Analysis of Evaluation System in different Departments at the College of Education

Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

MESSERET ASSEFA*

Abstract

Evaluation is the use of systematic gathering of information to learn about teaching and learning process. Addis Ababa University is moving from a summative to a continuous evaluation system. This study is an attempt to assess the extent to which the teachers adhere to continuous evaluation system in the University. The empirical basis of the study is a questionnaire-based investigation among the University teachers. The samples consist of forty teachers from different departments of College of Education, Addis Ababa University. The study also make an effort to compare the scores obtained by the students who were subjected to summative evaluation in 2005 and continuous evaluation during the first semester of 2006 which was completed in January 2006. The present paper elaborates about the background, objectives, methodology, sample and results of the study.

Background of the Study

Evaluation is a data gathering process to determine the worth or value of the instruction, its strengths and weakness. The identified strengths and weaknesses are used to revise the instruction to improve its effectiveness. It is conducted by collecting data about the instruction from variety of sources, using a variety of data gathering methods and tools. Tessemer (1993) argues that evaluation can be continuous or summative. Continuous evaluation is a judgement of the strengths and weaknesses of instruction in its developing stages, for purposes of revising the instruction to improve its effectiveness.

The higher education system in Ethiopia followed a summative evaluation system – an evaluation given at the end of the semester. This practice existed for the past four decades. Now, there is a discussion to change the evaluation system. The Ministry of

* *Assistant Professor of Education*, Addis Ababa University, Teacher Education and Curriculum Department, Ethiopia, P.O. Box 33993.

Education is in favour of introducing a continuous evaluation system. At the request of the Ministry of Education Addis Ababa University is planning to change the evaluation system from summative to continuous evaluation. It is expected that this transition will improve the teaching learning process.

The transition from summative to continuous evaluation system is seen in a phased manner. The teachers will be trained in continuous evaluation and then these teachers will be required to introduce continuous evaluation in their respective departments. As an initial step a higher diploma programme (HDP) was introduced to train university teachers in continuous evaluation. College of education was selected as a pilot case for introducing continuous evaluation in the University.

The higher diploma programme training was carried out largely on-the-job and emphasised the key elements of the role of continuous evaluation required in the college of education. This higher diploma programme started in 2004 September. A batch of 40 teachers selected from 14 departments of the college of education completed the programme in June 2005. They are expected to introduce continuous evaluation system in their respective departments of the college of education from September 2005 onwards.

It is felt that all departments for various reasons are not effectively implementing the new evaluation system. This study is an attempt to assess the progress in implementing continuous evaluation in all departments of college of education.

Statement of the Study

There exist differences in evaluation system followed by HDP trained teachers in different departments at the college of education, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

Objectives of the Study

- To analysis the evaluation system followed by college of education, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- To analysis of reasons for following the selected evaluation system by departments, College of Education Addis Ababa Ethiopia.
- To compare the scores of the same cohort of students who were subjected to summative evaluation in 2005 and continuous evaluation in 2006.
- To analyse the linkage between curriculum materials and the evaluation systems at College of Education, Addis Ababa Ethiopia.
- To Suggest recommendation for implementation of continuous evaluation system at college of education

Methodology of the Study

The methodology adopted involved four steps. First, an analysis of the role of evaluation system in higher education was analysed through review of relevant literature on evaluation system and a review of evaluation system followed in college of education in Ethiopia.

In the second step, an analysis of perception of teachers for following the selected evaluation system by departments, class size,autonomy in choosing the appropriate evaluation, teaching load, and training of teachers

was carried out by reviewing documents and from the information collected from teachers through questionnaires.

In the third step, an analysis of the curriculum materials and their linkage with the evaluation systems was analysed from information collected from the teachers through questionnaires.

In the fourth step, a comparison of the students' scores of the same cohort of students who were subjected to summative evaluation in 2004 and continuous evaluation in 2005 was made in order to see the effects of the evaluation system towards the students' performance.

Finally, the study summarizes the major findings of the study and also discusses recommendations that may help solve the major problems and indicates the lessons learned from the research.

Sample of the Study

The higher diploma programme was introduced in 2005. Forty teachers from different departments of College of Education were selected for this training programme. They are the first group of teachers selected to implement continuous evaluation in the University. The study administered questionnaires to all these 40 teachers. The questionnaire sought their views and opinions on continuous evaluation and its implementations in the departments they represent.

Furthermore, the study collected scores obtained by the students who were subjected to summative evaluation in 2004 and to continuous evaluation during the first semester of 2005 which is completed in January 2006. This is the latest data on evaluation scores available in the University. Given the time constraint, only two departments were selected for collection of data.

These two departments are selected on the basis of the largest number of teachers participated in the training programme. The departments which sent 3 teachers to the training programme are 1. Biology; 2. Chemistry; 3. Sport; 4 English; and 5. Mathematics. Among these departments, Mathematics from Science education and Geography education are selected. In total, the scores of 104 students from the II and III semesters are collected for analysis.

Review of Related Literature

Continuous and Summative Evaluation – A comparison

In one sense evaluation is about understanding and reflecting on a particular set of activities. Oliver argues that there is no single definition of evaluation. (Oliver, 2003), however he states that evaluation is a process of making judgements about the worth (costs and values) of something. Furthermore, he argues that evaluation can also be used in the context of descriptive studies, intervention studies (e.g. continuous evaluation), empirical research, monitoring and quality assurance processes.

