

Continuous And Comprehensive Evaluation Adopted In Secondary Schools

***Dr. Lekhan Gogoi**

Assistant Professor, Department of Education
Moridhal College

**** Niva Gogoi Baruah**

Assistant Teacher, Debera LP School
Lakhimpur, Assam

Abstract

Success of education, to a large extent, depends upon evaluation system which determines the learners' achievement in terms of their knowledge, skills and attitudes developed through teaching-learning system. Evaluation needs to focus adequately on both scholastic and non-scholastic areas of development. The present investigation attempted to study the nature and methods of continuous and comprehensive evaluation adopted in secondary schools; to find out the suitability of it from the perception of students; to make a comparative analysis of CCE adopted in private and government provincialised secondary schools; and to find out the problems in the maintenance of CCE in schools. The descriptive survey method was used and collected data from a sample of 88 working teachers and 124 students (40%) studying in four secondary schools. The study found that almost all the schools adopt a school based evaluation system in written and oral types, but activity based performance was not given due place; class tests, unit tests and half yearly examination were conducted; schools under study followed participation in games & sports, cultural activities, literary activities and students' discipline, but other non-scholastic aspects related to work education, physical education and social development were neglected. Compared to private schools, government provincialised secondary schools were found to have more problems.

(Key Words: Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation. Evaluation, Continuous Evaluation, Secondary School, Comprehensive Evaluation)

THE CONTEXT

Education aims at making children capable of becoming responsible, productive and useful members of the society. Knowledge, skills and attitudes are built through learning experiences and opportunities created for learners in school. It is in the classroom that learners can analyze and evaluate their experiences, learn to doubt, to question, to investigate and to think independently (CBSE, 2009). Success of education, to a large extent, depends upon evaluation system which determines the learners' achievement in terms of their knowledge, skills and attitudes developed through teaching-learning system. Adoption of appropriate tools and methods of evaluation is a prime concern of the educational institutions so as to determine effectively and accurately the learners' achievement and progress. But most of the policy documents pertaining to Indian education reiterated that evaluation system in vogue was inadequate and required changes. The concept of continuous and comprehensive evaluation (CCE) has been emerged out as a reform in the field of examination and evaluation which is expected to be an appropriate means of evaluating the holistic and integrated development of learners. Right to Education Act (2009) has mandated continuous and comprehensive evaluation as an integral part of teaching and learning in school education.

Examination plays a significant role in the total system of education in general, and the development of individual's total personality in particular. The traditional system of examination is predominantly focusing only on intellectual domain devoid of holistic development of personality. The psycho-motor and affective domains of holistic learning have not received due importance. It is because these domains are being considered as non-scholastic aspect of education and have not been taken due place in the traditional evaluation system. But holistic education demands development of all aspects of individual's personality including cognitive, affective and psycho-motor domains. Evaluation needs to focus adequately on both scholastic and non-scholastic areas of development by adopting continuous and comprehensive evaluation. The National Policy on Education (NEP, 1986) rightly states that Comprehensive and Continuous Evaluation should incorporate both scholastic and non-scholastic aspects of evaluation, spread over the total span of

instructional time. Realizing its importance, the National Curriculum Framework (2005) recommends that a school-based continuous and comprehensive evaluation system be established in order to (i) reduce stress on the children, (ii) make evaluation comprehensive and regular, (iii) provide space for the teacher for creative teaching, (iv) provide a tool for diagnosis and for producing learners with greater skills. But the evaluation practices carried out in schools are still conventional in nature and purposes. Continuous assessment is not followed systematically in those schools where teachers are trained in in-service programmes (Rao Manjula, 2001).

It is to be noted that several studies have been conducted on various issues related to continuous and comprehensive evaluation. A review of the studies conducted by earlier researchers revealed that status of co-scholastic activities, grading system, internal assessment, attitude towards CCE, etc. were the focusing areas for the investigators. Study conducted by Ravi (1989) showed dissatisfaction towards the continuous internal assessment. Malhotra et. al. (1989) found that combination of internal marks with the external assessment marks did not significantly improve in the prediction of further performance of the students. Prasad (2001) found the continuous internal assessment system with varying degree of the weightage to internal and external assessment. Singh, Patel and Desai (2013) found that the majority of the students were in favour of continuation of this system of assessment with certain improvements.

Sreelal K.V and Dr. Aseel Abdul Wahid in their study found that majority of teachers (80 percent) responded that both curricular and co-curricular activities are included in CCE. Majority of responded, i.e. 84%, have proper understanding of criteria of CCE with respect to their subject; 78% teachers do not keep a cumulative record of the students; 68% teachers are unable to develop evaluation tools for CCE; and 77% teachers felt shortage of training programmes for preparing evaluation tools.

Similarly, with respect to continuous aspect of evaluation with semester system, Patel (1978), Akhtar (1980) found that semester system helps in maintaining the continuity. NCERT revealed that the systematic implementation of the scheme of CCE helps in developing and providing both scholastic and non-scholastic areas. Singhal (2012) revealed that most of the teachers are still unaware of the concept of CCE. The major problems faced by the school teachers in the execution of CCE were large number of students in classes, lack of training, lack of proper infrastructure facilities and teaching materials.

