

The Evaluation Dilemma in Kenya Education System

By

Kafwa Nabwire Violet, Mwaka Marcella and Musamas K. Josphine

Lecturer in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Media, School of Education

Moi University, Eldoret, Kenya

Abstract

Kenya strives to achieve Education for All (EFA) in order to contribute to various developmental endeavours. Like any country she has national goals of education that reflect the prevailing needs for which the offered education should aim at addressing. Through evaluation a nation is informed on the performance of the education system and its outputs. Given this critical role the evaluation system should be accurate, credible, and realistic in providing data to advise the stakeholders on the quality, efficiency, effectiveness, competency and reliability of both the system and products. Kenyan education has since colonial period relied on summative evaluation as the standard measure for judging and awarding grades and certificates to its products. Bearing in mind that Kenyan society attaches a lot of value to grades and certificates the two are determining factors for quality products. They predetermine the academic and profession destiny of the products. Notwithstanding this approach the summative evaluation system in Kenya has high potential of anomalies regarded as examination irregularities. Due to this many stakeholders are left wondering and questioning how much confidence should continue to be entrusted in the system. Many questions arise such as what could be the alternative strategies for gauging the product's performance in the event of lack of confidence in the summative evaluation? Which best approaches can gauge learning achievements in a schooling system? The paper hopes to address the two questions by conceptualizing the meaning of Education and evaluation, analysing its function, criterion, and standards upon which evaluation is judged.

Keywords: *Education, Summative Evaluation, Quality Product, Dilemma*

1. Introduction

A healthy society is nurtured through the provision of quality education that is accessible and relevant (Digolo, 2006). Health has been defined in favour of education to mean a state of complete physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, and social well being and not merely the absence of disease and infirmity (Ojiambo, 1986). World governments recognize this and have factored education in their policies and budgetary allocation. For instance, according to the Economic Survey (2000), the total expenditure of Kenya's Ministry of Education (MOE) rose by 6.4% from Kshs. 46,894 26 million in 1999/2001 to Kshs. 49,858.13 million in 2000/2001 fiscal year (Government of Kenya, 2000). This trend continues to rise sharply especially with the notion of free primary and secondary education in Kenya.

Since education plays a crucial role in any developmental endeavours, there is need to establish clear and fair strategies of collecting information on its functions to gauge the operational value. Evaluation as one of the functions in education plays a central role in gathering data and informing on the performance of the system and its products. If evaluation in education is to be well presented, a pertinent question on what education is would need to be addressed. This is because one cannot evaluate what one does not well understand; a misunderstanding of the concept would also result in wrong evaluation. Similarly, the concept of evaluation will as well need to be understood to maintain the right focus. By presenting the two key concepts – education and evaluation, the dilemma of evaluation will be carefully established.

What is Education?

An evaluation of an educational system requires that the concept of education be critically analysed and therefore is essential that the question of *what is education?* be raised. Is education knowledge in basic

skills, academics, technical, discipline, citizenship, or is it something else? In its focus on good academic performance and putting on notice teachers whose schools are not performing well or whose subjects are not well performed, the Kenyan education system seems to imply, only academic basics are important and should be evaluated. How about the processing of knowledge, using inspiration, visionary ambitions, creativity, risk taking, ability to bounce back from failure, independence, critical thinking, integrity or motivation? Most educational institutions focusing on academic performance and do not consider these skills and values associated with education thus falls short of the skills and values evaluation instruments.

Mwaka et al (2010) assert that education is all the elements mentioned in the foregoing discussion - knowledge in basic skills, academics, technical, discipline, citizenship, the processing of knowledge, using inspiration, visionary ambitions, creativity, risk, integrity, independence, ability to bounce back from failure, and motivation among others, should all be considered. This would be ideal and sounds proper, but *all* is not possible where performance must be measured. Only what can be measured will be selected and the measuring instrument is the written test. Anyone who does not have the ability to put clear thoughts on paper is labelled a failure. All natural skills and values, including knowledge processing and integrity, do not count. The fact is, what is exercised grows stronger, what is ignored stays dormant. The classroom exercises the collection of academics, leaving all other natural skills and values in the closet. The typical employer wants employees with dictionary knowledge, not visionaries (Schofield, 1999). In his outline of six myths about the foundations of modern education, Orr (1991) cites that the purpose of education is that of giving one the means for upward mobility and success and identifies this as *the mass production of people literally unfit for anything except to take part in an elaborate and completely artificial charade*.

