग्रह</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage Coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Coverage of curriculum objective in English, Grade 5 of the sample schools (terminal and final exams combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of objectives in the curriculum</th>
<th>School 13</th>
<th>School 23</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 43</th>
<th>School 5</th>
<th>School 6</th>
<th>School 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage Coverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V

SAMPLE TEST ITEMS USED IN CAS PILOTED SCHOOLS

क) घाँ + + + ती = होर्टी
ख) घ + घ + ती = घाँटी
ग) गा + त + = आई
घ) अ + आ + श = हार्दिक
ढ) पु + च + व = फुडी
नाम : ——
रोल न. : ——

 предлагай виа трансформации раш.

नाम : ——
रोल न. : ——

 पदार्थ पता लगाओ।

क) ३७ + २
ख) ३ + २६

नाम : ——
रोल न. : ——

 प्रश्नोत्तरों को जवाब लेख।

1. खरायें कून स्थानमा छ?

2. पाँचीं स्थानमा कून जनावर छ?

3. हातीका पत्ता छडिछौ कि ऑटी जनावर छन?

नाम : ——
रोल न. : ——

 उदाहरण हेरेका वाक्य बनाओ।

मलाई विराजो मन पर्न।

APPLE

ELE PHANT

DOG

KIT

MANGO
Appendix VI

SAMPLE TEST PAPERS USED IN CAS PILOTED SCHOOLS
## Appendix VII

### SAMPLE OF REPORT CARDS

### श्री जालीकी माध्यमिक विद्यालय

#### प्रामाण-पत्र

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>विषय</th>
<th>नेपाली</th>
<th>अंग्रेजी</th>
<th>सामाजिक</th>
<th>विज्ञान</th>
<th>राष्ट्रीय एवं सामाजिक</th>
<th>शास्त्रीय एवं सामाजिक</th>
<th>पुर्वी स्थ.</th>
<th>क्षेत्रः</th>
<th>महत्त्व</th>
<th>वेबी</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>गणित</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विज्ञान</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### श्री सरस्वती माध्यमिक विद्यालय

#### लब्ध्याय-पत्र

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>विषय</th>
<th>नेपाली</th>
<th>अंग्रेजी</th>
<th>सामाजिक</th>
<th>विज्ञान</th>
<th>राष्ट्रीय एवं सामाजिक</th>
<th>शास्त्रीय एवं सामाजिक</th>
<th>पुर्वी स्थ.</th>
<th>क्षेत्रः</th>
<th>महत्त्व</th>
<th>वेबी</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>कार्य</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तत्त्व, विज्ञान एवं विद्या</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इतिहास एवं सामाजिक</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इतिहास, विज्ञान एवं विद्या</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इतिहास</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इतिहास, विज्ञान एवं विद्या</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य, विज्ञान एवं विद्या</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य, विज्ञान एवं विद्या</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य, विज्ञान एवं विद्या</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य, विज्ञान एवं विद्या</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>साहित्य, विज्ञान एवं विद्या</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### व्याख्या

- प्रामाण-पत्र: यह विद्यालय के छात्रों की भूमिका के लिए खास तौर पर देखा जाना जाने वाला एक पत्र है।
- लब्ध्याय-पत्र: यह विद्यालय के छात्रों की भूमिका के लिए बहुत खास तौर पर देखा जाने वाला एक पत्र है।

Effective Classroom Teaching Learning
**For Admission**

**Araiko Secondary Boarding School**

**Progress Report**

**Name:**

**Class:**

**Roll No.:**

**Education Year:** 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attendance:**

- Present: ___________
- Absent: ___________

**Remarks:**

- Good progress in studies.
- Improves language skills.

**Signature:**

- Teacher's Signature
- Principal's Signature

---

**FRP Report 17**