However, no scientific study has been conducted so far in Assam on adoption and effectiveness of CCE in the schools at secondary level. When this investigator reviewed the earlier studies she found that Bhattacharjee and Sarma (2009) conducted a study related to status of scholastic activities at elementary level who revealed in their study that co-scholastic activities have not earned a proper place in the school routine and was totally ignored in school programme. But no study has been conducted to ascertain the nature and methods of adoption of CCE at secondary level in Assam in general and Lakhimpur district in particular. Thus, the investigator felt a need to ascertain the continuous and comprehensive evaluation adopted by secondary schools of Lakhimpur District of Assam.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

“Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation in Secondary Schools: A Study in Lakhimpur District (Assam)”

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study attempted to find out answers of the following research questions:

- What is the nature and methods of CCE adopted in secondary schools?
- How far the practices adopted for implementation of CCE in secondary schools are suitable?
- Is there any implication to nature of management of secondary schools in the implementation of CCE?
- What are the problems faced by the secondary schools in the implementation of CCE?
- What should be the guidelines for effective implementation of CCE in secondary schools?

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In order to find out the answers of the above questions, the study made a sincere effort to achieve the following objectives:

- 1) To study the nature and methods of CCE adopted in secondary schools.
- 2) To find out the suitability of CCE from the perception of students.
- 3) To make a comparative analysis of CCE adopted in private and government provincialised secondary schools.
- 4) To find out the problems in the maintenance of CCE in schools.
- 5) To suggest guidelines for future improvement in effective implementation of CCE in secondary schools.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Descriptive school survey method was used for collecting the pertinent data. The study attempted to describe and interpret the insights of the students and teachers in relation to the system of CCE existing in their schools.

(a) Population

The universe of the present study was defined as all the Secondary Schools of Lakhimpur District in Assam. The population also constituted of all the teachers and students of secondary schools of Lakhimpur District.

(b) Sample

Out of 89 Secondary Schools of Lakhimpur District, four schools were selected randomly including two government provincialised and private secondary schools each. All the teachers (88) and 124 students of class IX, i.e. 40% out of total 298 students of schools under investigation were selected randomly for data collection.

(c) Tools of the Study

In order to achieve the objectives of the present study, two questionnaires viz. "Evaluation System Questionnaire" and "Students' Response Questionnaire" and interview were developed and used for data collection.

(d) Statistical Techniques

The simple statistical techniques, i.e. frequency and percentage were used for analyzing data of the study.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

(i) Preparation of Academic Calendar

Almost all teachers (98%), i.e. 100% government and 96% private school teachers responded that their schools prepared academic calendar for every academic session which included academic activities of teaching and learning (93%), all types of tests and examination (73%), observation of days and divas (69%) and activities related to co-curricular aspect (67%); while very meager (2%) of them responded the same negatively.

95%, 66%, 53% and only 47% teachers of government provincialised schools revealed that academic calendar of their schools included academic activities of teaching and learning, observation of days and divas, all types of tests and examinations, and activities related to co-curricular aspect respectively. But in case of private schools, almost all teachers responded that academic activities of teaching and learning (92%), all types of tests and examinations (88%), activities related to co-curricular aspect (82%), and observation of days and divas (72%) were included in their academic calendar.

Table 1: Preparation of Academic Calendar in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

ESQ: Does your school prepare academic calendar for every academic year?	Govt. Provincialised School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes						
No	38	100	48	96	86	98
ESQ: If yes, which of the following aspects are included in the academic calendar?	00	Nil	02	04	02	02
(a) Academic activities of teaching-learning	36	95	46	92	82	93
(b) Activities related to co-curricular aspects	18	47	41	82	59	67
(c) All types of tests and examination	20	53	44	88	64	73
(d) Observation of Days and Divas	25	66	36	72	61	69
	N = 38		N = 50		N = 88	

Suitability of Academic Calendar Prepared

The suitability of the academic calendar prepared by the secondary schools was studied through the perception of students. The results analysed in Table 2 indicate that all the students (100%) revealed that their schools prepared academic calendar for the session which included academic activities of teaching and learning (97%), all types of tests and examinations (81%), observation of days and divas (73%), and activities related to co-curricular aspect (72%).

Table 2: Students' Response Towards the Preparation of Academic Calendar in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

SRQ: Did your school inform you about the academic calendar prepared for the session?	Govt. Provincialised School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	82	100	42	100	124	100
No	00	Nil	00	Nil	00	Nil
SRQ: If yes, which of the following aspects are included in the academic calendar?						
(a) Academic activities of teaching-learning	80	98	40	95	120	97
(b) Activities related to co-curricular aspects	57	70	32	76	89	72
(c) All types of tests and examination	65	79	36	86	101	81
(d) Observation of Days and Divas	60	73	30	71	90	73
	N = 82		N = 42		N = 124	

Similarly, 98%, 79%, 73% and 70% students of government provincialised schools and 97%, 81%, 73% and 72% students of private secondary schools responded that the academic calendar included academic activities of teaching and learning, all types of tests and examinations, observation of days and divas, and activities related to co-curricular aspect respectively.

(ii) School Based Evaluation System

Regarding adoption of school based evaluation most of the teachers (95%) revealed that their schools adopt a school based evaluation system in their own whereas only 5% did not reveal the same. Similarly, 95% teachers of government provincialised schools (GPSTs) and 96% of private school teachers (PSTs) responded that their schools adopt school based evaluation system.

Moreover, 93%, 79% and 52% of respondents revealed that the school based evaluation system is written type, oral type and activity based performance type respectively. A comparative analysis of data revealed that as many as 92% of GPSTs and 93% of PSTs responded that the school based evaluation system is written type; 58% GPSTs and 79% PSTs revealed it oral type; whereas only about one third GPSTs (32%) against majority of PSTs (52%) responded the same as activity based performance type.