Though education has been defined differently, the authors would like to refer to one definition by Shiundu and Omulando (1992) - the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that prepare the learner to play an active and responsible role in the society. This definition takes one to the focus on playing an active and responsible role in the society; this is possible through an understanding of the national goals of education, whose achievement enables solution to the society's needs. In Kenya, the national goals of education are as follows:

1. Foster nationalism, patriotism and promote national unity
2. Promote social, economic, technological and industrial needs for national development
 - i. *Social needs*: Prepare children for the changes in attitudes and relationships which are necessary for the smooth process of a rapidly developing modern economy
 - ii. *Economic needs*: Produce citizens with skills, knowledge, expertise and personal qualities that are required to support a growing economy
 - iii. *Technological and industrial needs*: Provide the learners with the necessary skills and attitudes for industrial development
3. Promote individual development and self-fulfillment
4. Promote sound moral and religious values
5. Promote social equality and responsibility
6. Promote respect for and development of Kenya's rich and varied cultures
7. Promote international consciousness and foster positive attitude towards other nations
8. Promote positive attitudes towards good health and environmental protection

Based on the listing above, it would be noted that most of the national goals of education are never evaluated, and that the evaluation process of the Kenyan education system draws the teachers to the academic knowledge, thus not addressing real education issues in their entirety. If education is

acquisition of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, then why have an evaluation process that only concentrates on knowledge and academic oriented skills? Why ignore the evaluation of sound morals, social equality and responsibility nor religious values and life skills? Failure to design instruments and objectively evaluate these aspects of educational goals is a great omission and indicator that the evaluation is in dilemma.

The Concept of Evaluation

Evaluation has been defined and described variably by different scholars, programme developers and curriculum specialists. Recent ones perceive evaluation as the process of attaching value to observed behaviour. It includes making value judgment based on a composite of different types of measurements obtained from tests, projects, laboratory work, reports and examination. It also includes making a value judgment on the worth or significance of an educational programme which slightly varies with the definition below.

Shiundu and Omulando (1992) see evaluation as a general judgment as to whether the change manifested through the process of assessment and measurement was a desirable one. Mukwa and Too (2002) describe evaluation as a continuous process of collecting and interpreting information in order to assess decision made in designing a learning system.

The above scholars differ in their definitions variably on the basis of philosophical and ideological differences. The methodological backgrounds and preferences further bring additional variation. In the context of this discussion, evaluation is defined as a formal and informal systematic process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information data to determine holistic quality, effectiveness and efficiency of an educational object.

The aspect of being formal, informal and systematic process is very important in guiding on how evaluation should be conducted. The implication behind the four phrases is to strongly caution any activity that does not meet the above not to be prioritized in determining the quality of the educational outcome. Formal and informal aspects govern the situations in which an effective evaluation should be conducted. An informal setting does not forewarn the object of the intended action of evaluating and thus captures some hidden behaviors and traits that can effectively characterize the object unlike when the warnings in the formal settings are made. Since evaluation of the product should precisely define the product, then it is right that informal settings are considered in capturing the holistic aspects of the product unlike if the formal evaluations were pursued.

The systematic process is also very central in soliciting quality since the activity is not just one time event that may or may not get the product in the right state to portray the sought quality. Continuous process gives a chance to any evaluator to assess the quality of the product at any progression stage without necessarily allowing biasness that can be generated if the assessment is done at the end of the programme. This evaluation approach captures both planned and hidden curriculum without necessarily cautioning the evaluatee of the process and hence can address the aspects of natural values and skills.

The formal and informal evaluations take place at two levels namely formative and summative evaluation. The former is prevalent in classroom teaching while the latter is used for purposes of certification and promotion to subsequent levels of the education system. Both types of evaluation in Kenyan education system are used though formative evaluation is never recognised when in certification. This practice however, poses a lot of issues and dilemma in Kenyan evaluation system as the focus on summative is never sufficient in relation to the discussed goals of education and can be subjective many a times.

Nasibi (2003) identifies the following functions of summative evaluation:

The Evaluation Dilemma in Kenya Education System

- i. To identify problems that might hinder the achievement of set goals of education
- ii. Determine the effectiveness of and worthiness of a programme in order to make decision on the planning in terms of time, human power and resources
- iii. Secure information for selection of learners for further education
- iv. Provide basis for awarding certificates
- v. Determine the extent to which the desired objectives have been attained
- vi. Furnish the community with information concerning school performance
- vii. Provide information which determines the level at which the education certificate holder should enter the career.

