

## Original Research

## Challenges in Implementing Continuous Assessment in Wollega University

<sup>1</sup>Adugna Bersissa, <sup>2</sup>Eba Mijena, <sup>3\*</sup>Tamiru Olana & <sup>3</sup>Teshome Guteta<sup>1</sup>Department of Behavioral Sciences, Wollega University, P.O. Box 395, Nekemte, Ethiopia<sup>2</sup>CEO for Academic Affairs at FDRE Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia<sup>3</sup>Department of English Language and Literature, Wollega University, P.O. Box 395, Nekemte, Ethiopia

## Abstract

*The study aimed to explore the challenges instructors face in implementing continuous assessment at Wollega University using a mixed-methods approach. The researchers used questionnaires, focus group discussions (FGDs), and document analysis to gather data. A sample of 218 instructors and 28 students and 33 students from three campuses participated. Statistical tests were performed using SPSS for Windows, version 21.0, and thematic analysis was used for qualitative data. The results showed that CA results were inflated compared to final exam results, highlighting the need for improved assessment methods. CA was not implemented as expected due to instructors' lack of awareness of CA objectives, absence of a clear manual for CA implementation, insufficient materials for students, large class size, students' poor English language proficiency, group work burden for relatively clever students, lack of time for block courses, and vast content courses. Some of the recommended solutions to the challenges are: designing a guiding manual for CA implementation; providing training for instructors on how to implement CA; curricular revision; fostering cooperation among stakeholders; and giving students preparation time for mid- and final exams.*

## Article Information

## Article History:

Received : 21-03-2020

Revised : 15-05-2020

Accepted : 20-05-2020

## Keywords:

Continuous assessment,  
Challenges

\*Corresponding Author:

Tamiru Olana

E-mail:

olanatamiru58@gmail.com

Copyright©2020 STAR Journal, Wollega University. All Rights Reserved.

## INTRODUCTION

It is understandable that planning and delivering instructions are meant to help students learn. To know how well the learning has taken place, "assessment" is a relevant tool. Educational measurement experts view assessment as a basic tool of education to check the level of learning on the part of the learners. Greaney (2001) recognises assessment as any procedure or activity that is designed to collect information about the knowledge, attitude, or skills of learners. Muluken (2006) also argues that without assessment, it is

difficult for educators to get refined information about educational practices.

CA is a part of assessment having a formative nature concerned with finding out the overall gains that a student has made in terms of knowledge, attitudes, and skills after a given set of learning experiences (Ogunnyi, 1984). It is not continuous testing of the cognitive ability of students, as is practiced in many schools today (Bandeale & Ayodele, 2015; Aggarwal, 1999). However, CA is more than giving a test; it involves every decision

*Adugna B. et al*

made by the teacher in class to improve students' achievement.

Similarly, USAID (2003) stated that continuous assessment is a powerful diagnostic tool for learners and teachers to identify areas of difficulty and to concentrate. Likewise, according to Mitko (2004), continuous assessment promotes frequent interaction and enables teachers to know the strengths and weaknesses of learners for feedback and remediation.

Continuous assessment is a mechanism for making continuous judgements about the learner during and at the end of a programme. In ascertaining all these from the learner, other assessment instruments like tests, assignments, projects, observation, interviews, homework, etc. are used.

These days, advanced nations such as England, Spain, Australia, and others are applying continuous assessment, partially or wholly, to their educational systems (Heaton, 1990). Moreover, most African universities, like Nigeria, Namibia, Southern Africa, Malawi, and others, have already implemented continuous assessment in their higher education institutions (Nadia, 2013; Modupe & Michael, 2015; Ebele, 2014).

Taking advantage of the advantages of continuous assessment, the Ministry of Education in Ethiopia introduced continuous assessment in schools, colleges, and universities. Furthermore, the revised National Education and Training Strategy states that assessment is a very important part of ensuring the quality of education in real and practical skills (MoE, 2010). The aim of the new policy of continuous assessment in Ethiopia is to bring a paradigm shift from a judgmental role to a developmental role.

Although both international and national research findings revealed that continuous assessment is important to improve students' learning and thereby ensure quality education, there are many challenges associated with its proper implementation. For instance, Patrick (2015), Ovute and Ede (2015), Ajuonuma (2008), Ebele (2014), and Assad et al. (2016) found that

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

the extent to which university lecturers practice continuous assessment with emphasis on the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of students was low due to certain challenges. The results of these studies revealed that lecturers have negative attitudes towards the implementation of continuous assessment policies and that tests are the most frequently used strategies by teachers to assess students' performance and progress.