Table 3: Adoption of School Based Evaluation in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

	Govt. Provincialised Schools		Private Schools		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
ESQ: Does your school adopt school based evaluation of its own?	36	95	48	96	84	95
- Yes	02	05	02	04	04	05
- No						
ESQ: If yes, is it?	35	92	47	94	82	93
(a) Written type	22	58	48	96	70	79
(b) Oral type	12	32	34	68	46	52
(c) Activity based performance type						

N = 38

N = 50

N = 88

Suitability of School Based Evaluation System

As regards the students' perception towards the school based evaluation system, majority of students, i.e. 78% and 62% appeared in written type and oral type examinations respectively, while only 35% of them appeared in activity based performance test in school based evaluation system.

Table 4: Students' Response towards the Types of Examination Appeared in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

Types of Examination	Govt. Prov. Schools		Private Schools		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1. SRQ: In which type of examinations did you appear?						
(a) Written type	60	73	37	88	97	78
(b) Oral type	42	51	35	83	77	62
(c) Activity based performance type	17	21	44	64	44	35

N=82

N = 42

N =124

Similarly, majority of the students of government schools, i.e. 73% and 51% and most of the students of private schools, i. e. 88% and 83% appeared in written type and oral type examinations respectively. But only 21% students of government schools and as many as 64% of private schools revealed that they appeared in activity based performance test in their schools.

(iii) Maintenance of Formative Evaluation System

As regards the formative evaluation system, most of them (92%) of both GPSTs and PSTs responded that they maintained formative evaluation system in their schools which included class test (90%), unit test (92%) and half yearly test (76%) as its components.

Table 5: Maintenance of Formative Evaluation in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

	Govt. Provincialised School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
ESQ: Do you maintain formative evaluation system in your school?						
- Yes	35	92	46	92	81	92
- No	03	08	04	08	07	08
ESQ: If yes, what are the components of formative evaluation of your school?						
(a) Class test	34	89	45	90	79	90
(b) Unit test	35	92	46	92	81	92
(c) Half yearly test	33	87	34	68	67	76
ESQ: Do you use sessional test for diagnostic purpose?						
- Yes	28	74	45	90	73	83
- No	10	26	05	10	15	17

ESQ: If yes, what type of follow up measures did you take for backward students?						
(a) Conducted remedial teaching	27	71	30	60	57	65
(b) Arranged tutorial class	22	58	33	66	55	63
(c) Provided incentives	25	66	36	72	61	69
	N=38	N= 50	N= 88			

Similarly, most of the GPSTs i.e. 89%, 92% and 87%, and PSTs i.e. 90%, 92% and 68% revealed that their schools conducted class test, unit test and half yearly tests, respectively as components of formative evaluation.

The study also made an attempt to find out the diagnostic purpose of sessional tests. The results analysed in Table 5 also indicate that most of the teachers (83%) used sessional tests in diagnostic purpose whereas 17% of them did not use the same. Moreover, majority of them, i.e. 69%, 65% and 63% provided incentives, conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial classes respectively for backward students as follow-up measures of sessional tests.

Similarly, as many as 90% of PSTs used sessional tests in diagnostic purpose, whereas about three fourth (74%) of GPSTs used the same in diagnostic purpose. Majority of the respondents, i.e. 71%, 58% and 66% GPSTs and 60%, 66% and 72% PSTs revealed that they conducted remedial teaching, arranged tutorial and provided incentives respectively for backward students as follow-up measures of sessional tests.

Suitability of Formative Evaluation System

Students' perceptions were considered to study the suitability of formative evaluation adopted in secondary schools. The results in Table 4.6 indicate that most of the students, i.e. 81%, 74% and 73% appeared in class tests, unit tests and half yearly examination respectively.

Similarly, majority of students of government schools, i.e. 73%, 63% and 63% revealed that they appeared in class tests, unit tests and half yearly examination respectively; while almost all students of private schools appeared in class tests (95%), unit tests (95%) and half yearly examination (93%).

Table 6: Suitability of Sessional of Examinations as Responded by Students of Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

SRQ: In which of the following sessional examinations/test did you appear?	Govt. Provincialised School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
(a) Class test	60	73	40	95	10	81
(b) Unit test	52	63	40	95	0	74
(c) Half yearly test	52	63	39	93	92	73
SRQ: On the basis of results of sessional test, did your teachers take following measures?					91	
(a) Conducted remedial teaching	32	39	23	55		44
(b) Arranged tutorial class	23	28	21	50	55	35
(c) Provided incentives	60	73	36	86	44	77
					96	
	N=82		= 42		N =124	

Moreover, 77%, 44% and 35% students revealed that their teachers provided incentives, conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial classes respectively as follow-up measures of sessional tests. Although majority of students of government schools (73%) and private schools (86) reported that they were provided incentives, but it is not very encouraging to observe that only 39% and 28% students of government schools reported that their teachers conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial to them respectively. However, as many as 55% and 50% students of private schools revealed that their teachers conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial classes respectively to them as follow-up measures of sessional tests.

(iv) NON-SCHOLASTIC ASPECT

Regarding non-scholastic aspect of CCE, teachers were asked to respond to a question of which results shown in Table 7 indicate that most of the teachers, i.e. 94%, 90%, 84%, 80%, 76% and 73% reported that apart from academic aspect, emphasis is given on participation in quiz, debating or other literary activities; games and sports; cultural activities; students' discipline; work education; and NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide respectively. It is discouraging to observe that only 38% teachers gave emphasis on participation on publication of school magazine.

