Developing Country Studies
ISSN 2224-607X (Paper) ISSN 2225-0565 (Online)
Vol.4, No.6, 2014

Implementation of School Based Continuous Assessment (CA) in Tanzania Ordinary Secondary Schools and its Implications on the Quality of Education

Safarath Byabato , Kingtin Kisamo*
Department of Examinations Administration, National Examinations Council of Tanzania
P.O. Box 2624 or 32019, Dar-Es-Salaam, Tanzania
* E-mail of the corresponding author: kingtink@gmail.com

Abstract
Since introduction of continuous assessment system, National Examinations Council of Tanzania (NECTA) has identified an aspect of schools turning in high continuous assessment (CA) marks of their students which does not correlate at all with their respective final examination subject's marks and therefore a serious challenge to the implementation of National Education and Training Policy of 1995. Little has been done to determine teachers' practices and capabilities on the effective implementation of school based CA marks. The purpose of this study was therefore to investigate the implementation of school based continuous assessment in Tanzania Ordinary Secondary Schools (O-level) and its implications on the quality of education. Five hundred and forty six (546) O-level teachers from Dar es Salaam, Arusha and Zanzibar participated in the study. Convenience sampling technique was used and data were collected using a questionnaire and analyzed by SPSS package to compute mean, standard deviation and percentage. A 3.5 mean value of the six Likert scale formed the basis for presentation and discussion of the results.
The results showed that the implementation of school based CA it is not properly done as is currently challenged by number of serious problems such as lack of teachers' integrity (favouritism and inflation of marks), lack of uniformity in both the assessment tools used and procedures for CA recording and reporting. The role assumed by NECTA as CA coordinating and monitoring body so to eliminate the element associated with high price place on a single examination is not properly done and its guideline prepared in 1991 for CA implementation is not found in most schools and yet it is not in the same pace with today's society as it has not been reviewed since its inception. In general teachers showed little or no in-depth capacity of the assessment practices. It is recommended that there is a need to first, revoke the current NECTA's system of CA so that the new system considers National Form II and pre-national (Mock) examinations as the alternative CA components in grading the final examination results of candidates and second, to fine-tuning CA coordination and monitoring done by NECTA or establish coordinating and monitoring body operationalise CA to the intended standard.
Keywords: School based continuous assessment, CA implementation, Quality education,

Introduction

The fundamental role of assessment is to provide authentic and meaningful feedback for improving student learning, instructional practice and educational options. This means that assessment is not and should not be seen as an end in itself but a means to a justifiable end of learning (Njabili et al., 2005).
In Tanzania, the history of continuous assessment (CA) can be traced back to 1976 when it was implemented for the first time after the Musoma resolution (Njabili, 1987). This resolution emphasized the necessity of getting rid of "ambush" type examinations, and reducing the excessive emphasis placed on written examinations. Thus the main purpose of having a CA scheme as an integral component of assessment procedures in the Tanzanian education system was to eliminate or minimize the element of risk associated with a single examination, and to give a valid indication of student achievement (Njabili, 1987). To resolve this, the National Examinations Council of Tanzania (NECTA) introduced a system of evaluation using CA as a component in grading the final examination results of candidates. On implementing this, NECTA elaborates that, candidates' continuous assessment marks shall be obtained through terminal tests (two terms in a year), and one project (NECTA, 1991 & 2004). However in current practice, NECTA demands from school, candidates' CA marks that are obtained through form II national examination, two form III terminal tests, pre-national (Mock) examination and one project which are done in form IV.
The operationalization of CA in Tanzania came officially in 1995 after the establishment of Tanzania National Education and Training Policy (ETP) which stipulates that CA score shall contribute 50% of the total weighting of the students' final results. This means that the total marks for the final examination shall include the 50% marks from CA and 50% marks from the final examination (MoEC, 1995).

Statement of the Problem

Since introduction of continuous assessment system, there are many challenges associated with its use in practice

and hence the implementation of National Education and Training Policy of 1995. In almost every year during processing of the Ordinary Secondary School (O-level) examination results, NECTA has identified an aspect of schools turning in high CA marks of their students which does not correlate at all with their respective final examination subjects marks, hence teachers are believed to manipulate CA scores sent to examination body (NECTA database, 2008-2012). Little has been done to determine teachers' practices and capabilities on the effective implementation of school based CA marks. It is in the light of this the researchers investigated the implementation of CA in Dar es Salaam, Arusha and Zanzibar O-level.

