

## EXAMINATION REFORMS – A CASE STUDY OF TEACHER EDUCATION OFFERED THROUGH DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION UNIVERSITY OF KASHMIR

Dr Nahid Ruhee\*  
Showkat Rashid Wani \*

### ABSTRACT

*Examination is necessary to assess the minimum level of competency achieved by the student after completion of a particular course .Its effectiveness therefore depends upon the dissemination of knowledge by teachers and its assimilation by the students. The transnational character of education in the wake of globalization expects it to be the instrument of bringing social , cultural and economic transformation of society .Hence the need to make it fit to stand the test of time becomes pertinent. Educationists , policy makers , teachers need to put their endeavour toward revamping the system and prepare model ensuring validity, reliability and objectivity in the examination system and help student realizing the educational attainments in its true sense . In the past few decades the examination system in the universities has received vehement criticism for being inadequate to address the changing needs and priorities. The deficiencies in the system requires a revamping with the objective of not only ameliorating the standard of examination but also make it effective and efficient to assess the knowledge and skills of the student with high degree of objectivity. The present paper highlights the examination challenges in offering Teacher Education through Directorate of Distance Education University of Kashmir and the modus operandi to tackle these challenges .*

**Keywords:** Examination reforms, Distance Education, Results

### Introduction

The B. Ed programme is offered through

- a) Faculty of Education, University of Kashmir
  - b) Govt. College of Education, M.A. Road
  - c) Private B. Ed Colleges
  - d) Directorate of Distance Education, University of Kashmir
- First issue is no uniform Academic Calendar is followed in completing the admission formalities for the above listed four institutions. It has a direct impact on the conduct part of B. Ed examinations. Two or three B. Ed examinations with different sessions in the same year are conducted which strains the University exchequer.
  - Extending of admission dates beyond the prescribed limit has a negative impact on the conduct of B. Ed examinations.
  - Once the date sheet is notified, student start agitating and university is in news which clouds our accountability towards the society.

---

\* Associate Professor Directorate of Distance University of Kashmir Education.

\* Assistant Professor Directorate of Distance Education University of Kashmir

- Notification of date sheet within four or five days before commencement of examinations gives student a less breathing time for preparation.
- Gap of one day between papers is also not practically feasible because mostly Adult learners/in-service teachers with age above 40 are enrolled for B. Ed (Govt Deputees).
- Objection list regarding completing of Registration formalities is communicated to us at the time of examination, which puts the student of Leh/kargil to a great trouble.
- No single unique identity/enrollment number is allotted to student. Colleges/ Department allots one enrollment number; examination Roll No. is different and if the student is reappear in some paper, he is allotted different Roll No, so a single student carries three different identification Roll Numbers.
- Postponing the examinations has a de-motivating impact on the hard working students. Once the date sheet is notified and student download admit cards they travel from far-flung areas like Kishtwar, Tangdar, Gurez, Leh/kargil arrange accommodation for appearing in the examination. All of a sudden when they hear about examination being postponed they feel frustrated and a degree which should complete in one year is completed in two years. This uncertainty leads to psychological depression and enhances the chances of dropout among the students. If the student-support-services is strengthened student will go as good ambassadors, and we shall sustain in this competitive environment.
- After the declaration of the result (main Gazette), office of the Controller of the Examination issues subsequent notifications in continuation to the main gazette. This process continues for years together. For example notification No. 47 of B.Ed October 2011 was issued on May 03,2013.This process breeds unhealthy practices . There is a solution for it .After the declaration of main gazette seven days should be kept for the registration of post-examination –related –grievances. After screening the grievances a single notification should be issued and the process closed .
- **The solution is:**
  - a) Centralized admission policy should be followed in letter and spirit
  - b) Mode of admission may be kept flexible as per the philosophy of the system (a) Formal (b) Non-formal.
  - c) Date of admission and date of closing of admission should be same for all the four institutions.
  - d) Date sheet of examination for all the four institutions should be same.
  - e) Internal examination should be made subjective while external examination should be made objective on the analogy of NET/SET keeping in view the huge enrollment of students.
  - f) A committee should be constituted, inviting the beneficiaries from grass-root level, so that a mechanism is evolved for Examination reforms.