A comparative analysis of data in Table 7 also shows that a good number of GPSTs, i.e. 92%, 97%, 95%, 97%, 50% and 79% as well as 64%, 98%, 76%, 84%, 90%, and 80% of PSTs revealed that they gave emphasis on participation in work education; quiz, debating or other literary activities; cultural activities; games and sports; activities of NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide; and students' discipline respectively. However, only 26% of GPSTs and as many as 46% PSTs gave emphasis on participation on publication of school magazine.

Table 7: Non-scholastic Aspects for Comprehensive Evaluation conducted in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

ESQ: Apart from academic aspect, emphasis is given on participation of which of the following aspects for :	Govt. Provincialised School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
(a) In work education	35	92	32	64	87	76
(b) In quiz, debating or other literary activities	34	97	49	98	83	94
(c) In cultural activities	36	95	38	76	74	84
(d) In publication of school magazine	10	26	23	46	33	38
(e) In games and sports	37	97	42	84	79	90
(f) In NSS, NCC, and scout & Guide	19	50	45	90	64	73
(g) Students' discipline	30	79	40	80	70	80
ESQ: Which of the following activities did you give as compulsory to students?						
(a) Home work (question-answer)	36	94	50	100	86	98
(b) Preparation and presentation of project	33	87	47	94	80	91
(c) Science or other exhibition	21	55	20	40	41	47
(d) Group discussion	27	71	46	94	74	84

N=38

N = 50

N = 88

The present study also revealed that 98%, 91%, 84% and 47% teachers reported that they gave home work (question-answer), preparation and presentation of project, science or other exhibition and group discussion respectively as compulsory activities to students.

Similarly, 94%, 87%, and 71% GPSTs and 100%, 94% and 94% PSTs provided home work (question-answer), preparation and presentation of project, and group discussion respectively as compulsory activities to their students. However, as many as 55% GPSTs provided science or other exhibition as compulsory, while only 40% PSTs provided the same as compulsory to their students.

SUITABILITY OF NON-SCHOLASTIC ASPECT

Suitability of non-scholastic aspect of CCE in secondary schools was studied through the perception of students as they participated in different co-curricular activities in their schools. The data analysed in Table 8 revealed that majority of the students i.e. 76%, 72%, 70% and 56% participated in games and sports, cultural activities, students' discipline, and literary activities like quiz, debating, etc. respectively; while 48%, 30% and merely 10% of them participated in work education, publication of school magazine, and NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide respectively.

Table 8: Suitability of Non-scholastic Aspects as Responded by Students of Government Provincialised

and Private Secondary Schools

SRQ: Apart from examinations, in which of the following activities did you participate in in your school?	Govt. Provincialised School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
(a) In work education						
(b) In quiz, debating or other literary activities	37	45	23	55	60	48
(c) In cultural activities	38	46	31	96	69	56
(d) In publication of school magazine	53	65	36	86	89	72
(e) In games and sports	18	22	45	45	37	30
(f) In NSS, NCC, and scout & Guide	56	68	90	90	94	76
(g) Students' discipline	13	16	00	00	13	10
SRQ: Which of the following activities did you give as compulsory to students?	53	65	34	81	87	70
(a) Home work (question-answer)						
(b) Preparation and presentation of project	36	44	36	86	72	58
(c) Science or other exhibition	29	35	29	69	58	47
(d) Group discussion	21	26	11	26	33	27
	12	17	21	50	33	27

N=82

N = 42

N = 124

A comparative analysis of data shows that majority of students of government provincialised schools participated in games and sports (68%), cultural activities (65%), and students' discipline (65%); while in case of private schools majority of them participated in quiz, debating or other literary activities (96%), games and sports (90%), cultural activities (86%), students' discipline (81%), and work education (55%). However, 16% students of government schools participated in the activities of NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide, while none of the students of private school participated in the same.

Moreover, 58%, 47%, 27% and 27% students reported that home work (question-answer), preparation and presentation of project, science exhibition or other exhibition and group discussion respectively were given by their teachers as compulsory activities.

Similarly, less than half of the students of government schools, i.e. 44%, 35%, 26%, and 17% revealed that they were given home work (question-answer), preparation and presentation of project, science or other exhibition, and group discussion respectively; while majority of the students of private schools revealed that home work (question-answer) (86%), preparation and presentation of project (69%), group discussion (50%), science or other exhibition (26%) were given as compulsory activities by their teachers.

(v) STUDENTS' UNDERSTANDING

As to regards the teachers' opinion towards students' understanding of their teaching, the results in Table 9 show that most of the teachers (83%) thought that students could understand of their teaching as expected, while 17 % did not thought the same. A comparative analysis of the same also revealed that 82% of GPSTs and 84% PSTs thought that their students could understand their teaching as expected, while as many as 18% of GPSTs and 16% of PSTs did not thought the same.

Table 9: Understanding of Students on Teaching in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

ESQ: Do you think that students could understand of your teaching as expected?	Govt. Provincialised School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
- Yes						
- No	31	82	42	84	73	83
	07	18	08	16	15	17

N=38

N = 50

N = 88

(vi) MARKING OR GRADING SYSTEM

As regards the marking or grading system adopted in evaluation, most of the teachers, i.e. 92% GPSTs and 94% PSTs (Table 10) revealed that marking system is adopted in evaluation of academic aspect in their schools, while non-academic (co-curricular) aspect is evaluated by adopting grading system as revealed by 47% GPSTs and 72% PSTs.