The listed functions focuses on very important aspects of the student's life yet the timeframes, the environment, and mechanism put in place for the exercise maybe questionable. It is interesting to note that the Kenyan system basically relies on summative evaluation to establish the career placement, determine the certificate to be issued and degrees awarded to the learners. As much as this may sound as established roles played by the summative evaluation, behind the scene it determines the overall course of academic and professional direction in the life of a student.

It is a fact that no single technique and instrument of evaluation can yield all the data needed to assess in totality the student's achievement after teaching/learning experience. There is need therefore to develop variety of evaluation techniques that may combine the norm and criterion referenced tests to aid in judging the quality of the grandaunts (Ogula, 2003). To this effect, the foregoing discussion analyse the practice of evaluation in Kenya.

Evaluation Practices in Kenya

In its vision, the Kenyan government is determined to achieve the Education for All (EFA) guided by the principle that education plays central role in consolidating development. However many challenges are facing the system among which is the ability to effectively and efficiently evaluate the products of its various systems. These products are the assets of a nation in terms of developmental endeavours banked on for the current and future prosperities of the society. The discussion under the section focuses on the various aspects constituting the evaluation practices in the country as illustrated herein.

The Evaluators and Standards of evaluation

From the earlier discussions, indication was made that combination of techniques and instruments of evaluations is more favourable and objective way of conducting learning evaluation. Meaning that both the norm and criterion referenced tests may serve the purpose of evaluating the grandaunts better than the stand alone norm referenced tests.

In Kenya the policy on evaluation and assessments are guided by the policy makers in the ministry of education for different levels of schools and middle level tertiary institution. The universities are autonomous with mandates drawn from the respective university councils – governing body and the legal instruments. The schools and middle level colleges have only one source of evaluating body – Kenya national examination council (KNEC) that is mandated through the ministry of education to set and administer summative evaluations in all government approved learning institutions both public and private (Ministry of Education, 2012).

The dilemma in this type of arrangement is that the summative evaluation that utilises norm-referenced test standards does not put into considerations the different characteristics of the learners and conditions under which the learning takes place. An efficient use of this evaluation demands similar situation for effective comparison (Otunga. et al. 2011). This is never the case in Kenya; instead the country has varied learners and situations under which learning takes place. Examples of such include the differentiated infrastructures, teaching materials, professional qualification of teachers and capabilities of individual learners from various backgrounds and regions that include marginalised and minority groups. The aspect

of comparison of such learners under these circumstances could not appropriate but instead the Kenyan evaluation standards have embraced this regardless of the variations. The practice raises the question of *objectivity* in such comparison.

The problem in norm- referenced summative evaluation is that it lacks ability to provide information about individual's potentials or attitude, congruence with the educational goals/instructional objectives and the content, and the effectiveness of measuring what could have been taught. This approach is contrary to criterion-referenced tests which is fairly suitable if used in combination. The latter seek to show how a student performs or demonstrates a skill or task or understands a concept with respect to an external standards or criterion that the student is required to reach. This could be more objective and central in certification and directing the academic and professional course of the student.

Challenges in Evaluation Practices

The summative norm-referenced evaluation carries a lot of weight in the life of the Kenyan citizens. The system plays a very important role in the lives of Kenyan such as determining the academic and professional direction, grading and certification, career placement among others. Due to this the system has been abused and therefore operates in major non-conformities. This raises the questions as *to what extent the system is still serving the purpose initially intended, how much trust the society still holds for the system and if such system should continue serving the populace?*(Kafwa, et al. 2013).

The questions are raised in view of the fact that education is the backbone for any development in a nation. This being the case the questions surrounding the products and the system are worthwhile since the products and the system should objectively be evaluated to justify the needs in education and subsequent development especially in the perspectives of quality Education for All (EFA) and the free and compulsory primary education(FPE).

Since colonial times, Kenyan education system has embraced summative norm referenced evaluation as the benchmark for awarding grades, certificates and degrees. This evaluation is conducted at the end of each programme level for example after eight years of primary education and four years of secondary education circles respectively (Republic of Kenya, 1991). At the end of the eight years the products of the system are subjected to rigorous summative evaluation known as Kenya certificate of primary Education (KCPE). The evaluating process is a transition stage which is expected to sieve, grade, rank and certify the performance of the products by determining their academic destiny and professional map work. The same process is repeated after four year circle where the already sieved products are re-sieved again through Kenya certificate of secondary education (KCSE). However in higher learning institutions the universities, evaluation is conducted after every semester, a period of sixteen weeks. This is cumulatively conducted for the duration of that degree programme (Republic of Kenya, 1981).