A few local researchers, like Teklebrhan and Samuel (2015) and Berihu (2016), found some challenges related to the implementation of CA, like instructors' lack of continuous collection of information about student progress, the use of a small number of assessments, rare feedback, and using few techniques. Students also did not reflect on their individual assignments because of a time shortage. Teachers were challenged by the large class size, shortage of time, low readiness of students, students' poor knowledge, and negative attitude towards continuous assessment.

Wollega University has been implementing CA on its three campuses, which accounts for 70% of the students' scores. The final exam represents the remaining 30%. However, some of the graduates were observed to be incompetent, as recurrently complained about by the MoE, the university's administrative body, and other stakeholders. This concern prompted the researchers to investigate if there are challenges that hinder the proper implementation of continuous assessment at Wollega University. To this effect, the study attempted to provide answers to the following basic research questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant mean difference between students' CA results and final exam results?
2. What are the major challenges that affect the implementation of CA?

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Research Design**

In this study, a survey research design based on a mixed-methods approach was used. Consequently, a convergent parallel mixed-methods design was

*Adugna B. et al*

employed, where qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis took place concurrently. Equal weights were given to the quantitative and qualitative methods.

#### **Study Site**

The study was conducted on the three campuses of Wollega University. These campuses are Nekemte Campus (main campus), Gimbi Campus (social science), and Shambu Campus (agriculture), each found in three different zones of Wollega.

#### **Sample Size and Sampling Techniques**

The participants of the study were instructors and students from the three campuses (Nekemte, Shambu, and Ghimbi) of Wollega University. A minimum of 30% of the instructors were randomly selected from each campus for the questionnaire. The percentage was decided using the Gay & Arasian (2005) probability sample size determination technique. Hence, out of 785 instructors, 30% were selected, which counts nearly 235. Five colleges from the main campus (Education and Behavioural Sciences, Business and Economics, Natural Science, Engineering and Technology, and Health Sciences), one faculty from the Shambu campus (Faculty of Agriculture and Natural resources), and one faculty from the Gimbi campus (Faculty of Social Science) were randomly selected. This number was proportionally calculated for the three campuses: main campus ( $622 \times 0.3 = 186$ ), which was proportionally distributed to five randomly selected colleges: Gimbi campus ( $67 \times 0.3 = 20$ ) and Shambu campus ( $96 \times 0.3 = 29$ ), totaling 235 instructors. A non-probability sampling technique, namely purposive sampling, was used to target potential respondents for FGDs. FGDs were conducted on the three campuses of WU with both instructors and students. Accordingly, the number of instructors selected purposefully and who participated were 6 from the Gimbi campus, 10 from the Shambu campus, and 12 from the Nekemte campus. Likewise, the number of students who participated in FGD was 10 from the

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

Gimbi campus, 10 from the Shambu campus, and 13 (two teams with 6 and 7 respondents each) from the Nekemte campus.

#### **Instruments of Data Collection**

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used. The primary data were collected through questionnaires from instructors and through FGDs from both instructors and students. Mark lists were collected as secondary data sources from the respective registrar offices of some selected colleges at WU. A questionnaire was designed to gather quantitative data pertaining to the challenges instructors face in implementing CA. This construct was measured using nine items on a 3-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (disagree) to 3 (agree). A focus group discussion was employed in this study to complement the data collected through the questionnaire. The item under the document analysis was the students' mark record of CA and final exam in the 2015/16 first semester.

#### **Method of Data Analysis**

In this study, thematic analysis was used to analyse the qualitative data collected through FGDs. For the quantitative method, after the necessary data were collected and coded, statistical tests were performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows, version 21.0. Statistical methods, including descriptive statistics and paired-sampled t-tests, were used in the analysis. Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were conducted to determine the challenges instructors face in implementing CA. A paired-sampled t-test was computed to find out whether there is a statistically significant mean difference between students' CA and final exam results.

#### **RESULTS**

This section has dealt with the results and discussion of the data gathered using a questionnaire, FGD, and document analysis. The

data gathered by employing these instruments was successively analysed using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The data gathered through the questionnaire and document analysis were

analysed using SPSS version 21.0. The data gathered through FGDs was thematically analyzed. Then the results were discussed on the basis of the existing review literature.