Purpose of the Study

The study was carried out to investigate the implementation of school based continuous assessment (CA) in Ordinary Secondary Schools and its implications on the quality of education.

Research Questions

How are school based CA being implemented in O-level?
What are the challenges in the implementation of school based CA in O-level?
What are the implications of school based CA in O-level on the quality of education?

Literature Review

Continuous assessment of learners' progress is a mechanism whereby the final grading of learners in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of learning systematically takes account of all their performances during a given period of schooling (Falayalo, 1986). Njabili (1985) defined it as the procedure which involves a systematic collection of marks or grades by the teacher over a period of time and the consolidation of the marks or grades into a final score taken into account in deciding the candidate's final grades. Continuous assessment places teachers at the centre of all performance assessment activities. It encourages more teacher participation in the overall assessment or grading of his/her learners.

Competences are becoming increasingly important in the lives of individuals, practitioners and organization supervisors, team leaders and managers. The basic competences for Tanzania secondary school learners prescribed in the curriculum specify the assessment of communication, numeracy, creative and critical thinking, technology, interpersonal, self-learning /independent learning competences respectively (TIE, 2004, 2011). One of the cries from many educational stakeholders in most of our school leavers is lack of communication skills. School leavers can hardly communicate verbally or in writing because this assessment mode is minimally practiced, despite it being one of the key competences recommended by the current curriculum (Tilya, 2013). This conforms with other studies that language ability is a challenge to many Tanzania teachers as majority of them are seriously handicapped when it comes to use English as the language of instruction in teaching and learning processes (Kimaro, 2011; Qorro, 2006).

Assessment reform theorists assert that, teachers can improve achievement levels of students by implementing sound, consistent and reliable assessment practices. Unfortunately, there has been a disconnection between the practice said by different measurement specialists and the day to day classroom assessments and grading practices. For example, researchers have showed that teachers' classroom assessment has sometimes lacked meaning because they are not always based on information that is indicative of achievement. Many teachers' classroom assessment tends to be unreliable, inconsistent, and often based on non-achievement factors (Allen, 2005; Jordan, 2005; Tomlison, 2005). Therefore teaching as a professional like others needs to be activated from time to time, purposely to make the professionals very active according to their work (Haki Elimu, 2006).

Premaratne (1976) argues that, the position of the teacher as an assessor may affect the teacher-student relationship and may restrict inquiry, constrain creativity and arrest the development of independent thinking. On the other hand, the teacher will be easily overwhelmed by the effects of befriending students in awarding marks to them. Teachers may be unduly kind and generous by awarding better marks than they should to weak students. Since contribution of CA marks to the candidates' final examination results is as high as half of the total mark, and since each school craves for a good name based on the standard of the examination performance of its students, schools may inflate continuous assessment marks (Lauwerys et al., 1969). CA does correlates very well with final examinations scores if it is done properly (Njabili 1999, & 2005; Kitosi (1982).

On the other hand, Mtani (1976) commented that, it would be difficult to have uniform standards in various tests and exercises given by different teachers, different schools and in different subjects and hence very little correlation in the marks awarded to students in different schools. Assessing students is a task that most teachers dislike and that few do well because many of them have little or no in-depth knowledge of assessment principles (Ojuonuma, 2007; Tilya, 2013).

Study done by Lissu (2008) to examine the public awareness on the administration and contribution of school based CA marks in Tanzania secondary schools revealed that students, teachers, education officers, parents and some of NECTA staff are not aware of how continuous assessment scheme as an integral part in assessing

student' achievements operates. He also found that the current CA scheme is faced with various setbacks to smooth running of the system. Some weaknesses encountered were no adherence to guidelines of conduct and administration of CA marks, unawareness of the CA scheme as a result CA marks in schools were obtained haphazardly and school based CA was confronted with problems such as favourtism and inflation of marks exercised by teachers. In resolving the challenges, the researcher suggested that CA marks be obtained through zonal or regional examinations, as students will be equally and fairly assessed to grade students' final examination results.

From the above researches, it shows that little has been done to investigate implementation of school based CA by teachers who are the key implementers. The researchers in this study, therefore, investigated out how different O-level teachers prepare, handle, and report CA. They further investigated teachers' challenges in implementing school based CA and its implications to quality education.

Design and Method

The study adopted the descriptive survey design where questionnaires were administered to all participants.