This system has served the country efficiently and effectively given the visible current standards of development from independence. However the high demand for education emanating from the rapidly growing population of around 41 million and half of it being youth and children has overstretched the system. This could compromise standards and encourage anomalies that have in the recent past dominated the system.

Whereas this is the case, the millennium development goal (MDG) no.2 and the Kenya vision 2030 must be lived to the latter. The MDG is a global blueprint document focusing on quality education for ALL which anchors the Vision 2030 as a Kenyan policy developmental document positioning the country in industrially developed nations by 2030 through the three pillars of social, economic and political. Under the social pillar quality education and training is emphasised. It is projected that through quality education and training the country will achieve industrialised statue by 2030. Being the case then it worries and calls for the concern to interrogate the summative evaluation as to whether it has ability to coup with these expectations and the high demands for quality education (Republic of Kenya,)

The system has in the recent past been immersed in cases of exam irregularity. This in specific has arisen many questions pointing to the evaluation creditability. Questions raised are as to whether the summative evaluation is a justified tool to be used as a benchmark for validating the education products and processes. This question is worrying today, especially when the system is a blueprint tool of assessment to the nation and yet appears to be at cross-roads.

Confirming these worries UWEZO Report (2010) revealed that the learning achievements in schools is too low such that a child of class V cannot make mathematical calculation of class III work, and among one out of ten in class VI cannot read the text book for class II. This study was countrywide but the researcher zeroed in the marginalised areas of pastoralists communities. Surprisingly enough, this was not to be confirmed by the release of the KCPE examination results in 2013 where some of the identified areas posited the best results in the examination. In this kind of scenario who could be cheating who?

The Examination Irregularities

During the examination sessions in October-November for the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) and the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE), there are many reports on cheatings and other irregular dealings with examination papers administered to products of the eight and four year circle programmes of primary and secondary schools respectively. The irregularities do not only end at the primary and secondary education levels but is rampant all over including the middle level tertiary institutions such as the Polytechnics and even the higher learning institutions at Universities. With such flouted cases of cheating, selling of examination papers, leaking of student's exam questions in pretence of revisions, teaching the set exam questions in the name of covering syllabus, and wrong grading due to computer error among others is worrying a lot. As one would wonder, what justification is there to the community and the population of this nation when success or failure in education is pegged on the grades and certificates achieved through irregular means? Is it justified to tag success with scores of good grades and failure with poor grades in the wake of today's irregularities in the summative evaluations? Is the nation concerned with holistic education or only concerned with academic grade? (Daily Nation, March 3rd, 2008). Can the moral status of our products be established by the one-time summative evaluation the education system so much rely on? Is the free and compulsory education set to succeed in this kind of environment? Shall we realise the goals of the MDG and the Vision 2030 in this context? (Kafwa, et al. 2013).

For instance, a learner who ends up being graded with 'A' grade informs the public that is the best and those awarded lesser grade are regarded as either average or poor performers. Given that the summative evaluation is offered at the end of the course after the learner has undergone so many processes, it does not justify for a one-time event/activity when there is so much that has been acquired by the learner during the course. With flouted irregularities as already discussed, it is unfair for a one-time grade of evaluation to be assigned to the learner and yet it predetermines the entire course of one's academic and career life? The learner's visionary, emotions, values, processing of acquired knowledge, transparent and competent is missed out in such grading system especially in the midst of today's norm-referenced summative evaluation irregularities.

Sound morals are central in educational achievement. The norm referenced summative evaluation has no capacity as mentioned earlier to gather data on moral value and this cannot be captured in a one-time evaluation. In effort to use one time-event to assess the moral values, the exercise will be artificial and therefore will not gather the best it deserves. But on the other hand, is a fact that life cannot be lived on pretence throughout. Therefore, is a de- service to the society, the products, and the global community if the system is not measuring the right variables in the products but still declare them as the best?

Terminal evaluation should not be based on examinations only but also on coursework. It should discover what the learner does during the course of the studies. The learner can therefore be evaluated at the end of

the course in light of what has been covered during the course and should therefore not be perceived to mean use of exam as in summative evaluation. Terminal evaluation is necessary as it can take place without exams, and throughout the programme. Its outcome therefore should form part of the final grading.

Scenarios of the Norm-referenced Summative Evaluation

There are many scenarios of norm-referenced summative evaluation that are presented in Kenya in addition to those highlighted in the text. Some of these include: - the grading trends that take this course, candidates scoring good marks like 410 out of 500 for Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE) from public schools are considered for national schools slots; 400-300 marks for provincial schools and 200-100 for District schools. However, below 100 marks are labelled as 'failure' and may not find a place in most of the schools and therefore recommended to undertake the technical education curriculum (Kerre, 2010, Otunga, 2010)

The short comings in such scenarios are critical in that if something happens to a student and she/he misses the exam it means no academic progression of that student until when she/he undertakes the same exams when next offered. Such delays and time wastage can easily be resolved if the criterion-referenced formative evaluation system is recognized and concurrently utilized with summative without comprising the standards.