**Table 1**  
*Background Characteristics of the Respondent Instructors*

	<b>Background Characteristics</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>College/Institute/School</b>	Education and Behavioral Sciences	9	4.1
	Business and Economics	20	9.2
	Natural Science	50	22.9
	Engineering and Technology	64	29.5
	Health Sciences	30	13.8
	Agriculture and Natural Resources	27	12.4
	Social Sciences	18	8.3
<b>Sex</b>	Male	193	88.5
	Female	25	11.5
<b>Service year in WU</b>	< 1 year	60	27.5
	1-5 years	113	51.8
	> 5 years	45	20.6
<b>Academic Level</b>	Graduate Assistant I	19	8.7
	Graduate Assistant II	24	11
	Assistant Lecturer	52	23.9
	Lecturer	111	50.9
	Assistant Professor	11	5
	Associate Professor	-	-
	Professor	1	.5
<b>Mode of study</b>	Applied	155	71.1
	Teaching	63	28.9
<b>Pedagogical Trainings taken</b>	HDP	31	14.2
	Induction	57	26.1
	Both HDP and Induction	99	45.4
	Didn't take training	31	14.2

The background characteristics of the instructors that participated in the study are shown in Table 1 above and were discussed as follows: The respondents were seen with respect to six categories. These categories were with respect to college, sex, service year in WU, academic level, mode of study, and pedagogical training.

The background characteristics shown in the table were the number of college-wise respondents that participated in the study through a questionnaire. According to the sample size, the expected number of respondents should have been 235. However, 17 instructors did not return the questionnaire administered to them. Hence, the

number of instructors involved in responding to the questionnaire was nine (4.1%) from Education and Behavioural Sciences, 20 (9.2%) from Business and Economics, 50 (22.9%) from Natural Science, 64 (29.5%) from Engineering and Technology, 30 (13.8%) from Health Sciences, 27 (12.4%) from Agriculture and Natural Resources, and 18 (8.3%) from Social Sciences. This total sums up to 218 (92.8%) of what was expected.

Regarding sex, 193 (88.5%) were male instructors and 25 (11.5%) were female instructors. The service years of the respondents in WU were categorised into three categories: less than one year, 1–5 years, and greater than five

*Adujna B. et al*

years for ease of data management. The analysis of the service year shows that instructors with less than one service year in WU were 60 (27.5%), those with 1–5 service years were 113 (51.8%), and those with more than five service years were 45 (20.6%). The result shows that instructors with 1 to 5 service years had the highest number, which is slightly greater than half of the total respondents, whereas those with the least number were those with service years above five.

With regard to the academic level of the respondents, there were seven categories. These are graduate assistant I, graduate assistant II, assistant lecturer, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Their percentages were 19 (8.7%) for assistant graduate I, 24 (11%) for assistant graduate II, 52 (23.9%) for assistant lecturer, 111 (50.9%) for lecturer, 11 (5%) for assistant professor, and 1 (0.5%) for professor. Hence, the result of the percentage shows that all academic levels were involved in the study except associate professors, with the highest number of lecturers involved.

The other considered background characteristic was the mode of study of the respondents. It was categorised into applied and teaching modes. Table 1 shows that among the total respondents, 155 (71.1%) were graduates from the applied

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

mode of study and 63 (28.9%) were graduates from the teaching profession. This implies that a very high number of the instructors have been teaching without having the qualifications that the profession requires.

The issue of having or not having pedagogical training was one of the concerns about the respondents' background characteristics. With this regard, the instructors that had been trained in HDP were 31 (14.2%), in induction were 57 (26.1%), in both HDP and induction were 99 (45.4%), and those who had been trained in none were 31 (14.2%). Hence, the majority of the respondents, 187 (85.8%), took pedagogical training in either or both ways, whereas a small number, 31 (14.2%), of the respondents did not take any pedagogical training.

### **Comparison of Continuous Assessment and Final Exam Results**

In order to find whether there is a statistically significant mean difference between students' continuous assessment and final exam results, a paired sample t-test was performed, and the result is given in Table 2.