Participants

Participants in this study were O-level teachers from Dar es Salaam, Arusha and Zanzibar. A total number of 546 teachers participated in filling up a questionnaire. The sample targeted 560 teachers from 40 O-level schools in which 14 teachers were involved in each school. At least 12 schools were involved in each of the three regions. The study focused on teachers because they are the core implementers of school based CA at school level. Convenience sampling technique was used to select study area and sample to be studied. It is a non-probability sampling technique where subjects are selected because of their convenient accessibility and proximity to the researcher (Castillo, 2009; Gupta, 2011). For that matter teachers who were accessible and ready to volunteer were sampled since all teachers have the same qualification for this study.

Instrument

In this study, a six parts questionnaire consisting of 76 items was administered to teachers. The statements developed for each part respectively were on: Teacher's capacity in assessment practices, Teacher's assessment of students based on a wide variety of competences, Assessment tools used in assessing learners' work for CA, Teacher's practice in recording and reporting CA, Parental participation in the implementation of CA and finally, Teacher's challenges in implementing the school based CA.

In all parts except part three, participants' personal opinion was obtained by them marking in the appropriate column of Likert Scale numbered 1-6 (1= I Agree Very Much, 2= I Agree Pretty Much, 3= I Agree a Little, 4= I Disagree a Little, 5= I Disagree Pretty Much, 6= I Disagree Very Much). In part three, participants marked in the appropriate column of Likert Scale numbered 1-4 (1= Weekly used, 2= Monthly used,3= Termly used, 4= Annually used) which also represented their personal opinion.

Method of Data Analysis

Data from the questionnaires were analyzed through SPSS version 17 to compute mean (M), standard deviation (SD) and percentage. The 3.5 mean value of the six Likert scale for CA implementation formed the basis for presentation and discussion of the results. Percentage was used for presentation of assessment tools.

Results

The results of the study are presented in Tables 1-6 as follows.

Table 1: Teacher's capacity in assessment practices (N=546)

Assessment practices	Mean	SD
Make use of Table of Specification in constructing test items	3.67	1.74
Attach adequate weight to each of domains during test construction	3.10	1.60
Construct test items so as to reflect the construct they are designed to measure.	2.52	1.58
Consider the appropriate objective for each domain	2.66	1.59
Assess students in lower cognitive domain	2.94	1.71
Assess students in higher cognitive domain	2.89	1.65
Assess students in affective domain	2.87	1.62
Assess students in psychomotor domain	2.97	1.66
Consider reliability and validity of instrument before using them.	2.73	1.76
Competent in computing and using item analysis, item difficulty, item facility and discrimination indices	3.11	1.69
Develop and use valid assessment instruments for assessing the three domains	2.59	1.61
Prepare a model answer with a well-made marking scheme before scoring	2.57	1.68
Give students frequent feedback on their scripts after scoring	2.73	1.61
Summarize and transform score into standard scores for uniformity purposes	3.59	1.63
Plan remedial teaching based on information got from assessment	2.69	1.65
Incorporate CA scores in the annual assessment of students	3.61	1.86
Identify student's areas of strength and weaknesses and use it to guide the student and improve teaching	2.37	1.65

The results of Table 1 have a mean average of 2.92 showing that, teachers have little capacity in assessment practices. The highest mean (M>3.5) in the use of table of specification in constructing test items, transforming score into standard scores for uniformity purposes and incorporating CA scores in the annual assessment of students prove that teachers do not practice them accordingly. However the results showed that teachers have capacity of identifying students' areas of strength and weaknesses and using it to guide them to improve teaching (M=2.37).

Table 2: Teacher's Assessment of Students Based on a Wide Variety of Competences (N=546)

Assessment Based on a Wide Variety of Competences	Mean	SD
Communication	3.73	1.61
Numeracy	2.92	1.55
Creative and Critical thinking	2.79	1.60
Technology	3.17	1.64
Interpersonal competences	2.80	1.57
Self-learning /Independent learning competence	2.76	1.55

As shown in Table 2 majority of teachers assess their students based on the variety of competences. However the aspect of Communication showed that it is insufficiently assessed with a M>3.5.