Further scenarios are, if a student happens to use irregular means to earn a good grade/score like in K.C.S.E exam through cheating or leakages of the paper will have an upper hand in grading over a student who genuinely used her ability. This may lead to frustration in either way to both genuine and the cheating student.

Another example involves where a student attains grade 'A' in K.C.S.E and is admitted for medicine or Engineering and yet in actual sense she/he measures at grade 'D'! Such misadvice will lead to career misplacement, wastage of resources and comprise of professional. The same situation may happen to a student who scores grade 'D' in summative evaluation just because she/he was in poor physiological and emotional state yet in actual sense the student is a good material of 'A' standards. The same misplacement and subsequence consequence will occur. It is unfair therefore to rely on a summative evaluation when is clear that the system has so many subjectivity issues. The combination of both formative and summative may attempt to eliminate overcome the challenges.

Way forward

Scholars have expressed different functions of evaluation based in the context within which the terminology is utilized. In general, functions of evaluation are varied and include: Assessment of the process, product, programme, materials and for psychological and socio-political purposes.

In Kenya, evaluation is used for improvement and development of an ongoing activity, product or programme (Nasibi, 2003). The results of this kind of evaluation are used and directed towards improvement of education ventures. Evaluation of students, for instance is conducted for purposes of placement, selection or rejections, certification, projection, maintenance of standards, motivation to learn, and for feedback to the teachers, community and students.

For the purposes of students' performance, the evaluation process is utilized to rank and assign grade to student which translates into a terminal categorization of one as successful or failure. However, such evaluation can be biased in terms of favouritism and/or leakage thus giving some products (students) higher advantage over others if not well monitored and controlled. In such situations it is reasonable to question the systems and eliminates the shortcomings to enhance the quality and fairness. These calls for repackaging of strategies to enable the system serve the initial purpose.

Evaluation is also used for accountability where cost-effectiveness, expenditure monitoring and resource apportioning are of great interest. In this context, the function is relevant to donors and other sponsors of educational programmes. Just like any other economical expenditures, the cost of quality education in any nation is expensive. Since the inception of Free and Compulsory Primary Education (FPE) in 2003 and the Supplemented Secondary Education in 2008 (Republic of Kenya, 2006), the Kenya government has continually allocated a higher percentage of expenditure to education that comes from the tax payers. In addition, government has also received substantive financial support from developed countries like United Kingdom to support the good course of education. That being the situation, good accountability is eminent for further trust both locally and internationally. One of the best ways of accounting for the expenditure is the production of superior products (granddaughter). Evaluation is one aspect of ascertaining quality products, but if the system is manifested with irregularities how does a system account for such high expenditures? This is so because the outputs (granddaughters) may not be measurable to the input and the desired products - this puts the summative evaluation system at cross-roads.

On the other hand, the enrolment of Free and Compulsory Primary Education and Supplemented Secondary Education is massive. The primary school enrolment in 2003 brought on board approximately an increment of 18% translating into 1.3m pupils in 2008 in addition to the previous years (ibid). Given the high enrolment, there is need to have an effective system to promote quality products. At the moment this quality is dedicated to summative evaluation that focuses on nominal evaluation rather than criterion and yet surrounded with a lot of anomalies. The increased enrolment of students in schools and tertiary institutions requires proper monitoring in progression and evaluation that should be harnessed to assess the final products. This may help to scrutinize the products during the course and may lead to resolving the crisis of the products not meeting the expected standards due to irregularities. A case in point is the UWEZO report (2010)! What products are they being waited to be graded at summative evaluation? Supposing such student indulgence in irregular means like leakage of the exam papers and scores an 'A'?

Objects of Evaluation

In the past, educational evaluation has always focused on students and teachers but today the trend is shifting to examine the projects, programmes, instructional materials, environment and the process. All variables that influence teaching/learning are objects of evaluation. The objects are grouped into input, process and output (Mukwa et al, 2002). This grouping is advantageous when dealing with performance effects of programmes, schools, and projects as opposed to the performance effects of individual students although the latter must be taken collectively to determine the former.