**Table 2**

*Comparison of Means of Students' CA and Final Exam Results*

Assessment Type	N	Mean	SD	df	t	p
CA	385	38.22	4.71	384	20.88	.00
Final Exam	385	26.27	12.44			

When Table 2 is examined, it can be seen that there is a statistically significant mean difference between students' continuous assessment and final exam results ( $t(384) = 20.88, p = 0.00 < 0.05$ ). That means students scored better results on continuous assessment

as compared to the final exam result. The difference between the students' CA score and that of the final exam was also evidenced in the instructors' FGD that CA scores are inflated compared to those of the final exam. For instance, an instructor mentioned the

reason for inflation as projects and assignments are done in groups, and marks are given in groups without identifying who did it.

The major challenges instructors face in implementing CA at Wollega University were investigated and summarised in Table 3 below.

**The Major Challenges Instructors Face in Implementing CA**

**Table 3**

*The Major Challenges that Affect the Implementation of CA in WU*

S.N	Item	Rating Scale	F	%
1	Discipline problems due to larger number of students	Disagree	59	27.1
		Undecided	20	9.2
		Agree	139	63.8
2	Instructors' negative attitude towards CA	Disagree	116	53.2
		Undecided	45	20.6
		Agree	57	26.1
3	Instructors' failure to implement varieties of CA techniques	Disagree	93	42.7
		Undecided	46	21.1
		Agree	79	36.2
4	Insufficient time for teaching and assessment	Disagree	73	33.5
		Undecided	31	14.2
		Agree	114	52.3
5	Large class size makes it difficult to implement CA	Disagree	48	22.0
		Undecided	20	9.2
		Agree	150	68.8
6	Lack of materials like textbooks, modules, etc.	Disagree	45	20.6
		Undecided	26	11.9
		Agree	147	67.4
7	Poor knowledge of CA on the part of the teachers	Disagree	114	52.3
		Undecided	48	22.0
		Agree	56	25.7
8	Lack of capacity building on how to carry out CA	Disagree	90	41.3
		Undecided	41	18.8
		Agree	87	39.9
9	No clear manuals and guidelines on how to implement CA	Disagree	77	35.3
		Undecided	32	14.7
		Agree	109	50.0

The major challenges in CA implementation were summarised in Table 3. The first item presents problems due to the large class size, and the result of the analysis shows that 139 (63.8%) respondents agreed that discipline problems due to the large class size affected

the implementation of CA in WU. However, 59 (27.1%) of the respondents did not agree. Meanwhile, 20 (9.2%) of the respondents replied undecided.

Item 2 of the same table is concerned with instructors' negative attitude towards CA as a

*Adugna B. et al*

challenge to its implementation. The result shows that 116 (53.2%) respondents disagreed with the idea; only 57 (26.1%) of the respondents agreed that instructors' negative attitude towards CA is a challenge to its implementation. The least, 45 (20.6%), could not agree or disagree.

Item 3 in Table 3 investigated if instructors' failure to apply varieties of CA techniques challenged their implementation. Accordingly, 93 (42.7%) of the respondents replied that there is no instructor's failure to apply varieties of CA techniques that challenge CA implementation. Seventy-nine (36.2%) of the respondents agreed that instructors failure to apply a variety of CA techniques Forty-six (21.1%) of the respondents could not decide.

Item 4 in Table 3 explores whether insufficient time challenges CA implementation. Hence, the result indicates that 114 (52.3%) of the respondents agreed that insufficient time for teaching and assessing is a challenge to the implementation of CA. Seventy-three (33.5%) of the respondents disagreed with the time challenge, whereas 31 (14.2%) were uncertain.

Item 5 of Table 3 explores whether the large class size makes it difficult to implement CA. Accordingly, 150 (68.8%) of the respondents revealed that the large class size is a challenge that makes the implementation of CA difficult. Contrarily, 48 (22%) of the respondents disagreed that the application of CA was hampered by large class sizes. The other 20 (9.2%) respondents reply that they were undecided.

The sixth item of the same table looked into the lack of materials (textbooks, modules,

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

etc.) as a challenge to CA implementation. As a consequence of the analysed data, 147 (67.4%) of the instructors showed that lack of materials is a challenge in practicing CA. Forty-five (20.6%) of the participant instructors in the study did not agree that lack of materials was a challenge to CA. The rest of the respondents, 26 (11.9%), responded with the undecided option. Poor knowledge of CA on the part of the instructors as challenging to CA was dealt with on Item 7 of Table 3. The analysed result depicts that 114 (52.3%) disagreed, 56 (25.7%) agreed, and 48 (22% were undecided).