### **Examination Reforms**

#### **Justification for introduction of objectivity in the examination system**

##### **I. Case Study 1st**

(42,6); (44,18); (52,17); (60,18); TGE (44,17); THS 944,18); PED (61,14)

In this case, the examiner has awarded 6 marks in sessionals, while passing marks are 08. When the examiner was approached, he said that due to oversight he awarded 6 marks instead of 16. The Tabulation Wing declined to change the result. She had to wait for one complete year. She had to submit the examination form afresh and re-appear in the theory and Sessionals of paper 1<sup>st</sup>.

## II. Case study 2<sup>nd</sup>

(44,17),(44,19);(55,18); (62,17); TGE (49,18); TBS (66,0); PED (63,17)

In this case the candidate has been shown 'zero' marks in sessionals in Teaching of Bio-science, while as he has secured 66 marks in the theory. A look at the above reflected marks sheet shows that in all other six papers, candidates has 17 marks and above out of 20 in all sessionals, while he is getting zero in Teaching of Bio-science. After investigating the factual position, the examiner of Bio-science, had poorly handled the sessional papers of candidates and lost the sessional paper of above mentioned candidate. The attendance register, showed that candidate has attended all the classes in the paper where he was marked zero. Now next year he was supposed to submit the examination form and re-appear in theory and sessionals. But due to lack of proper guidance rather misguidance he was told that he had to reappear only in sessionals of Bioscience while his theory marks in TBS shall remain intact and she does not need to submit the examination form. This exercise cost him one more year and she completed the one year degree in three years.

## III. Case Study 3<sup>rd</sup>

(44,16); (47,18); (49,17); (52,16); TUR (44,NA);THS (46,17);PED (48,16)

In this case, the students had opted for Teaching of English (TGE) at the time of admission, but later during contact classes he changed his language paper to Teaching of Urdu. The liaison officer did not communicate the Directorate on time about the change of optional paper. The Registration return (RR) forms were sent to the registration section, without any change. The directorate also did not float the RR details of the candidates on the website to invite queries /feedback before sending the details to the Registration section. While compiling the awards his marks were placed under the 'Teaching of English (TGE) column instead of Teaching of Urdu (TUR) column. This put the student in a great trouble.

## IV. Case Study 4<sup>th</sup>

(42,17);(44,16); (61,17);TGE (49,18);THS (31,19); PED (44,19)

In this case the candidate is failing in THS by just one mark. The pass marks are 32 out of 80. While investigating the case, it appeared that the teacher due to additional assignments had dropped the confidential sack filled with answer scripts of Teaching of History (THS) at one of the homes of Research scholars. There were three sacks filled with 1500 answers scripts and the assignment letter to the examiner reflected that the deadline for completing the job is ten days. The Research scholar without any experience failed the candidates with one or two marks. The examiner without looking at the entries, in the award roll prepared by Research scholar signed the award Roll, and submitted the bill in his name.

**V. Case Study 5<sup>th</sup>**

(32,19);(29,19);(28,19);(33,19);TGE (32,19),THS (34,19), PED (40,19)

If we look closely at Theory and Sessional marks, we see that the coefficient of variation is high between Theory and sessional marks. The coefficient of correlation was worked out between Theory & Sessionals for 500 paper and result was-0.671

**VI. Case Study 6<sup>th</sup>**

(32,19);(34,18);(28,17);(35,18);TGE (29,17),THS (34,17), PED (64,17)

The candidate was shown re-appear in Teaching of English (TGE) and paper III, because the passing marks are 32. He was eligible for submitting the re-evaluation form and deposit Rs.1000 as re-evaluation fee. When the re-evaluation result was declared he jumped from mere 28 marks in paper III to 55 marks and in Teaching of English his re-evaluation result reflected 62 marks. Now see the huge variation. Student has to pay a re-evaluation fee for his no fault, sustained torture is meted upon him due to delay in declaration of re-evaluation result.