Phillips (2000) on the other hand argues that as human beings we naturally ask questions about how useful and how valuable our activities are. We can think of evaluation as a process of considerably sharpening this natural activity of checking on our ongoing work.

A more formal definition is to think of evaluation as providing information to make decisions about the product or process. Further, in relation to the importance of evaluation and research, he stated that evaluation is not equivalent to research, although it employs research techniques as a means of generating the necessary information, and uses similar criteria for the reliability and validity to judge the quality of the evidence and that evaluation tends to be broader than research, as it usually requires information about a range of situations, products and processes. However, the main similarity between evaluation and research is that evaluation also involves making judgements about the value of what is being evaluated. He further states that in one sense evaluation in an educational setting is the process whereby we seek evidence that the learning experiences we have designed for students are effective. He believes that we evaluate educational activities for two overlapping reasons:

(a) To obtain information that can inform the ongoing design and development process (often referred to as continuous evaluation);
(b) To decide whether an innovation is worth retaining (often referred to as summative evaluation). These forms of evaluation often hold together, and each can be difficult to undertake properly.

Evaluation is the process of delineation, obtaining, providing, and applying descriptive and judgmental information about the merit and worth of some object's goals, design, implementation, and outcomes to guide improvement decisions, provide accountability reports, inform institutionalisation dissemination decisions, and improve understanding of the involved phenomena.

His concept of evaluation deals with context, input, process, and product (CIPP) model. It deals with the four salient aims of evaluation that is (a) guiding decision (b) accountability (c) informing the out come, and (d) developing understanding of the findings.

Continuous Evaluation and Student Performance

Over the last 30 years, a number of empirical studies have shown that continuously evaluating instructional materials has resulted in revised instruction that produces statistically significant increases in student performance over the original, unevaluated versions of the instruction (Nathenson and Henderson, 1980). These improvements have been reported on all types of instruction. Even the use of a single learner for and evaluation has resulted in improved materials. Thus, there is evidence that using continuous evaluation can improve the learning effectiveness of instructional materials.

Can continuous evaluation make instruction more motivation or interesting and effective? Historically, most continuous evaluation studies have measured student performance gains and ignored measures of student attitude or acceptance (or instructor attitude/ acceptance!). However, evaluators have used both experts and students to evaluate the interest and acceptability of instruction to its users, and have

obtained suggestions on how to revise instruction to meet these goals (Flagg, 1990, Nathenson and Henderson, (1980). Certainly, continuous evaluation can be used to obtain criticisms and suggestions on the interest/ motivation of the instruction to its users.

Markle (1979) has indicated that continuous evaluation should be conducted for the life time of the instructional product. Markle suggests that the idea of summative evaluation should be abandoned in product evaluation, since summative evaluation implies that the product is some how finished and no longer in need of revision. Instead, evaluation should always be done with an eye toward product improvement, even after the instruction has been distributed in the market place.

When comparing continuous and summative evaluation, continuous evaluation is needed if understanding and learning by doing concerns arise in a classroom practice. Otherwise we lose an interest in teaching if we do not give the student a chance to practice different approach in the teaching-learning activities. Continuous evaluation need not be an isolated step or stage of an instruction. Geis (1986), dick (1977) and Braden (1992) have suggested that

Difference between Continuous and Summative Evaluation

Continuous Evaluation	*Summative Evaluation*
1. Quick diagnostic that helps students reflect on the class and gives the teacher immediate feedback.	1. Identify the problem of the students at the end of the semester programme.
2. Students working collaboratively in groups on questions or projects in and out of class.	2. The students are doing individually during teaching-learning process.
3. Process evaluation where feed back is provided and shaping the programme in an explicit goal.	3. More general evaluation of the extent to which the better product have been obtained the complete lesson.
4. Conducted during the development or improvement of a programme or product.	4. Conducted after the learning or instruction has taken place.
5. Conducted with a small group of people to examine different aspects of instructional materials.	5. Conducted with a large group of people to examine different aspects of instructional materials.
6. Adjusting the whole learning pattern into manageable units.	6. Stresses more on the wider capability expressed by the concept construct and interpret.
7. Continuous evaluation quizzes are achievement tests over a particular topic of learning.	7. Summative tests are achievement tests over a number of units of learning.
8. A judgement of the strengths and weaknesses of teaching-learning process.	8. Mostly concerned for grading purpose and qualification.

Source: w.w.w//*jan.ucc.nau.edu*

continuous evaluation can be applied to every step of the design process; that continuous evaluation is a common thread that can be woven through the fabric of the entire design process. For example, a design expert could evaluate the objectives or strategies created in the design stage. An instructor could review activities done in the analysis stage; determining the instruction will solve the defined problem, if the task analysis is accurate, and if key environmental variables have been defined. Whenever there is a design decision or plan made, continuous evaluation can be used. In our current situation in college of education continuous evaluation has an important place thus, we have to move from traditional summative way of evaluation to progressive continuous evaluation method because from experience and researches, we know that it is practical and help full in introducing the practical environment. So far, we have seen that evaluation in general and continuous and summative evaluation in particular plays a great role in enhancing students' performance.

Continuous Evaluation: An analysis of Teachers' Perceptions

This section deals with presentation, analysis, interpretation and discussion of the data collected through questionnaire. The respondents of this study are Forty College of education teachers those who have completed the higher diploma training programme in the year 2005, which oriented them to use continuous evaluation system. A questionnaire was prepared and administered to the respondents with its part seeking personal information. Accordingly, based on the responses obtained from the sample teachers with reference to their background information, some major characteristics of them are presented as under.