In many occasions, if the right measurements are missed out, the effects of such blunder is felt widely. In the same context, proper identification of the right instruments to measure the performance of students is an added advantage to the whole system, and in the eventualities of the contrary, a similar role will be played. The performance of students in Kenya as gauged through summative evaluations and being prone to subjectivity as mentioned in the text can jeopardize the quality of the programme as the aspects of the curriculum, instructional resources and the quality of teaching may not be gauged through such faulty instruments. In circumstances where the products are biased in their quality, the same biasness is translated to the quality of other variables in the system and therefore it will be very challenging to identify where exactly the problem could be to warrant an appropriated actions or remedies. For example if the curriculum, or the instructional resources or the instructional process are poor, the "good performance" that is realized through cheating in exam, or using other irregular means to score good grades of 'As' may not help much to realize where the problem could be lying despite of the faulty elements in the system. Instead all attention will be focused on "good grades" and it will be assumed that all is ok in the system, until later when it hits the point of no return. It is therefore, very important that the instruments for benchmarking are perfect and transparent in all perspectives (Kafwa, et al. 2013).

On the other hand, some scholars argue contrary to the objectives oriented criterion and state that educational goals should not be accepted as stated but instead should be evaluated. In this perspective, the

focus is on achieved outcome rather than intended or desired programme outcomes. Pre-determined goals are not supposed to narrow down the focus of evaluation. Instead, merits are determined from an examination of programme effects without reference to goals and objectives.

Educational Outputs

Teaching as a process involves complex human behaviours that call for stock taking to gauge the progress of the processes at different levels. Education measurement focuses on the outputs to attest the quality of the programme. The outputs are reflected in its clients - the students. The evaluator therefore concerns with measuring the collective acquisition of skills, knowledge, attitudes and behaviours across learner as a way of determining the quality of educational process, and the extent to which the system meets their needs. These measurements also provides information to determine the growth and progress of each student in order to evaluate, facilitate, and verify that growth and progress. The outcome is usually measured by means of educational achievement tests based on cognitive domain of achievement and more specifically at the lower level of recall. In evaluating human beings, the aspect of holistic development is very central and must be examined in terms of physical, emotional, spiritual and intellectual elements. These elements have to be captured in any standard of evaluation. It therefore leaves one wondering whether summative evaluation is observant of such aspects (Mwaka et al, 2010).

The Standard Newspaper (Feb, 20th, 2009) for example, articulates this dilemma of the Kenyan education curriculum. The implication is explicitly apparent in the graduates of the system as the aspect of value and application of acquired knowledge is never at par with qualifications acquired. Then the acquired 'A' grade, however, good, makes a robot of a graduate if she/he cannot apply acknowledge. Such people become a danger to society and themselves. The graduates have knowledge to know when things are not working but lack application skills to rectify the situation through legitimate method. Such are the shortcomings in the evaluation tools and therefore we have failed to identify the variables we need to asses in learners and instead we use invalid tools to wrongly award grade.

The many 'A' grades assigned to the grandaunts will have brought massive development in the society. Instead the wrong grading due to irregularities has established a data bank of grandaunts that cannot separate fact from fiction, or truth from falsehood. Logic alone is not adequate to explain failures of key institutions in the Kenyan society. A high degree of moral understanding is necessary, otherwise; logic becomes a danger in itself.

Morals as such, make education a tool for service not just for the self, but also for the community, nation and the world. It moulds the learners to be useful in society and self-reliant, and help them stand up to challenges in life. Moral character must anchor educational achievement. The evaluation system should encourage and support this principle by setting out criterion that identifies and assign a value on this. Definitely summative evaluation cannot play an efficient role in moral evaluation. If moral achievements must anchor educational achievements, then we need sound evaluation system to identify this.

Other scholars like Kafua, (1995) have discussed issues on evaluation criteria. He argues that if evaluation is an attempt to determine the goals to be achieved, then goal achievement criterion should be applied. For example when instructional programme is directed towards student achievement of specific behavioural objectives, a question often asked at the end of instruction is the extent to which the student exhibits the competency implied or specified in the behavioural objective. Tests formulated to answer this question must contain specific criteria by which judgment can be made. This calls for setting standards in terms of specifying a performance that either is or is not acceptable. Students whose test scores meet the standard are judged to pass while those below the standards fail.

It is however, controversial today to base judgment on such standards when at the same time the standards are flouted with irregularities. It is prudent at such point to question whether such standards are set in view of the existing irregularities.