Item 8 presents the issue of a lack of capacity building on how to carry out CA implementation. The result shows that 90 (41.3%) disagreed, 87 (39.9%) agreed, and the remaining 41 (18.8%) of the respondents answered undecided.

Item 9 in Table 3 dealt with the absence of clear manuals and guidelines as challenging factors in CA implementation. The result of the analysis shows that 109 (50%) respondents agreed. In contrast, 77 (35.3%) of them showed their disagreement that the absence of clear manuals and guidelines for CA affects its implementation. The neutral respondents were 32 (14.7%).

Concerning the challenges facing CA, the FGD respondent instructors mentioned four factors. These are instructor-based challenges, student-based challenges, institutional challenges, and facility-based challenges. Some major ones under each corner are:

1. The instructor-related challenges are lack of awareness of the objectives and how to use the techniques, partial inclusion of contents in final exams, lack of standardised assessment questions, use of unvaried assessment techniques (continuous tests), and

*Adugna B. et al*

assessing a large percentage at once (20% to 40%). Other instructor-based challenges are applying more objective-type tests, guest lecturers' accomplishing 7-8 chapters within a day, and teachers' marking inflation for fear of evaluation by students. The FGD also showed that instructors from non-teaching backgrounds lack pedagogical knowledge and skills for the implementation of CA. Further, FGD participant students indicated instructor-related challenges. For example, one student from the Gimbi campus pointed out that a seven-time evaluation of a single course before the final exam is very challenging. Other student respondents from Ghimbi Social Science College addressed the fact that instructors miss classes, especially those who made their residence in other towns, which created challenges in completing CA.

2. Student-based challenges, as responded to by sampled instructors, are students' lack of awareness of CA, students' perception that CA has been designed to compensate for students' low marks, and that relatively clever students carry the burden or dominate their works and are also disappointed.
3. Facility-based challenges that the respondent instructors identified are a lack of sufficient classrooms, a lack of functional laboratories, and a lack of computers for students.
4. Institutional-related challenges include non-standardised assessment processes, inflexibility of CA for

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

differently natured courses, lack of time versus vast content courses, and stiff block courses. Other institutional challenges include permanent 1–5 grouping, many courses with many assessments, favouring students to minimise attrition rates, and a lack of incentive for instructors, for instance, during re-exams. A considerable number of respondents revealed that courses have bulky contents, and instructors give focus to covering the portion within a limited time. Due to this, they do not have time to properly assess, give feedback, and follow up on learners' improvements. The respondents showed that the institution forces teachers to work against harmonised legislation. Instances of this include the deviation from 50% CA to 50% final exam. The other is imposing instructors not to submit learners' low results that made learners feel righteous.

## **DISCUSSION**

In this chapter, an attempt was made to discuss the results found with respect to the research questions described in the introduction in light of the existing body of literature. The comparison of the means of students' CA and final exam results indicated that students scored better results in CA than in the final exam. The difference was evidenced by FGD respondent instructors that CA scores are inflated compared to those of the final exam because projects and assignments were done and marks were given



*Adugna B. et al*

in groups without identifying who did them. It is decisive to argue why the CA results are higher as compared to those of the final exam results in the WU context. This significant mean difference in CA and final exam results might have occurred due to the wrong conception on the part of both instructors and students that CA is a means to help students score better marks, expecting that they might score a low mark in the final exam. In other words, instructors inflated the CA results due to an inclination towards reducing students' attrition rate, as stated in the FGD. In line with this, Denga (2003) reports that there are unnecessary favours contributing to such unbalanced performances, warning that they should be avoided.

The questionnaire and FGD respondents unreservedly listed the major challenges they thought might have hindered the appropriate implementation of CA. The results from both quantitative and qualitative data analysis are alike. In the quantitative data, instructor respondents reported that the major challenges in implementing CA at WU are problems due to the large class size, insufficient time for teaching and assessing, a lack of materials, poor knowledge of CA on the part of the instructors, and the absence of clear manuals and guidelines. Therefore, WU instructors did not seem to have used CA implementation procedures set by Adaramaja (n.d.) and incorporated in this study elsewhere. Asamoah-Gyimah (2002) wrote that large classes affect the number as well as the variety of items a teacher includes in his or her assessment because the time for marking, processing, and filling of records has to be considered. On his part, Amedahe (2000)

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

points out that the pressure to finish within a specific time will make teachers inconsistent in their marking. This clearly shows that large class sizes have a substantial effect on the timely implementation of CA.