Characteristics of Teachers

As shown in table I, All the teacher respondents are 100% males because no females were participated in 2005 HDP training. When we see their qualification 2.5% of the respondents were holding Ph.D and 96, 5% of them were holding M.A degree. By their teaching experience 22.5% teachers have served from 1 to 5 years, 32.40% teachers have served 6 to 10 years, 27.5% of the teachers have served 11 to 15 years, 2.5% of the teachers have served from 16 to 20 years, 12.5% of the teachers have served 21 to 25 years and 2.5% have served 26 to 30 years out side college of education respectively. Whereas, 15% of the teachers have served 1 to 5 years, 40% have served 6 to 10 years, 32.5% have served 11 to 15 years, 5% have served 16 to 20 years, 2.5% have served 21-25 years and 5% of them have served 26-30 years respectively inside college of education. Regarding teaching load, 22.5% teachers teach between 1 to 9 periods per week, 50% of the teachers teach between 10 to 12 periods per week, 12.5% teachers teach 13 to 15 periods per week, 15% teachers teach 15 to 20 periods per week.

Concerning class size, from the investigator's work experience all of the teachers, i.e. 100% are found to teach more than 50 students per classroom in their respective departments. In addition to this, 62.5% teachers were reported to be from main campus and 37.5%

TABLE 1
Characteristics of Teacher Respondents by Sex, Qualification, Teaching Experience, Teaching Load and Place of Work

	Respondents (%)	
Sex		
Male	100	
Qualifications		
M.A.	97.5	
Ph.D	2.5	
	Teaching Experience (%)	
Years	Outside College of Education (%)	Inside College of Education (%)
1-5	22.5	15
6-10	32.4	40
11-15	27.5	32.5
16-20	2.5	5
21-25	12.5	2.5
26-30	2.5	5
Teaching Load in Hours		
1-9		22.5
10-12		50
13-15		12.5
15-20		15
Place of Work		
Main Campus		62.5
Science Campus		37.5

teachers were from Science education. Thus, as presented in the table 1, even though the majority of the respondents on their current positions limited on their long years of total services together with their limited services as current positions. One could say that they were the right persons to share their views in support of this study.

Results and Discussions

The percentage for teacher perception, class size, teaching load, curriculum, teacher'training and students' performance were computed and the results are presented below.

As could be observed from table 2 level of perception to use continuous evaluation seems to have been fully met. On further enquiry the majority of the respondents (90.5%) reported that the level of perception of continuous evaluation is very high that they favoured continuous evaluation as an appropriate

TABLE 2
Teachers Perception on the Appropriateness of the Evaluation System (in percentage)

Items	*Very High*	*Low*
1. Level of perception to use continuous evaluation	90.5	9.5
2. The teachers prefer summative evaluation than continuous	11.5	88.5

evaluation system. Where as 9.5% of the respondents regard low perception. Teachers' responses to the question indicated that teacher prefer summative evaluation than continuous evaluation. On further enquiry only 11.5% teachers' responded positively very high whereas 88.5% of them have low regard.

Hence, from this result, we can conclude that teachers in the study have shown a clear preference for continuous evaluation to summative evaluation. It has been underlined by many scholars that the main objectives of continuous evaluation are to enable the learners acquire knowledge; develop skill and attitude to fit to the existing society. This objective can be attained only if the students efficiently learn the contents to be learned at different levels of education. The one and the most important means to attain this aim is the continuous evaluation method used by teachers in the teaching-learning process. Nonetheless this suggests that successful use of continuous evaluation is determined by the presence of certain appearances. It should, however, be noted that unless teachers are aware of these conditions and have the skills essential to plan and manage continuous evaluation, its resistance to the students performance is unavoidable prodigious. The teacher is the most significant factor in determining success of a new material. Teachers' perception and their abilities to adjust to new thinking and what it involves in real terms are critical decisive.

TABLE 3
Reasons for using Continuous Evaluation Method (In percentage)

Items	*Very High*	*Low*
Better performance	97	3
Well-informed on the progress of students	95	5
Systematic possibility of getting feed back	94	6

In table 3, the respondents indicated the reasons for using continuous evaluation method in the college of education particularly they have made high level of agreement on the better performance (97%), well-informed on the progress of the students (95%) and systematic possibility of getting feed back (94%). The significant point of reference are more in favour of teachers with high level of perception towards the reaons for using continuous evaluation method than for teachers with low level of attitude. This shows that from the HDP training they have got the necessary training about continuous evaluation and truly they have seen from their classroom practice the importance of continuous evaluation than the

summative one. For example, in table 9 and 10, the Geography students who were subjected to continuous evaluation method perform better than Mathematics students and definitely this students' performance will convince the teachers of the evaluation method who were using summative evaluation through time. However, selecting appropriate evaluation method is an important part of the planning process. Teachers must make it come alive for their students.