Nasibi (2003) on supporting this criterion sees the need to counteract the bias that results from focusing on objectives by using a goal free approach. For example at classroom level, norm-referenced tests are used to compare the performance of each learner with others in the group and ranked in descending order. Thereafter, grades are determined by each learner's performance in the group. However, the two evaluation modes should be seen at best, as supplement to each other rather than mutually exclusive. This could be the way forward for our Kenyan evaluation system. To add value and discourage the summative anomalies that has engulfed the system today. Most evaluation experts agree that a criteria used for a specific object must be determined within the specific context of the object and the function of such evaluation.

Information data of the object

On identifying process of evaluation, a decision ought to be made in regard to various features and dimensions of the object that should be evaluated. Nasibi (ibid) in her model suggests that evaluation focuses on four variables namely; goals, design, process of implementation and outcomes. This approach of an educational project for example, would assess: the merit of its goals; the quality of its plans; the extent to which those plans are carried out; and the worth of its outcomes.

On the other hand, Tawney (1976) suggests five variables while considering assessing an object. The variables are: Descriptive information regarding the object; information responsive to concerns of relevant audience; information about relevant issues; information about values and; information about standards relevant to worth and merit of assessments.

The forgoing discussion suggests a wide range of information that should be collected in regard to the object/variable. It should not limit itself to narrow scope of results. The evaluator should focus on the related information to identify evaluation priorities. The measurement in education outcomes plays the following roles Tawney (ibid):

- i) Provision of feedback to the teachers concerning teaching objectives, procedures, and materials among others
- ii) Provision of feedback to parents/guardians on the progress record of their children in order to provide the necessary emotional, social, academic and material support.
- iii) Provision of feedback to the community on what it could do to supplement school effort in improving the academic and social life of the learners
- iv) Advice on decision making as to where the teacher should begin his/her instruction
- v) Determination of quality of education being offered to learners' vis-à-vis the national goals of education as well as international convention on the rights of the child. Appropriate decisions therefore, can be taken to address any issue of special concern.
- vi) Gives direction on research issues on existing curriculum and suggest necessary amendments.
- vii) Provides suggestions on career placement for school graduates.
- viii) Gives basis for performance, assessment and certification
- ix) Establish basis for promotion of students from one class to another
- x) Acts as a basis upon which information is provided to advice on guiding and counselling services to individual or groups of students on both academic and social issues.

The above points (iii and v) are very pertinent to this discussion as they focus on the quality of education versus the set objectives and what support the stakeholders can contribute towards the improvement of quality rather than focusing on the grades. The real situation is contrary as expressed in point (viii) which is given greatest emphasis in Kenya.

In this perspective, it is important to note that decisions based on achievement scores should be made cautiously since the scores are not absolute indicators of one's performance. For example a score of 0%

in a given subject does not mean that the candidate knows nothing in that subject. In the same vein the score of 90% doesn't neither imply that the candidate is perfect or brilliant in the area especially today when we are raising many questions on efficiency and effectiveness of our evaluation system. Does this score say everything about the student and does it mean that the latter gained totally nothing during his/her education and schooling period? Does education only stand for that one time grade of "A" or "E" or is there more?

Evaluation of Evaluation

The meta-evaluation deals with standards upon which judgment on learner's performance is made. Shiundu and Omulando (1992) identify the following five criteria that can be used for judging the adequacy of evaluation as follows.

- i) Accuracy – the extent to which the information obtained is an accurate reflection
- ii) Creditability – extent to which the information is believable to clients who need it
- iii) Utility - extent to which the results are actually used
- iv) Feasibility – the extent to which the evaluation is realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal
- v) Propriety – extent to which the evaluation is done legally and ethically, Protecting the rights of those involved

The five steps are safeguard against the credibility of the evaluation standards. However, the disconnect today in summative evaluation caused by exam irregularities does not fit into the above criteria. The leakages of exam papers and other irregularities ranges from the time of setting to release of results including what transpires within the period of setting and administration. Normally the setting of exams is conducted way back with several months/year in between before the administration. The experts who do the setting are the same ones assigned teaching responsibilities in the school systems. By and large, everyone wants his products and institutions to be ranked the top and therefore his/her competent (Daily Nation Newspaper, March 5th, 2009).

In the processes the same experts end up teaching the set exams to outshine the rest, then one wonders whether this objectivity or a show of prudent or realistic?

The administration of the exams is flouted with irregularities such as leakages and during the marking and release of those exams other misfortunes like computer errors leading to wrong grading is blamed on, then one still asks, is that accuracy and credible? (Standard Newspaper, April, 2008). These and many other irregularities in summative evaluation system - leaves the stakeholders wondering whether our summative evaluation should continue to be used as standards upon which judgment is made on the grading of learners? (Daily Nation Newspaper, March 5th, 2009).