Table 10: Marking or Grading System Adopted in Different Aspects of Examination in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

ESQ: Which of the following system does your school adopt in examination? (a) Academic aspects (b) Non-academic aspect (co-curricular aspect)	Govt. Provincialised Schools				Private Schools			
	Marking		Grading		Marking		Grading	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
(a) Academic aspects	35	92	01	03	47	94	00	00
(b) Non-academic aspect	02	05	18	47	04	08	36	72

N=38

N = 50

SUITABILITY MARKING OR GRADING SYSTEM

Table 11: Suitability of Marking or Grading System Adopted in Different Aspects of Examination in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

SRQ: Which of the following system does your school provide in examination? (a) Academic aspects (b) Non-academic aspect (co-curricular aspect)	Govt. Provincialised Schools				Private Schools			
	Marking		Grading		Marking		Grading	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
(a) Academic aspects	60	73	00	00	38	90	00	00
(b) Non-academic aspect	60	73	00	00	38	90	02	05

N=82

N = 42

Students' perception towards adoption of marking or grading system in evaluation was used to find out its suitability. Most of the students, i.e. 73% students of government schools and 90% of private schools (Table 11) revealed that their schools provide marks in evaluation of both academic and non-academic (co-curricular) aspects.

(vii) SATISFACTION ABOUT EXISTING SYSTEM OF EXAMINATION AND EVALUATION

Secondary school teachers were asked a question "Are you satisfied with the present system of examination and evaluation?" The responses analysed in Table 12 indicate that majority of teachers (73%) were satisfied with the present system of examination and evaluation while as many as 27% of them did not satisfy with the same.

Table 12: Satisfaction of Teachers with the Present System of Examination and Evaluation in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

ESQ: Are you satisfied with the present system of examination and evaluation? - Yes - No	Govt. Prov. School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
	26	68	38	76	64	73
- Yes	12	32	12	24	24	27
- No						

N=38

N = 50

N = 88

Similarly, majority of teachers, i.e. 68% GPSTs and 76% PSTs were satisfied with the present system of examination and evaluation while as many as 32% and 24% of GPSTs and PSTs respectively did not satisfy with the same.

(viii) MAINTENANCE OF CUMULATIVE RECORD CARDS

Regarding the cumulative record cards, the results in Table 13 indicated that a good number of teachers (91%) maintained cumulative record card of students in their schools while 9% of them did not maintained the same. Similarly, 84% GPSTs and the highest 96% PSTs responded that they maintained cumulative record cards in their schools.

Table 13: Cumulative Record Maintained in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

ESQ: Does your school maintain cumulative card?	Govt. Prov. School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
- Yes	32	84	48	96	80	91
- No	06	16	02	04	08	09
	N=38		N = 50		N = 88	

SUITABILITY OF CUMULATIVE RECORD CARDS

The students of secondary schools were asked a question pertaining to the suitability of cumulative record cards. The results in Table 14 indicated that most of the students (90%) revealed that they were provided cumulative record cards, while 10% of them did not reveal the same. Similarly, most of the students, i.e. 87% of GPSTs and 95% of PSTs revealed that they were provided the cumulative record cards by their schools.

Table 14: Suitability of Cumulative Record Maintained in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

SRQ: Does your school provide cumulative record card to you?	Govt. Prov. School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
- Yes	71	87	40	94	111	90
- No	11	13	02	05	13	10
	N=82		N = 42		N= 124	

(ix) PROBLEMS OF MAINTAINING CCE

One of the main objectives of the study was to find out the problems faced by secondary schools in maintaining and adopting CCE. In order to achieve this objective, data were collected from the teachers of secondary schools. The results in Table 15 show that 30%, 29%, 26%, 23%, 22%, 17% and merely 5% teachers of secondary schools faced problems in maintaining CCE in their schools were lacking infrastructure facilities and teaching materials, lacking seriousness among students, large number of students in class, costly to maintain all the activities, lacking adequate training of teachers, time consuming, and increased volume of workload respectively.

Table 15: Problems Faced in Maintaining CCE in Government Provincialised and Private Secondary Schools

ESQ: Which of the following problems did you face in maintaining CCE in your schools?	Govt. Prov. School		Private School		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
(a) Large number of students in class	07	18	25	50	32	26
(b) Lack of adequate training	23	61	04	08	27	22
(c) Lack of seriousness among the students	34	89	02	04	36	29
(d) Costly to maintain all the activities	16	42	13	26	29	23
(e) Time consuming	09	24	13	26	22	17
(f) Lack of infrastructure and teaching materials	31	82	06	12	37	30
(g) Increased volume of work load	02	05	04	08	06	05
	N=38		N = 50		N = 88	

A comparative analysis of data shows that more GPSTs faced problems than PSTs. As many as 89%, 82%, 61% and 42% of GPSTs faced problems of lacking seriousness among the students, lacking infrastructure facilities and teaching materials, lacking adequate training of teachers, and costly to maintain

all the activities of CCE respectively. Only 24%, 18% and merely 5% faced problems of time consuming, large number of students in class respectively. On the otherhand, half of the PSTs (50%) faced problem of large number of students in class; whereas only 26%, 12%, 8% and merely 4% of them revealed the problems of costly to maintain all the activities and time consuming, lacking infrastructure facilities and teaching materials, lacking adequate training of teachers and increased volume of workload, and lacking seriousness among the students respectively in maintaining CCE in their schools.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the present study derived from the analysis of data were as follows:

1. Almost all of the schools (98%) prepared academic calendar for every academic session which included academic activities of teaching and learning (93%), all types of tests and examination (73%), observation of days and divas (69%) and activities related to co-curricular aspect (67%).
2. Both the government provincialised (100%) and private secondary schools (96%) prepared academic calendar for every academic session.
3. 95%, 66%, 53% and only 47% teachers of government provincialised schools revealed that academic calendar of their schools included academic activities of teaching and learning, observation of days and divas, all types of tests and examinations, and activities related to co-curricular aspect respectively. But in case of private schools, almost all teachers responded that academic activities of teaching and learning (92%), all types of tests and examinations (88%), activities related to co-curricular aspect (82%), and observation of days and divas (72%), were included in the academic calendar of their schools.
4. All the students (100%) revealed that their schools prepared academic calendar for the session which included academic activities of teaching and learning (97%), all types of tests and examinations (81%), observation of days and divas (73%), and activities related to co-curricular aspect (22%).
5. Most of the students, i.e. 98%, 79%, 73% and 70% students of government provincialised schools and 97%, 81%, 73% and 72% students of private secondary schools responded that the academic calendar included academic activities of teaching and learning, all types of tests and examinations, observation of days and divas, and activities related to co-curricular aspect respectively.
6. Most of the teachers (95%) revealed that their schools adopt a school based evaluation system in their own which was incorporated by 95% teachers of government provincialised schools and 96% of private school teachers.
7. Most of the teachers, i.e. 93%, 79% and 52% of respondents revealed that this system is written type, oral type and activity based performance type respectively.
8. As many as 92% of GPSTs and 93% of PSTs responded that the school based evaluation system is written type; 58% GPSTs and 79% PSTs revealed it oral type; whereas only about one third GPSTs (32%) against majority of PSTs (52%) responded the same as activity based performance type.
9. Majority of students, i.e. 78% and 62% appeared in written and oral type tests respectively, while only 35% of them appeared in activity based performance test in school based evaluation system.
10. Majority of the students of government schools, i.e. 73% and 51% and most of the students of private schools, i. e. 88% and 83% appeared in written type and oral type examinations respectively, whereas only 21% students of government schools and as many as 64% of private schools revealed that they appeared in activity based performance test in their schools.
11. Most of them (92%) of both GPSTs and PSTs responded that they maintained formative evaluation system in their schools which included class test (90%), unit test (92%) and half yearly test (76%).
12. Most of the GPSTs i.e. 89%, 92% and 87%, and PSTs i.e. 90%, 92% and 68% revealed that their schools conducted class test, unit test and half yearly tests, respectively as components of formative evaluation.
13. Most of the GPSTs i.e. 89%, 92% and 87%, and PSTs i.e. 90%, 92% and 68% revealed that their schools conducted class test, unit test and half yearly tests, respectively as components of formative evaluation.
14. Most of the teachers (83%) used sessional tests in diagnostic purpose whereas 17% of them did not use the same. Majority of them, i.e. 69%, 65% and 63% provided incentives, conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial classes respectively for backward students as follow-up measures of sessional tests.
15. Another finding of the study is that 90% of PSTs used sessional tests in diagnostic purpose, whereas about three fourth (74%) of GPSTs used the same in diagnostic purpose.

16. Majority of the respondents, i.e. 71%, 58% and 66% GPSTs and 60%, 66% and 72% PSTs revealed that they conducted remedial teaching, arranged tutorial and provided incentives respectively for backward students as follow-up measures of sessional tests.
17. Most of the students, i.e. 81%, 74% and 73% appeared in class tests, unit tests and half yearly examination respectively.
18. Majority of students of government schools, i.e. 73%, 63% and 63% revealed that they appeared in class tests, unit tests and half yearly examination respectively; while almost all students of private schools appeared in class tests (95%), unit tests (95%) and half yearly examination (93%).
19. It is found that 77%, 44% and 35% students revealed that their teachers provided incentives, conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial classes respectively as follow-up measures of sessional tests.
20. Although majority of students of government schools (73%) and private schools (86) reported that they were provided incentives, but it is not very encouraging to find that only 39% and 28% students of government schools conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial to them respectively. As many as 55% and 50% students of private schools revealed that their teachers conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial classes respectively to them as follow-up measures of sessional tests.
21. Most of the teachers, i.e. 94%, 90%, 84%, 80%, 76% and 73% reported that apart from academic aspect, emphasis is given on participation in quiz, debating or other literary activities; games and sports; cultural activities; students' discipline; work education; and NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide respectively.
22. A good number of GPSTs, i.e. 92%, 97%, 95%, 97%, 50% and 79% as well as 64%, 98%, 76%, 84%, 90%, and 80% of PSTs revealed that they gave emphasis on participation in work education; quiz, debating or other literary activities; cultural activities; games and sports; activities of NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide; and students' discipline respectively.
23. It was also found that that 98%, 91%, 84% and 47% teachers gave home work (question-answer), preparation and presentation of project, science or other exhibition and group discussion respectively as compulsory activities to students.
23. 94%, 87%, and 71% GPSTs and 100%, 94% and 94% PSTs provided home work (question-answer), preparation and presentation of project, and group discussion respectively as compulsory activities to their students
22. Majority of the students i.e. 76%, 72%, 70% and 56% participated in games and sports, cultural activities, students' discipline, and literary activities like quiz, debating, etc. respectively; while 48%, 30% and merely 10% of them participated in work education, publication of school magazine, and NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide respectively.
23. Majority of students of government provincialised schools participated in games and sports (68%), cultural activities (65%), and students' discipline (65%); while in case of private schools majority of them participated in quiz, debating or other literary activities (96%), games and sports (90%), cultural activities (86%), students' discipline (81%), and work education (55%).
24. It was found that 58%, 47%, 27% and 27% students were given home work (question-answer), preparation and presentation of project, science exhibition or other exhibition and group discussion respectively by their teachers as compulsory activities.
25. Less than half of the students of government schools, i.e. 44%, 35%, 26%, and 17% revealed that they were given home work (question-answer), preparation and presentation of project, science or other exhibition, and group discussion respectively; while majority of the students of private schools revealed that home work (question-answer) (86%), preparation and presentation of project (69%), group discussion (50%), science or other exhibition (26%) were given as compulsory activities by their teachers.
26. Most of the teachers (83%) thought that students could understand of their teaching as expected, while 17 % did not thought the same.
27. A good number teachers, i.e. 82% of GPSTs and 84% PSTs thought that their students could understand their teaching as expected, while as many as 18% of GPSTs and 16% of PSTs did not thought the same
28. 82% of GPSTs and 84% PSTs thought that their students could understand their teaching as expected, while as many as 18% of GPSTs and 16% of PSTs did not thought the same.
29. Most of the teachers, i.e. 92% GPSTs and 94% PSTs revealed that marking system is adopted in evaluation of academic aspect in their schools, while non-academic (co-curricular) aspect is evaluated by adopting grading system as revealed by 47% GPSTs and 72% PSTs.
30. Most of the students, i.e. 73% of government schools and 90% of private schools revealed that their schools provide marks in evaluation of both academic and non-academic (co-curricular) aspects.