The FGD respondent instructors mentioned some extra challenges that impeded the implementation of CA at WU, such as lack of standardised assessment questions, use of unvaried assessment techniques (continuous tests), and assessment in large percentages at once (e.g., 20% to 40% and then splitting it into 10%*s*). Bandele and Ayodele (2015) argue that the essence of continuous assessment is not merely administering a number of paper and pencil tests to students. Rather, they add, it is the continuous testing of the cognitive ability of students, but what is practiced in WU, as reported in the results of the data today, is continuous testing, where instructors administer tests on students fortnightly or monthly as a pretext of CA. This implies that instructors need to identify the difference between the two and implement accordingly. Thus, the researchers believe that it is high time for the university to make instructors aware of the need to refrain from consistently using more objective-type tests and dividing them into 10%. A hasty use of time also poses a big problem for CA implementation, as instructors and students face having to carry out each element of the CA strategy.

Other major challenges the FGD respondents raised were lack of awareness of CA, low English language skills proficiency, the wrong perception of CA as designed to help students score high marks, carrying the burden of other students, a lack of sufficient

*Adugna B. et al*

classrooms, a lack of functional laboratories, a lack of computers for students, fixed seats in lecture halls, etc. In line with the respondents' request, Plessis et al. (2003) set guidelines to engage students in assessment. He suggested that instructors should create a spirit of collaboration among students and instructors to avoid dependence; inform students that assessment leads to better understanding and improvement; tell them that it is not marked but an assessment for learning; and use professional judgements in case s/he uses the assessment for marking.

The FGD respondents also raised further challenges. They touched upon non-standardised assessment processes, the inflexibility of CA for differently natured courses, and permanent 1–5 grouping. Additionally, they elaborated on the denial of incentives for instructors during re-exams, focusing on covering portions within a limited time, deviating from 50% CA versus 50% final exam, and imposing instructors not to submit the actual results of learners when they score low marks, which are the major determinants of the implementation of CA. They finalised, saying that this made learners feel righteous and be laissez-faire. Realising the challenges instructors are facing in CA implementation, Plessis et al. (2003) suggest instructors need awareness, skills, and guidelines for the actual implementation of CA, an integral part of the curriculum. Instructors need professional development through in-service training (Ibid.).

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The findings of the study concerning the challenges instructors face in implementing

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

CA in WU, done with the help of a mixed-methods approach, were concluded for the two basic research questions. Accordingly,

1. With respect to the first research question about CA result inflation, one can conclude that there was a difference between CA and final exam results, implying that students' CA result was more inflated than the final exam result.
2. It was disclosed that various challenges that faced CA implementation were instructors' lack of awareness of CA objectives, the absence of a clear manual, limitations on capacity building, and insufficient materials for students. Further, large class size, partial inclusion of course contents in the final exam, poor item qualities, residing in one town and instructing in another town (e.g., Nekemte versus Gimbi), students' poor English language proficiency, group work burden to relatively clever students, stiff or lack of time for block courses, and vast content courses were reported challenges about CA implementation. Instructors were also not properly implementing CA techniques due to challenges like splitting assessments given out of 20% to 40% into 2 to 4 out of ten percent.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The recommendation part has suggested some possible remedial actions for the mitigation of problems related to the implementation of CA.

*Adugna B. et al*

1. The researchers would like to suggest that the university's Academic Quality and Assessment Office needs to design a manual on CA implementation that provides a common understanding for instructors and students, clear objectives of CA, responsibilities, and accountabilities of students, particularly of each member participating in group assignments, to avoid the group leaders' burden and enhance the slow learners' roles. In addition to the manual preparation, the office should regularly schedule and execute training and monitoring mechanisms.
2. The office has to facilitate the preparation of a brief guideline that gives clear objectives for CA, responsibilities, and accountabilities of students, particularly of each member participating in group assignments, to avoid the group leaders' burden and enhance the slow learners' roles.
3. Academic units, in collaboration, need to set up a contractual agreement document for guest lecturers to urge them to abide by the legislation of WU and set up monitoring mechanisms for them.
4. Indicators were found that the vast contents of courses need trimming to allow enough time for learning and CA, provide detailed feedback to students, and take remedial actions.
5. It was found that block courses with 70% CA were practically so challenging that the respondents complained. Therefore, they need to be