Table 3: Assessment tools used in assessing learners' work for CA (N=546)

Assessment tools used in assessing learners'	**1 (%)**	**2 (%)**	**3 (%)**	**4 (%)**
Tests	41.10	33.84	17.05	4.93
Portfolio	12.47	32.12	23.36	26.85
Project	1.64	12.95	18.77	48.08
Worksheets	19.79	27.53	20.27	23.77
Practical	3.70	11.92	22.60	19.38
Take-home assignments	51.03	21.10	12.81	12.53
Investigations	6.44	11.85	19.52	23.56
Research assignments	12.67	18.84	24.79	39.18
Rating scales and rubrics	5.41	13.36	14.59	27.74
Take attendance before teaching and use it as part of assessment	15.55	21.03	9.79	9.93
Mark students notes	17.74	16.51	8.08	11.58

Key: 1=Weekly Used, 2=Monthly Used, 3=Termly Used, 4=Annually Used

Findings in Table 3 indicate that take home assignments are more used (51.03%) in weekly basis. Tests predominate more (33.84%) in monthly basis, Research assignments more used (24.79%) in termly basis while project showed to be more used (48.08%) in annual basis. The findings showed high missing involve mark students notes (46.09%), take attendance before teaching and use it as part of assessment (43.70%), rating scales and rubrics (38.90%) and investigations (38.63%) assessment tools respectively. This implies some of the assessment tools are not applied at all.

Table 4: Teacher's Practice in Recording and Reporting CA. (N=546)

Practice in Recording and Reporting CA.	Mean	SD
CA are recorded in		
One ledger for all students	3.20	2.06
One ledger for each class	2.70	1.88
Two ledgers per class – Female/Male	3.81	1.98
A separate card/file for each student	2.90	2.07
CA records are stored in		
The headmaster's office	2.69	1.96
Each class	3.46	2.09
A room designated as record center	3.00	1.97
Archive	3.88	1.97
The responsibility for maintaining school CA records in your school is assigned to		
The head teacher/head of school	2.70	1.93
The class teacher	2.92	1.89
The school clerk/PS	3.90	1.93
The academic teacher/dean	2.82	2.02
How long do school CA records remain active in school before being destroyed		
One years after the student leaves the school	3.85	2.04
Two years after the student leaves the school	3.93	1.91
10 years after the student leaves the school	3.76	1.99
Forever	3.11	2.17
Teachers innovation/ knowledge about		
Ability to use computer for CA records keeping	2.88	1.91
Ability to use computer for CA storage	2.93	1.91

Findings in Table 4 show that: CA are recorded in both separate card for each student (M=2.90) and in one ledger for each class (M=2.70), recorded CA are mostly stored in the headmaster's office (M=2.69) and in a room designated as record center (M=3.00), the responsibility for maintaining school CA records in school is assigned to head of school (M=2.70), class teacher (M=2.92) and academic teacher (M=2.82), CA records remain active in school forever (M=3.11) and teachers are innovative in using computer for both CA recording and storing (M=2.91).

Table 5 Parental Participation in the Implementation of CA (N=546)

Parental Participation in CA	Mean	SD
National and local policies support parental engagement	3.56	1.73
National policies facilitate schools working to engage parents in meaningful ways	3.49	1.63
Schools encourage parents to support their students in their learning	2.68	1.76
Schools and teachers are supported to encourage parents to become involved in schools for smooth implementation of CA	4.23	1.60
School capacitate parents to be able to engage in meaningful student CA outcomes	4.08	1.35

The results of parental participation in the implementation of CA in Table 5 indicate that parents are rarely involved (M>3.5).

Table 6 Teacher's Challenges in Implementing the school based CA (N=546)

Challenges in Implementing the school based CA.	Mean	SD
Heavy teaching workload (above 28 periods per week)	1.86	1.35
Overloaded classes (a class of above 40 students)	1.67	1.22
Lack of CA coordination and monitoring body	2.43	1.55
Poor recording and reporting on students continuous assessment	2.46	1.64
Inadequate teaching and learning support materials	2.04	1.42
Lack of guideline for preparing/implementing CA	2.33	2.02
Lack of interest from parents in schoolwork of students	1.98	1.29
Inadequate understanding of English	2.22	1.43
Insufficient time to carry out CA	2.26	1.50
Absenteeism of learners	2.33	1.55
Inflation of CA marks and favouritism are practiced in schools	2.49	1.57
Practical assessment not performed & included in CA marks	2.28	1.49
Not attended seminars/workshops on CA implementation procedures	1.84	1.43

Findings in Table 6 show a real picture of the most challenges teachers encounter in the course of implementation of school based continuous assessment. All the means are below 3.5, with the most reported challenges being overloaded classes (M=1.67), heavy teaching workload (M=1.86), not attended workshops on CA implementation (M=1.84) and lack of interest from parents in schoolwork of students (1.98).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the implementation of school based assessment (CA) in Tanzania Ordinary Secondary Schools and its implications on the quality of education.