31. Majority of teachers (73%) were satisfied with the present system of examination and evaluation while as many as 27% of them did not satisfy with the same.
32. Majority of teachers, i.e. 68% GPSTs and 76% PSTs were satisfied with the present system of examination and evaluation while as many as 32% and 24% of GPSTs and PSTs respectively did not satisfy with the same.
33. A good number of teachers (91%) maintained cumulative record card of students in their schools. Similarly, 84% GPSTs and the highest 96% PSTs responded that they maintained cumulative record cards in their schools.
34. Most of the students (90%) revealed that they were provided cumulative record cards. Similarly, most of the students, i.e. 87% of GPSTs and 95% of PSTs revealed that they were provided the cumulative record cards by their schools.
35. 30%, 29%, 26%, 23%, 22%, 17% and merely 5% teachers of secondary schools faced problems in maintaining CCE in their schools were lacking infrastructure facilities and teaching materials, lacking seriousness among students, large number of students in class, costly to maintain all the activities, lacking adequate training of teachers, time consuming, and increased volume of workload respectively.
36. As many as 89%, 82%, 61% and 42% of GPSTs faced problems of lacking seriousness among the students, lacking infrastructure facilities and teaching materials, lacking adequate training of teachers, and costly to maintain all the activities of CCE respectively. Only 24%, 18% and merely 5% faced problems of time consuming, large number of students in class respectively.
37. Half of the PSTs (50%) faced problem of large number of students in class; whereas only 26%, 12%, 8% and merely 4% of them revealed that it was found costly to maintain all the activities and time consuming, lacking infrastructure facilities and teaching materials, lacking adequate training of teachers and increased volume of workload, and lacking seriousness among the students respectively in maintaining CCE in their schools.

OBSERVATION AND DISCUSSION

The analysis and interpretation of data helps the investigator to make a critical discussion of the results of the study. This section presets a detail discussion of the nature and strategies of the CCE adopted in secondary schools. The observation and discussion also attempted to compare the data and possible causes of differences found between the government provincialised schools and private secondary schools. Almost all of the schools (98%) prepared academic calendar for every academic session which included academic activities of teaching and learning (93%), all types of tests and examination (73%), observation of days and divas (69%) and activities related to co-curricular aspect (67%). The preparation of academic calendar may help the schools to organize all the activities of curricular and co-curricular aspects systematically and timely for the all round development of the students. Of course, co-curricular aspect in private schools (82%) is given more importance than government provincialised (47%) as revealed by their teachers. This may be due to the reason that the private secondary schools are more serious than government provincialised schools in case of students' all round development. On other hand, Bhattacharjee and Sarma (2009) revealed that co-scholastic part of the curriculum was totally ignored in the school programme.

A school based evaluation system provides flexibility to teachers of secondary schools to make the evaluation system effective and need based. Most of the teachers both GPSTs (95%) and PSTs (96%) revealed that their schools adopt school based evaluation system which is written type (93%), oral type (79%) and activity based performance type (52%). But compared to government provincialised schools (32%), private schools (52%) give more emphasis on activity based performance in their school based evaluation system as revealed by their teachers. This fact is also incorporated by the perception of the students where only 21% students of government schools vis-à-vis 64% of private schools revealed that they appeared in activity based performance test in their schools.

The results analysed above (Table 4.5) also revealed that almost all the secondary schools, both government provincialised and private schools maintained formative evaluation with the components of class test (90%), unit test (92%) and half yearly test (76%). In tune with the teachers, most of the students also responded that they appeared in class tests (81%), unit tests (74%) and half yearly examination (73%). It is very significant to observe that as many as 83% teachers used sessional tests in diagnostic purpose and majority of them provided incentives (69%), conducted remedial teaching (65%) and arranged tutorial classes (63%) for backward students as follow-up measures of sessional tests. Although majority of students of government schools (73%) and private schools (86) reported that they were provided incentives, but it is not very encouraging to observe that only 39% and 28% students of government schools reported that their

teachers conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial to them respectively. But in case of private schools, as many as 55% and 50% students revealed that their teachers conducted remedial teaching and arranged tutorial classes respectively to them as follow-up measures of sessional tests. Prakash and Bhalla (1996) in their paper also focused upon in-built scope for diagnostic and remedial measures of CCE.