2. Conclusion

Meta-evaluation are important since any evaluation is said to be biased to some level due to numerous decisions that are made all the time through the processes ranging from planning to execution. The stakeholders must be concerned with evaluation to avoid investing in the wrong targets. A lot is lost when an evaluation is found to be deficient in some critical aspects. To safeguard this, both criterion-referenced formative and norm- referenced summative meta-evaluations are recommended such that, Formative will cater for improvement and summative to add value to final results.

3. Recommendations

In view of what has been presented in this paper, the authors make the following recommendations:

- i) Review of evaluation system with intention of combining both formative and summative evaluation to serve as basis upon which decision on grading, issuance of certificate and career placement will be prudent.
- ii) More emphasis to incline towards formative evaluation where the learners' achievements are continuously gauged within the whole period of the learners' programme.
- iii) Summative Evaluations is inadequate and limited in several capacities like establishing the acquisition of skills and moral values need specially designed evaluation system possibly within informal approach.
- iv) Quality monitoring and control measures could be designed to curb the leakages and other irregular practices in summative evaluation. External custody after setting is crucial and viable alternative storage for consideration.
- v) External supervisions and invigilation should be provided for by members drawn from different regions in the same fraternity of teachers and security. Only the Head teacher should be aware of the specific supervisors, invigilators and securities assigned to their centres. The persons assigned with different responsibilities should be notified at the last minute of their stations of work and far away from their working stations. For examples personnel from western assigned to Nairobi region and vis-à-vis.
- vi) The subject teachers of any course should not be allowed any near to examination venue of his/her students. Why should the subject teachers in science practical be allowed inside the classroom where his/her students are taking exam? He/she should not be amongst the assessors of those practical.

References

- Digolo, O.O. 2006. "The Challenges of Education in Kenya in the 21 Century" in *The Educator*, Vol.1. A Journal of School of Education. Moi University press, Eldoret
- Kafua, P. 1995. "The Evaluation" Unpublished paper.
- Kafwa, V.N. Mwaka, M. Musamas, J. 2013. Teacher Preparation Practices and the Focus to Learning in the 21st Century. Unpublished Article
- Kerre, B. W. 2010. Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET): A strategy for National Sustainable Development. Moi University Inaugural Lecture 9 series No. 1. Eldoret. Moi University Press
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology 2001. Report of the Task Force on Student Indiscipline and Unrest in Secondary School. Nairobi, Jomo Kenyatta Foundations
- Mukwa, C. and Too, J. K. 2002. General Instructional Methods. Moi University Press. Eldoret.
- Mwaka, M, Kegode, G., and Wambua B.K. 2010. Choosing the Right School: Redefining Performance in the Contemporary Kenyan Educational System. *Journal of African Studies in Educational Management and Leadership*.
- Nasibi .W. 2003. Instructional Methods- Teaching Across the Curriculum. Strongwal Africa. Nairobi.
- Ogula, P.A. 2001. A Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation Projects and Programmes. Nairobi; New Kemit Publishers

- Ojiambo, H. 1986. *You and Your Health*. Nairobi, Hermannen Kenya Limited.
- Orr, D. 1991. What is Education For? Six Myths about the Foundations of Modern Education and Six New Principles to Replace Them. *The Learning Revolution (IC#27)*, Winter 1991:52, 1996 by Context Institute
- Otunga R.N. 2010. *The Dilemma of Curriculum Relevance*. Moi University Inaugural Lecture109 series No. 2. Eldoret. Moi University Press.
- Otunga, R. Odero,I. and Barasa, P.L. 2011. *A handbook for Curriculum and Instruction*. Eldoret. Moi University Press
- Republic of Kenya. 2006. *Ministry of Education Strategic Plan(2006-2011.)*
- Republic of Kenya. 2000. *National Development Plan 2000 – 2001*. Nairobi, Government Printers
- Republic of Kenya. 1999. *Education for All, Issues and Strategies, 1991-2000 and Beyond*. Government Printers, Nairobi.
- Republic of Kenya. 1981. *Report of the Presidential Working Party on Second University in Kenya*. Government Printers, Nairobi.
- Schofield, K. 1999. *The Purposes of Education, Queensland State Education: 2010*, [Online] URL: www.aspa.asn.au/Papers/eqfinalc.PDF [Accessed 2002, Oct 28].
- Shiundu, J.S. Omulando, S. J. (1992). *Curriculum – Theory and Practice in Kenya*. Nairobi: oxford University Press
- Tawney, D. 1976. *Curriculum Evaluation Today. Trends & Implication*. Macmillan. London