The study particularly focused teachers on the: Capacity in assessment practices, Assessment of students based on the wide variety of competences as stipulated in the secondary schools curriculum, Assessment tools used in assessing learners' work for CA, Practice in recording and reporting CA, challenges in implementing the school based CA and Parental participation in the implementation of CA.

Based on the findings of this study, teachers' showed to have little capacity in assessment practices especially in the use of table of specification in constructing test items, transforming score into standard scores for uniformity purposes as well as incorporating CA scores in the annual assessment of students. This finding conforms to Ajuonuma (2007) and Tilya (2013) who observed that many teachers are incompetent in conducting effective and efficient assessment of learner's achievement, thus they have little or no in-depth knowledge of assessment principles. Despite the limited capacity in assessment practices, teachers showed to have knowledge of identifying students' areas of strengths and weaknesses and using it to guide them to improve teaching.

Findings about the teacher's assessment of students based on a variety of competences showed that majority assess their student based on the variety of competences as stipulated in secondary school curriculum. In numeracy competence, teachers showed to have enough competence in assessing student's ability to recognise, understand, analyse and respond to information, which is presented in numerical and mathematical forms such as graphs, tables and charts as applied within the subject area. Teachers had further showed to master the assessment of students' ability to make appropriate use of technology in solving problems at the individual and community level (TIE, 2011). However the aspect of Communication showed that is insufficiently assessed. The insufficiently assessed competences were on students' use of a range of language experiences for developing knowledge of a subject area and students' understanding and use of the vocabulary, structures and forms of

expression which characterize each area of study.

These findings may imply that, teachers have limited competence of language and various subject vocabularies. The limited communication–competences hinder them to teach and assess students using a range of language experiences and language vocabulary, structures and forms of expression which characterize each area of study. This is among the cries from many educational stakeholders to most of our school leavers that they lack competences of communication skills. Most of our school leavers can hardly communicate verbally or in writing because this assessment mode is minimally practiced, despite it being one of the key competences recommended by the current curriculum (Tilya, 2013). In Tanzania, the medium of instruction in secondary schools is English for all subjects but Kiswahili subject. The finding conforms with other researches that language ability is a challenge to many teachers where the majority are seriously handicapped relative to using English as the language of instruction (Kimaro, 2011; Qorro, 2006).

Regarding assessment tools used in assessing learners' work for CA, the findings indicated that take home assignments and tests are more used on weekly basis with 51.03% and 33.84% respectively. Findings show that take home assignments were properly done; however it was revealed that teachers assign more tests on weekly basis contrary to directives of the curriculum and circulars (Education Circular No.6, 2011; TIE, 2004) which directed that tests should be administered on monthly, midterm or termly basis to allow teachers enough time for efficient teaching and students to cover enough content to be measured. Most appropriate assessment tools to be administered on weekly basis are portfolio, worksheets, marking students' notes and class attendance. However, the findings in Table 3 revealed that assessment tools are not used accordingly by most of the teachers as there are high missing in marking students' notes (46.09%), taking attendance (43.70%), rating scales and rubrics (38.90%) and investigations (38.63%) respectively. Furthermore, the findings indicate that in termly basis, research assignments and project were fairly administered with 24.79% and 48.08% respectively. All this indicates teachers lacked uniformity and proper use of the different assessment tools is agreeable with Mtani (1976) that, it would be difficult to have uniform standards in various tests and exercises given by different teachers, different schools and in different subjects and hence very little correlation in the marks awarded to students in different schools. This may imply that: The role of NECTA as a CA coordinating and monitoring body is not properly administered and monitored, there is no CA implementation guideline and there are weak school inspections for academic progress in most schools.

The findings on parental participation in the implementation of CA in Table 5 indicated them being rarely involved (M>3.5). In actual practice, students whose parents are actively involved in their education are more likely to attend school regularly, adapt well to school, take advanced classes, excel academically and have better social skills. Since parents showed being not involved, smooth academic progress of students is interfered.

Study in Table 6 had revealed that implementation of school based CA is overwhelmed by serious challenges. All researched attributes had means below 3.5, with the mostly reported challenges being overloaded classes (M=1.67), heavy teaching workload (M=1.86), lack of interest from parents in schoolwork of students (1.98), not attended workshops on CA implementation (M=1.84) and inadequate teaching and learning support materials (M=2.04).