All these points make clear that improving continuous evaluation is a difficult enterprise. Some teachers will resist attempts to change for change is threatening. However, feedback has been shown to improve teaching learing process in which it offers each student specific guidance on strengths and weakness. Hence, the way in which continuous evaluation results are revealed back to students is a critical aspect of feed back to students which should not be an overall mark, but pointing out their own strengths and weaknesses, together with the means and possibility to work with this substantiation to overcome problems. While it may also be essential to have a syllabus, such a test cannot be of much value for continuous evaluation process. To this effect, under certain conditions, teachers can play a useful role in this effort, specifically, their mission of promoting collabotaion and co-operation within and across departments can be used by enhancing his or her own efforts; the capacity building role is especially important, since it contributes to building and supporting the very components of collaboration and co-operation which are important determinants of quality within an individual department.

TABLE 4
The difficulties Encountered in using Continuous Evaluation Method

Item	*Very High*	*Low*
Class size reduce the effect of continuous evaluation	90	10

Table 4 shows that most of the teachers (90%) seem to have positive attitude towards the responses to the questionnaire on the effect of class size in using continuous evaluation system. While 10% of them regard low perception towards class size.

It seems logical – smaller class sizes would allow for greater individual attention by the teacher. As to archive information, smaller class students substantially outperformed larger class students on both standardized (Stanford Achievement Test and Curriculum-based Skills Test). This was true for white and minority students in smaller classes and for smaller class students from inner city, urban, sub-urban, and rural schools. (March, 1999).

- The positive achievement effect of smaller classes on minority students was double that of the majority students initially, and then was about the same.
- A smaller proportion of students in the smaller classes was retained in-grade, and there was more early identification of students' special educational needs.

Furthermore, many of the respondents seem frustrated by the large

number of students they teach. It's not a secret that the fewer students you have in a classroom, the more individual attention a teacher can give to his students. Too many students in a crowded room cause problems. Since class size is a major constraint to introduce continuous evaluation. It is important that the Addis Ababa University explore possibilities of revising norms regarding class size and strictly adhere the norm. Reducing class size request more teachers to be employed which, is very difficult to the financial health of the University. This situation lies in finding a right balance between adjusting the class size and appointment of new teachers.

TABLE 5
Perception of Teachers about Autonomy in Choosing the Appropriate Evaluation System (in percentages)

Item	*Very High*	*Low*
Choosing the appropriate evaluation system	95	5

The item in table 5 is devised to draw information regarding the teachers' autonomy whether they have right in choosing their own evaluation system or not. Thus as can be seen in the above table, the majority of the respondents (95%) of them have autonomy to choose their own evaluation system whereas 5% of them have low understanding. Every teacher has a unique set of personal practice, background, mode of training, teaching skills and personality traits that make him or her more comfortable and effective with certain evaluation system than others. That is why the majority of the teachers preferred to use continuous evaluation to summative evaluation. But this choice doesn't mean that they practice it systematically.

College of education should adopt and practice continuous evaluation system that link their educational contributions closely with improved centre of excellence to produce quality teachers and to use for Ethiopia in general as well. For it is in the capital and other regional schools that the job is most difficult, the schools then are most in need of transformed schools, and it is in these neighborhood schools that the evaluator can choose to undertake his exceptional role of being a vehicle for change and transformation. Proponents of educational reform advocate change, improvement and restructuring of schools, could be the environments that create wonderful opportunities for evaluators to maintain a critical stance toward theory, research practice and social policy.

Nonetheless, there are evidences where teacher' likes and dislikes, together with their experience, have a bearing on the method of evaluation they use. This is partly related to their philosophy, style and value system but also to their past experiences and their confidence in using new and often less controllable methods (Knott and Mutunga, 1995).

One can apparently understand that teachers tend to select the evaluation method that have proved most successful in the past and that makes them feel most comfortable. This means people naturally resist to change or new innovation as it upsets them and makes

TABLE 6
Perception of Teachers related to Curriculum Materials (in percentages)

Items	*Very High*	*High*	*Low*
1. Problems of inadequacy in the preparation of training materials	97	0	3
2. Encourage teachers to enhance their knowledge and skills through continuous evaluation	0	10	90
3. Adequate activities and exercises in the training materials to practice	0	10	90
4. Training material emphasizes the use of summative evaluation system	82.5	0	17.5

them feel not confident. Inline with this view, Hutchinson and Torres (1994) argued that, the fundamental problem of change is that it disturbs the framework of meanings by which we make sense of the world. It challenges, and thereby potentially threatens the values, attitudes, and beliefs that enable us to make experience meaningful and predictable.

The items under Table 6 were devised in order to get the respondents' views about the curriculum material impact on the continuous or summative evaluation system. Out of the respondents, 97% strongly feel that there is a problem of inadequacy in the training material while 3% of them were arguing that there is no problem of inadequacy. With regard to item 2, 10% of the respondents support that it encourages to use continuous evaluation, but the majority of the respondents (90%) says that the training material doesn't encourage or prepare them to use continuous evaluation method. For item 3, 10% of the respondents said the training material has adequate exercises and activities. While the majority of the respondents 90% were saying there is no adequate exercise and activities in the teaching material.

82.5% of the respondents under item 4 emphasise the use of summative evaluation method while 17.5% were of the opinion that it doesn't help much. Thus, in reference to the above results we must improve what is needed for example, the syllabus of a teaching material is a plan for the course. The plan typically includes the goals and or the rational for the teaching material, topics covered, resources used, assignments given, and evaluation strategies recommended. In general it represents the ends and means of the course. Thus, unless otherwise this has to be controlled, improved and geared in line with the standard the quality of education will deteriorate. And the teaching forces who were executing the teaching material in the classroom will lose hope.