Non-scholastic aspect is an important part of CCE. It is encouraging to observe that secondary schools under study both government and private schools gave emphasis on participation in non-scholastic aspects i.e. quiz, debating or other literary activities (94%); games and sports (90%); cultural activities (84%); students' discipline (80%); work education (76%); and NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide (73%) respectively. It is discouraging to observe that only 38% teachers gave emphasis on participation on publication of school magazine. But perception of students towards participation in work education (48%), publication of school magazine (30%), and NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide (10%) were not in tune with the findings responses of teachers which is a matter of concern for the schools. It is very interesting to note that only 16% students of government schools participated in the activities of NSS, NCC, Scout & Guide, while none of the students of private school participated in the same. The study of Natarajan and Kulshrestha (1983) revealed that teachers do not attempt to assess the non-scholastic abilities for various reasons like they are not clearly observed, they develop slowly and become visible only after a long time, it is difficult to assign quantitative values to them and are not very clearly defined.

Most of the teachers of government provincialised schools (92%) and private schools (94%) revealed that marking system was adopted in evaluation of academic aspect in their schools, while non-academic (co-curricular) aspect was evaluated by adopting grading system as revealed by 47% GPSTs and 72% PSTs. Mead (1992) in his study found that grading student work is a neglected subject and it appeared to be a distasteful and marginalized teacher activity. Moreover, although majority of teachers (73%) were satisfied with the present system of examination and evaluation but as many as 27% of them did not satisfy with the same which may be a matter of concern for rethinking on examination and evaluation adopted in secondary schools in Assam.

The results of the study show that secondary schools faced several problems in maintaining and adopting CCE. The teachers of the schools under study revealed that main problems of maintaining CCE were lacking infrastructure facilities and teaching materials (30%), lacking seriousness among students (29%), large number of students in class (26%), costly to maintain all the activities (23%), lacking adequate training of teachers (22%), time consuming (17%), and increased volume of workload (5%). All these problems should be kept in mind while planning the programme of action for implementing CCE in secondary schools.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

On the basis of the above findings, conclusions of the study may be drawn that secondary schools of Lakhimpur Education Block prepared academic calendar for every academic session in which entire activities of both curricular and co-curricular activities were given due importance. Almost all the schools adopt a school based evaluation system in written and oral types, but activity based performance was not given due place in it. Although participation in games & sports, cultural activities, literary activities and students' discipline were found to be followed in these schools, but other non-scholastic aspects related to work education, physical education and social development were not found. Neither marking nor grading systems were adopted systematically to evaluate the non-academic aspects. No systematic criteria based system was found in evaluating the non-scholastic aspects. The non-scholastic aspects were found to be more suitable in private schools than government provincialised schools as revealed by the students. Compared to private schools, government provincialised secondary schools were found to have more problems like lacking seriousness among the students, lacking infrastructure facilities and teaching materials, lacking adequate training of teachers, and costly to maintain all the activities of CCE. Hence, teachers should be trained properly on how to conduct the activities maintained properly all the records of CCE. All the activities of non-scholastic aspect should be given due weightage and proper criteria based formative evaluation system should be adopted so as to evaluate the non-scholastic aspect systematically.

REFERENCES:

- Akhtar, R. P. (1980). *A Critical study if the semester system in selected Universities in India*, Ph.D. thesis, Baroda: CASE, The M. S. University of Baroda.
- Best, John W. *Research in Education*, New Delhi, Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited, 1977.
- Bhattacharjee, A. and Sarma, N. (2009). *Status of Co-Scholastic Activities in the School Programme of the Elementary Schools, Assam, India*. Retrived January 6, 2011 from <http://www.aiaer.net/ejournal/vol22110/8.pdf>.
- Buch, M.B. Ed, *Fourth Survey of Research in Education*, Vol. II, New Delhi, 1983-88.
- CBSE (2009). *Teachers. Manual on Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation*. pp.1-10, Retrived January 4, 2011 from http://cbse.nic.in/cce/cce-manual/initial_pages.pdf.
- Koul, L. (1984). *Methodology of Educational Research*. Vikash Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Malhotra, M. M., Menon, P. N., Bedi, S. P. and Tulsi, P. K. (1989). *Status study of internal assessment of students in the polytechnics of Haryana*. In M. B. Buch (ed.), (1988). *Fifth survey of Educational Research*, New Delhi: NCERT.
- NCERT (2005). *National Curriculum Framework*. New Delhi.
- Natarajan, V. and Kulshrestha, S.P. 1983. *Assessment of Non-scholastic Aspects of learners' behaviour*. Independent Study. Association of Indian University.
- Patel, A. (1978). *A Critical Study of the Present Scheme of Semester System and Evaluation Procedure at the B.Ed. and M.Ed. Program in the Faculty of Education and Psychology of The M. S. University of Baroda*, Baroda: CASE, The M. S. University of Baroda.
- Prasad, S. (2001). *A Study on the Attitude of B.Ed. Students of the M.S. University towards Internal Assessment*, Baroda: CASE, The M. S. University of Baroda.
- Rao Manjula, P. (2001). *Effectiveness of the Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation Training Programme over the Evaluation Practices of Primary School Teachers*. A DPEP Research Study in Tamilnadu, RIE, Mysore.
- RTE. (2009). Right to education. <https://mhrd.gov.in/rte>
- Singhal, P. 2012. Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation: A Study of Teachers Perception. Delhi Business Review X Vol. 13, No. 1 (January - June 2012).