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

- considered as either semester-based courses or assessments with a 40% CA versus a 60% final exam.
6. To reduce the burdens of students and enhance the effectiveness of CA, the university should readjust the percentage of CA to 50%, including 20% mid-exam, implying 30%, 20%, and 50%.
7. The university needs to prioritise quality over quantity by optimising large class sizes.
8. Instructors and respective line managers need to cooperate to provide sufficient modules, reference materials, computers, internet access, labs and lab equipment, and others.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The research team would like to express its heartfelt gratitude to all the devoted supporters during the course of the study. It forwards the first grace to the office of the president, the research vice president, the academic vice president of the university.

## **DECLARATION**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## **DATA AVAILABILITY**

All the necessary data are available from the corresponding author on a reasonable request.

## **REFERENCES**

Adaramaja, S.R. (n.d.). *The Use and Principles of Continuous Assessment in*

- Adugna B. et al*  
*the Classroom* (unpublished research paper, University of Ilorin)
- Aggarwal, P. (1999). *Formative and summative assessment teachers study in service education*. New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House
- Ajuonuma J.(2008). A Survey of the Implementation of Continuous Assessment in Nigerian Universities, *African Higher Education Review (AHER)*, 1, ISSN: 2141-1905
- Amedahe, F. K. (2000). Issues with Combining Continuous Assessment Scores with External Examination Scores for Certification at the Basic and Secondary School Levels. *Journal of Educational Management*, 3, 110–127.
- Asamoah-Gyimah, K. (2002), An Evaluation of the Practice of Continuous Assessment in SSS in the Ashanti Region of Ghana (Master's Thesis), University of Cape Coast.
- Assad et al. (2016). *The impact of continuous assessment on the final results: a case study*: Sudan, College of Medicine, King Khalid University.
- Bandle SO & Ayodele CS. (2015). Improving Continuous Assessment Practice in Nigerian Schools *Sci-Africa Journal of Educational Research and Learning Techniques*, 1 (4), 125–130.
- Berihu Asgele Seyoum. (2016). Implementation of Continuous Assessment and Its Effectiveness in Adwa College of Teacher Education, Ethiopia. *International Journal of*
- Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*  
*Education, Culture, and Society*, 1 (1), 16–22.
- Denga, D.I. (2003). *Educational Measurement Continuous Assessment and Psychological Testing*: Calabar Rapid Educational Publishers.
- Ebele, U.M. (2014). *Knowledge and Use of Continuous Assessment among Teachers' in Basic Schools of Nursing in the South East Zone*. Nigeria.
- Greaney, V. (2001). *Using assessment to improve the quality of education Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Education Planning*.
- Heaton, J.B. (1990). *Classroom testing*. London: Longman.
- Mitko A.J. (2004). *Continuous assessment and performance assessment* Accessed in November (2016) from <http://www.MoEc.gov>
- Modupe & Michael, (2015). *Evaluation of continuous assessment practices in higher institutions of learning in Enugu State, Nigeria*
- MoE (2010). *Higher Diploma Programme Handbook: Module 1: Addis Ababa*.
- Muluken, Ayalew (2006). *Teachers' perceptions: practice of continuous assessment in selected government first cycle primary schools in Addis Ababa* (unpublished thesis)
- Nadia, M.M. (2013). *The Importance of Continuous Assessment in Improving ESP Students' Performance* (PhD Dissertation), Kasdi Marbah Ouargla University.

*Adugna B. et al*

Ogunnyi, M.B. (1984). *Educational Measurement and Evaluation*. London: Longman.

Ovute, A.O., & Maxwell, E.O. (2015). *Evaluation of continuous assessment practices in higher institutions of learning in Enugu State, Nigeria*.

Patrick U.O. (2015). *Evaluation of Continuous Assessment Practice by University Lecturers, Nigeria*.

*Sci. Technol. Arts Res. April-June 2020, 9(2), 39-51*

Plessis, J.D., Prouty, D., Schubert, J., Habib, M., & George, E.S. (2003). *Continuous Assessment: A Practical Guide for Teachers*. Washington, DC, USA.

Teklebrhan Berhe & Samuel Embiza. (2015). Problems and Prospects of Implementing Continuous Assessment at Adigrat University. Adigrat University, Tigray, Ethiopia.

USAID (2003). *Educational Quality in the Developing World, 1* (1).