**VII. Case Study 7<sup>th</sup>**

Paper	Roll No series	Examiner Out of 80	Marks Range marks	Average
1 <sup>st</sup>	1-500	A	50-60	56
1 <sup>st</sup>	501-1000	B	32-40	44

In this case, five hundred papers of paper 1<sup>st</sup> from Roll No. 1 to 500, were assigned to Examiner a. He marked most of the papers in the range of 50 to 60. Another series of paper 1<sup>st</sup> from roll No 501 to 1000 were assigned to Examiner B. He marked most of the papers in the Range of 32 to 40.

**VIII. Case Study 8<sup>th</sup>**

(22,17)

The candidate was confident that he has written the answer script to the best of the ability. Since he was short of one or two marks, he could not apply for re-evaluation. So he procured his answer script under Right to Information (RTI) Act. It was written on the face of answer script that the examiner was supposed to write marks on the perforated corner at the end of each question. The answer script of the candidate reflected that the examiner has not followed the rule while he had awarded marks on the face of the answer script. The authorities told him that they are helpless in his case and cannot challenge /question the integrity of examiner.

**IX. Case Study 9<sup>th</sup>**

Internship (20/30)	Teaching Aids (20/30)	Microteaching (40/60)	Lesson Plan (40/60)	Total (120/180)
Internal (120)	20	20	40	39
External (180)	15	16	38	38

In B.Ed we have two components Internal Practice of Teaching and External Practice of Teaching . Internal Practice of Teaching (IPOT) is conducted in school under the supervision of concerned Head of the

Institutions. The award Rolls of IPOT, received from some schools reflect Head of the Institutions/Principals display Non-seriousness and do not maintain confidentiality in awarding marks. They award them 40 out of 40 as if they are mastered the teaching skills to the ideal point. This approach is childish as if we are giving candies in the form of marks to primary kids. Another issue in this IPOT is that the IX grade teacher or teachers working in higher/Hr. Secondary school opt primary/middle school as their practice teaching school.

Lesson plan registers of the B.Ed trainees reflect that they follow the old Herbertian approach and do not integrate technology in their lesson structures. They follow the old text based approach.

#### X. Case Study 10<sup>th</sup>

##### Inter-examiner-variability

Roll No. series 1-500 allotted to examiner A in paper Psychology of Learning & Development	20% pass percentage
Roll No. series 501-1000 allotted to examiner B in paper Psychology of Learning & Development	80% pass percentage
Papers were interchanged Roll No. series 501-1000 allotted to examiner A in paper Psychology & learning & Development	25% pass percentage
Papers were interchanged Roll No. series 1-500 allotted to examiner B in paper Psychology of Learning & Development	75% pass percentage

#### XI. Case Study 11<sup>th</sup>

Teaching Practice awarded by 4 head of the institution in 4 different schools (A,B,C,D) There is a significant mean difference between the marks awarded by different Head of the institutions as per their perception.

	School A	School B		School C		School D	
Roll No	Marks (120)	Roll No	Marks	Roll No	Marks	Roll NO	Marks
1	119	6	101	11	80	16	75
2	118	7	102	12	86	17	77
3	119	8	104	13	84	18	79
4	119	9	106	14	88	19	79
5	117	10	107	15	87	20	79

**Reference**

- Aggarwal, J. C. (1997). *Essentials of examination system: evaluation, test and measurement*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Baker, E. L., & Linn, R. L. (2004). *Validity issues for accountability systems. Redesigning accountability systems for education* (pp. 47–72). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.W. (1989). *Research in Education* (Tenth Edition). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.
- Gage, N.L., Remmers, H.H. and Rummel, J.F. (1967). *A Practical Introduction to Measurement and Evaluation*. New Delhi: India Offset Press.