Furthermore, due emphasis is also given to whether the curricular materials developed for the college of education

makes the teachers not to use continuous evaluation methods dominantly.Therefore, the teachers are of the opinion that they do not use the continuous evaluation method frequently as the syllabi, the students' textbooks and the teachers' guides of the subject matters they teach are poorly organised. It is true that the content of the curriculum has an impact on the implementation of continuous evaluation method. Further, the curricular materials enforce the teachers to use the summative evaluation dominantly. This is because the materials are very vast, too difficult to understand easily and effectively, chunk in nature and at the same time not activity-oriented.

This shows that, the teachers believe that inappropriateness of the curricular materials prepared for the student teacher for college of education is one of the factors that intimidate them to use continuous evaluation. Therefore, most of the respondents believe that even if the college of education teachers wants to employ the continuous evaluation system, they could not do so as the curricular materials (syllabi and student textbooks) do not invite such teaching approaches. The teaching materials should be prepared in light of continuous evaluation to the level.So that, students can always do and answer certain questions–about the task's purpose, the resources needed to carry it out, what it means to do the task well. They can grasp what is essential about the task, set priorities, and make intelligent judgements. Ideally, this is true not only at the level of a particular assignment, but also when applied to all the courses in a curriculum, taken together. However, the literature on education indicates that adopting new materials or techniques may not guarantee its implementation. That is, curriculum innovation may fail to do well in attaining its objectives. It is mainly stated that, putting a new curriculum in place does not mean that a change in classroom behaviour will occur. It should, therefore, be stressed that any set of techniques, no matter how good it is need to be executed in practice.

TABLE 7
Perception of Teachers related to Teaching Load (in percentages)

Item	*Very High*	*Low*
Impact of teaching load in using continuous Evaluation	95	5

Table 7 was intended for finding out the respondents' belief that whether teaching load has an impact in the application of continuous evaluation or not in their respective classrooms. 95% of the respondents gave high response indicating their beliefs that teaching load is a hindrance to apply continuous evaluation method. While 5% of the respondents said teaching load is not the cause for not using continuous evaluation method. Nontheless, teaching load is one of the factors that may enforce teachers to use or not to use a particular evaluation method. Because, teachers do not get sufficient time to prepare activity-based lessons so as to apply the continuous evaluation method in most cases. Hence, the teaching load must be balanced in order to get engaged in the teachers within the expected method of evaluation.

Furthermore, to cross-check the responses given by the informants' regarding teaching loads, Table 1 shows that 15% of the respondents only teach more than 15-20 periods but 72.5% of them were teaching less or equivalent to the average college teachers' teaching loads.

However, reducing class size does not necessarily reduce the teacher's workload, if a teacher is assigned to teach more classes because the number of students in each class is reduced , the teacher spends more time teaching and has no small number of students but this still implies either that teachers teach all year or that more teachers get employed. The common understanding is that small class size allows teachers to increase the time devoted to each student, either individually or in smaller groups, and thereby improve the quality of the students' achievement. If this feeling is true, successful class size reduction programmes will have to attend to the impact on teachers' workloads.

One should be able to conclude from the information presented above that teaching load is fairly evenly distributed across departments, contrary to perceptions that might exist. There may be teachers who are working apparently more or less than the averages presented here, but not whole college of education.

Therefore, in order to alleviate the problem a teaching load policy has to be introduced to recognise the many and varied teaching activities in which college of education staff members are engaged, to recognise and reduce significant disparities in teaching loads through a process that emphasises teaching load considerations in departmental planning activities, and to ensure fairness across and within departments at the college education level.

TABLE 8
Perception of Teachers related to Training (in Percentages)

Item	*High*	*Low*
HDP is adequate enough in order to equip you to the necessary evaluation system.	37	63

Table 8 of the teachers' questionnaire was intended to find out the respondents' beliefs about the training programme. Out of the respondents, 37% of them said yes it was very adequate and helpful for our work, and 63% of them were in a position that the higher diploma programme was not adequate enough to equip them for the necessary expected teaching-learning process they were under taking.

Without practicing the evaluation method it is difficult to judge and to expect a big change in a short period of time. Through time, definitely they will see a difference if they were using continuous evaluation method properly and frequently by enriching their classroom creativity and sharing ideas within the department and among departments colleague.

One expected that the more the training advanced the greater the percentage of teachers who would report on the influence of the materials learned on their work in the classroom. However, the success of the educational process depends to a great extent on the character and ability of teachers. Currently, teaching is more than imparting knowledge. It includes helping

learners to learn by themselves, to acquire skills and to develop attitudes in the changing social context. To this end, the mode of training that teachers get in HDP plays a vital role.

However, lack of training is also quite a significant factor that makes the teachers use the summative evaluation frequently in the teaching-learning process. Besides, the respondents were asked so as to check whether lack of training makes them use the summative evaluation method in most cases at the expense of continuous evaluation. But the surprise here is that even after the training some of the teachers were not using continuous evaluation. This shows that for change one has to be convinced both intrinsically and extrinsically.

Furthermore, education in Ethiopian context must assist in shaping students to be able of making studies into practical knowledge through continuous evaluation system. In order to train teachers to manage an educational environment, which will enable them to change information to practical and transferable knowledge, the only possible way is to train the teaching force in HDP as a supportive environment. The college of education must also revise the HDP training and keep a follow up through a tracer study and do more than just to build a supportive environment for a teacher which trains them mainly to access and deal with information.

Continuous evaluation serves to strengthen students' sense of their own personality over the content. Through their work they become good on one aspect of a problem, and learn to collaborate with other students in the exchange of important facts. Table 9 deals with the comparison between Mathematics and Geography students who were subjected to summative and continuous evaluation in 2005, I and II semeesters and 2006, I semester to continuous evaluation.

Students Achievement

Introduction

The performance of the same cohort of Mathematics and Geography students who were subjected to summative evaluation in 2005, I and II semesters and continuous evaluation 2006, I semester is summarised in the following tables.

Out of 53 Mathematics students who were taught in summative evaluation 26.42% students showed an

TABLE 9
Comparison of the Scores of Mathematics Students Related to Summative and Continuous Evaluation

Subjected to Summative Evaluation 2005, I and II Semesters			*Subjected to Continuous Evaluation 2006, I Semester*	
No of Students	*Achievement improved in the II Semester*	*Achievement Decreased in the II Semester*	*Achievement improved in 2006 I Semester*	*Achievement Decreased in 2006 I Semester*
53	26.42%	73.58%	18.86%	81.14%

improvement in their semester grade average. However, 73.58% students didn't improve in their result. When we see the results of Mathematics of the same cohort of students who were subjected to continuous evaluation method in the year 2006 I semester 18.86% students were improved in their semester result while 81.13% students didn't show any improvement at all. From this, we can simply infer that the teachers were not in a position to use continuous evaluation properly either in summative or in continuous evaluation. Student results are deteriorating; it doesn't show any pace of development. This is because, some of the teachers were not using continuous evaluation regularly or properly as per their training. Then there is no surprise for the students varied result.

Yet, there is no theoretical formula that has factually stood the test of time.Hence, it is all the more urgent and essential to consider how students should be best prepared and take on multiple and new roles in their respective society. Thus, teachers have to be trained to the appropriate evaluation and been fully familiar with the notion of learning in successive stages–training in which the use of new technology should make a useful contribution in order to cope up with the order of the day.

Out of 51 students, 45.09% of them showed an improvement in their performance. And 54.81% of them didn't improve their results. While those who were taught by continuous evaluation method in 2006, semester I 60.78% of them showed an improvement in their semester grade average but 39.22% of them didn't improve their performance. Geography students who were taught in continuous evaluation improved than the Mathematics students who were subjected to continuous evaluation. Unless they use continuous evaluation method properly the results will remain even worse than this, there must be a conviction and a dedication from both the teachers and the students side other wise it is difficult to bring the expected result.

In the light of this, one can therefore draw certain implications as regards continuous evaluation practice of teachers of the above type. The above responses imply that such teachers have healthy reliance on the teacher's role as source of knowledge and as an all knowing person who should play decisive

TABLE 10
Comparison of the Scores of Geography Students related to Summative and Continuous Evaluation

Subjected to Summative Evaluation 2005, I and II Semesters			*Subjected to Continuous Evaluation 2006, I Semester*	
No of Students	*Achievement improved in the II Semester*	*Achievement Decreased in the II Semester*	*Achievement improved in 2006 I Semester*	*Achievement Decreased in 2006 I Semester*
51	45.09%	54.81%	60.78%	39.22%

roles in the learners' learning process. Clearly speaking such attitudes and assumptions are far from being helpful for implementing continuous evaluation system.

This would seem to indicate the fact that teachers in the study have more or less clear views about what kinds of evaluation are desirable in their respective departments and the factors influencing selection and application of evaluation methods. On the other hand they are able to realise the impact of continuous as well as summative evaluation method on Mathematics and Geography students' performance.

Further, when we compare the result of 2005 – I and II semesters summative evaluation and 2006 I semester continuous evaluation result, those students who were taught in continuous evaluation results are far better than those who were taught in summative evaluation method. This shows us that teachers were using continuous evaluation system properly. Furthermore, it is a signal that the success of the training already had an effect on their work in their way of thinking when preparing lessons, in relating the material with other materials and in better understanding of the needs of their students. But as per the result of the students still an effort is needed from the teachers' side to fully apply their training capacity.

From continuous evaluation point of view, learners construct meaning from experience and interaction with others, and the teacher's role is to provide meaningful experience for students. Further more, students come to the classroom with ideas, beliefs and opinions that need to be altered or modified by a teacher who facilitates this alteration by devising tasks and questions that create problem for students. Where as from the summative point of view Rugg and Shumaker (1969) argue that guided by rote and routine, the students mind is submitted to the grindstone of educational discipline which for ever dwarfs his capacity to think for himself, which dulls his interest, in gleaming, pulsing life.

These authorities assert that the key concept in the open or progressive development of the student is

Progressive	*Traditional*
Teacher as guide to educational experience	Teacher as distributor of knowledge
Active pupil role	Passive pupil role
Pupil participate in curriculum planning	Pupil have no say to curriculum planning
Learning predominated by discovery techniques	Accent on memory, practice and rote
External rewards and punishment not necessary	External rewards and punishment used
Not too concerned with conventional academic concerns	Concerned with academic standards
Little testing	Regular testing

Accent on cooperative group work	Accent on computation
Teaching not confined to classroom base	Teaching confined to classroom base
Accent on creative expression	Little emphasis on creative expression
Cognitive and affective domains given equal emphasis	Cognitive domain emphasised, affective is neglected
Process is valued	Little attention paid to process

Source: Brandes and Ginnis (1986)

individualisation. Comparing the two (the new and the old), Rugg and Shumaker (1969) contend that the old maintained silence as the ideal school room atmosphere whereas the new school removes the ban from speech, encourages communication as a vehicle for social understanding and personal development. Brandes and Ginnis (1986) have cited Bennet (1976) who contrasted the progressive approach and the traditional one as follows.

Most of the authorities of the new or progressive view showed the overwhelming effectiveness of this approach over the old/traditional summative evaluation method.

When we see the score of the students in continuous and summative evaluation we can see a variation of results. The, teachers were expected to incorporate students' primary point of reference. Thus, the teacher can encourage students to be able to use examples and references from their experiences. Students can also be asked to seek clarification. Encouraging students understanding and relating such ideas to the students' own sphere of interests, concerns and problems is the third classroom technique for utilising the above main strategy (Borich, 1988). Student self-evaluation can be achieved by providing opportunity for students to reason out their own answers. Still there is room for other students and the teacher to suggest for necessary alternations or amendments.

In general, class size reduction, impact of curriculum, teaching load and lack of training have an impact on the students' achievement. With regards class size, Ferguson (1991) Using data from more than 800 districts containing more than 2.4 million students, found significant relationships among teacher training, class size, and student achievement. Using student/teacher ratio as a measure of class size, Ferguson found that student achievement fell as the student/teacher ratio increased for every student above an 18 to 1 ratio. Further, he measures teacher quality (that is, teacher literacy skills and professional experience) were even more strongly related to higher student scores. It can be concluded that the impact of class size should be given due attention in order to help the students to learn better as intended. However, a considerable commitment of funds and its implementation can have a sizable impact on the availability of trained teachers. Strengthening teacher quality also leads to higher student achievement. Depending on how it is done, the benefits

of class size reduction will be larger or smaller. To bring change with continuous evaluation in the students' achievement all in the system must develop a sense of ownership.

Summary and Conclusions

The central objective of this research was to analyse some of the factors attributing to students evaluation system at college of education, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. To attain this objective the following question were posed: Appropriate evaluation system, a chance of choosing an evaluation system, curriculum material, teaching load and training of teachers were considered.

To answer the above general basic question out of 12 departments found at the college of education five departments were selected. Bases for selecting the departments are in reference to the teachers' participation in the training programme that is departments which sent three teachers to the training programme. The departments which nominated three teachers for training are: 1. Biology, 2. Chemistry, 3. Sport, 4.Geography and 5.Mathematics. Among these departments, Mathematics from Science education and Geography education were selected. Further, the study also included a comparison between the scores obtained by the students who were subjected to summative evaluation in 2005 and to continuous evaluation during the first semester of 2006 which is completed in January 2006.This is the latest data on evaluation scores available in the University. In total the scores of 53 teachers from Mathematics education department and 51 from Geography education department in their, I and II semesters in 2005 and I semester in 2006 were analysed.

Given the time constraint, information collected from two selected departments. To gather the necessary data a questionnaire containing 27 items was administered to the sampled teachers. Document analysis, and observation were incorporated to substantiate the data obtained using the close-ended items of the questionnaire. Finally, after analysing and interpreting the data, the following outcomes were reached at.

- It has been found that the majority of the respondents teaching at College of education use continuous evaluation as an appropriate evaluation method because, all of the respondents had the higher diploma training that provided training in the use of continuous evaluation system.
- Regarding the impact of class size teachers are still using summative evaluation frequently due to the large number of students they teach. Since class size is a major constraint to introduce continuous evaluation, it is important that the Addis Ababa University explores possibilities of revising norms regarding class size and strictly adheres to the norm.
- Regarding curriculum materials on the teachers' choice and application of continuous evaluation method. The teachers reported that the teaching materials prepared for college of education is inadequate

in the preparation of training material, the teaching materials doesn't encourage teachers to use continuous evaluation, no adequate activities and exercises are included in the material rather the teaching material content emphasise the use of summative evaluation method.

- The research findings revealed that there are a serious shortage of teaching materials in the college of education and this inadequacy compelled some of the teachers select and apply summative evaluation most of the time, the study further showed that there is inadequacy of facilities.
- Fisher (1994) claims that now a days academic life is becoming increasingly stressful. And among the factors which make teachers stressful are the workloads they have or the time pressure that is put on them in schools. In a similar fashion, in this study it was found that teaching load to some extent intimidate College of education teachers to use continuous evaluation method.
- As per to Knott and Mutunga (1995), teachers' likes and dislikes together with their experience have a bearing on the method they use. To this end, however, it was found that the impact of teachers' preference in choosing and applying the summative evaluation has been insignificant.
- The research finding indicates that some of the factors that deter the teachers to use continuous evaluation are class size, lack of facilities and teaching loads. From this we can see the impact of summative evaluation to Mathematics and Geography students performance. Relatively the Geography students' who were taught by continuous evaluation method, the students' performance are better than Mathematics students. This will lead to the assumption that Geography teachers performed better than Mathematics teachers.
- The mode of training that teachers get in higher diploma programme plays a vital role. Thus, the training and its impact in the teaching-learning process at college of education assisting learners to learn by themselves, to acquire skills and to develop attitudes in the changing social context.

The final conclusion that can be drawn from the study is that it is difficult to introduce reform confining to selected areas only. The reform should be comprehensive. For example, introduction of continuous evaluation should be accompanied by changes in the curriculum, teaching methods and material and class size (along with the teachers' perception about class size). Unless these changes are not seen together, the efforts in one selected area may not lead to visible changes.

REFERENCES

Archived Information. 1999. *Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know?*

Arends, R.I. 1997. *Classroom Instruction and Management.* Mc Graw-Hill Inc., New York.

Baker. E.L. and U.C. Alkin. 1973. *Formative Evaluation of Instructional Development*, Audio Visual Communication Review.

Borich, L.S. 1988. *Effective Teaching Methods.* Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.

Braden, R. 1992. "Formative Evaluation: A Revised Descriptive Theory and A Perspective Model", A paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for Educational Communications Technology, Washington D.C.

Brands, D. and P. Gunnies. 1986. *A Guide to Student Centred Learning.* Basil Black Well Ltd., Great Britain.

Bruce, Anne. 1995. "SCET Contact: The Development of National Bulletin Board Service for Schools–Results and Evaluation of a Pilot Project in Scotland Covering Secondary Schools", A paper presented to the Open Classroom Conference, Oslo (September 95), International Council for Distance Education.

Cambre, M. 1981. *Historical Overview of Formative Evaluation of Instrucional Media Products*, ECTJ.

Chauhan, S.S. 1996. *Advanced Educational Psychology* (6th revised ed.). Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

Chelimsky, E. and W.R. Shadish (eds.). 1997. *Evaluation for the 21st Century: A Handbook*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Dick, W. 1977. "Applications for Formative Evaluation to the Instructional Design Process", Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Dubin, F. and E. Olshtain. 1986. *Course Design: Developing Programmes and Materials for Language Learning.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

Eggen, P.D. and D.P. Kauchak. 1996. *Strategies for Teachers: Teaching Context and Thinking Skills* (3rd Edition). Allyn Bacon, London.

Ferguson, Ronald F. 1991. "Paying for Public Education: New Evidence on How and Why Money Matters", *Harvard Journal on Legislation*, 28(2).

Fisher, B. 1990. *Formative Evaluation for Educational Technologies.* Lawrence Erlbaum, San Francisco.

Gage, N.L. 1976. *The Psychology of Teaching Methods*, Chicago

Geis, G. 1996. "Student Input in the Materials Development", Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association. The University of Chicago Press, San Francisco.

Kelleghan, T. et al. 2003. *International Handbook of Educational Evaluation.* Kluwer Academi Publishers, London,

Knott, M. and P. Mutunga. 1995. 'Methods of Teaching and Learning' in Matiru, B. Mwangi, A. and Schlette R. (eds.) *Teach you are Best: A Handbook for University Lecturers.* Witzenhausen Institute for Socio-cultural Studies.

Lowe, A., W. Thurson and S. Brown. 1983. *Clinical Approach to Formative Evaluation in Performance and Instruction.*

MARKEL S.M. 1989. *The Ancient History of Formative Evaluation in Performance and Instruction*. August.

NATHENSON, M.B. and E.S. HENDERSON. 1980. *Using Student Feedback to Improve Learning Materials*. Croom Helm, London.

OLIVER, M. and G. CONOLE. 2000. Assessing and Enhancing Quality Using Toolkits, *Journal of Quality Assurance in Education*.

PHILLIPS, R. (ed.). 2000. *Handbook of Learning-centred Evaluation of Computer Affiliated Learning Projects in Higher Education*, Murdoch University.

RUGG, H. and A. SHUMAKE. 1969. *The Child-centred School*. Arno Press and The New York Times, New York.

SCRIVEN. 1991. in jan.ucc.nau.edu.

SHINN, M.R. and S. BAMONTO. 1998. "Advanced Applications of Curriculum Based Measurement: Big Ideas and Avoiding Confusion" in M.R. SHINN (ed.) *Advanced Applications of Curriculum-based Measurement* . The Guilford Press, New York.

SCRIVEN, M. 1967. "The Methodology of Evaluation" in R. TYLOR, R. GAGNE and M. SCIVEN (eds.) *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*. Rand Mc Nally, Chicago.

TESSMER, M. and J. WEDMAN. 1992. "The Practices of Instructional Design: A Survey of What Designers Do, Don't Do and Why They Don't Do It?" Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

TESSMER, M. 1993. *Planning and Conducting Formative Evaluations*, Kogan Page, London.

TOM HUTCHINSON and EUNICE TORRES. 1994. *ELT Journal* 1994, 48(4), 315-328. Oxford University Press.

TYLER, R.W. 1942. General Statement on Evaluation, in *Journal of Educational Research*.

VEEN WIM. 1995. "Telematic Experiences in European Classrooms: Overview and Evaluation", A paper presented to the open classroom.

WELCH A. SANDRA. 1995. "What Stimulated the Rapid Growth of Distance Learning in the USA". A paper presented to the Open Classroom Conference, Oslo (September, 95) International Council for Distance Education.

WESTON MC ALPINE and BORDONORO. 1995. in jan.ucc.nau.edu.

WILLIAMS, J. 1983. *Formative Evaluation in Instructional Design: Theory versus Practice*, Doctoral Dissertation at Northern Illinois University De Kalb Illinois.

www.// jan.ucc.nau.edu/edtech 2006.

ZEMEKE. 1985. *The Systems Approach, A Nice Theory but in Training* Oct., pp.103-08.