The missing link between what teachers think they know and what they can do in practices is likely to be resulting from the lack of training on assessment practices among teachers, college tutors and school inspectors. This might also be caused by the reported heavy teaching workload and overpopulated classes. It is complained that since 1995, when operationalization of CA came officially in the Tanzania school assessments system, little efforts were made by the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) through both NECTA and the Tanzania Institute of Education (TIE) to train teachers about effective implementation of school based CA. This suggests that teachers are likely to have just a superficial and limited knowledge and skills on CA and thus being unable to effectively implement school based CA. The findings on the aspect of inflation of CA and favouratism (M=2.49) as well as poor involvement of parents interest in the implementation of CA suggest that teachers were not well oriented and monitored to the assessment practices therefore classroom assessment tends to be unreliable, inconsistent, and often based on non-achievement factors (Allen, 2005; Jordan, 2005; Tomlison, 2005) and since each school craves for a good name based on the standard of the examination performance of its students, schools may inflate continuous assessment marks (Lauwerys et al,1969). Despite the heavy workload and overpopulated classes, workshops and seminars to teachers on the implementation of CA are not given importance (M=1.84). Teaching being professional like others then needs to be activated from time to time, purposely to make the professionals very active according to their work (Haki Elimu, 2006).

This study has revealed that currently the implementation of school based CA is fraught with a number of serious problems such as lack of teachers' integrity eg favaouratism and marks inflation, lack of uniformity in the assessment tools, procedures for recording and reporting varying from school to school and the doubted training and ability of some of the teachers who generate them as many of them lack professional training on assessment practices. The role assumed by NECTA as CA coordinating and monitoring body is not properly done and its guideline prepared in 1991 for CA implementation lacks in most schools and not updated as it has

not been reviewed since its inception. These interlink as the cause of schools turning in high CA grades of their students which do not correlate at all with their respective final examination subject scores and thus improper implementation of school based CA in Tanzania. Njabili (1999, 2005) and Kitosi (1982) evidenced that CA correlates very well with final examinations scores if it is done properly. The findings are evidenced throughout teachers' responses in the entire questionnaire as from Table 1-6.

In general findings from table 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 revealed a high SD implying that teachers had limited knowledge about implementing school based CA. In practice, a small standard deviation means a high degree of stability or uniformity of the observations as well as homogeneity of the series (Gupta, 2011). The observed high dispersion of mean from the standard deviation indicates that there is no proper implementation of CA and therefore marks in schools are obtained haphazardly. This might be the serious problem that partly caused poor 2009-2012 O-level examinations results. Improper implementation of CA leads to inadequate teaching and learning which means poor fulfillment of intended curriculum objectives and hence poor quality of education.

Conclusion

Effective school based CA, though lacking from the study's findings, can be an answer in eliminating the element of risk associated with a single examination, and providing authentic and meaningful feedback for improving student learning and hence giving a valid indication of student achievement.

School based CA marks that perfectly reflect the students' future performance should be obtained through harmonized assessment tools which are uniformly administered. The experiences in form II and pre-national (Mock) examinations show that it is possible to develop authentic (reliable, valid, and fair) school based continuous assessment from them (Lissu, 2008).

Recommendations

There is a need to revoke the NECTA system of evaluation using CA marks from schools by considering Form II and Mock examinations as the sole components in grading the final examination results of candidates. The current traditional school based assessments should not be ignored but be emphasized for effective and good performance for both Form II and Mock examinations.

There is a need to fine-tuning CA coordination and monitoring done by NECTA or establish coordinating and monitoring body for proper CA implementation. A coordinating body to be Local Government Education Authority, School Inspectorate Department at the Ministry of education and Vocational Training or NECTA so as to:

1. Monitor the operation of CA to ensure that the minimum standard is met
2. Organize workshops or other forms of training for teachers and school inspectors.
3. Be advisory body to the government and schools on the operation of CA.

More researches are needed on the effective ways of implementing school based CA such as the use of Form II and Mock examinations as well as to whether such innovations are sustainable to solve the current CA implementation challenges.

References

Ajuonuma, J. O. (2007). *A survey of the implementation of continuous assessment in Nigerian Universities*. A Paper Presented at Second Regional Conference of Higher Education Research and Policy Network (Herpnet) held at Ii1a Ibadan, Nigeria.

Allen, J. (2005). Grades as valid measures of academic achievement of classroom learning. *The Clearing House, 78(5),* 218-223.

Castillo, J. J. (2009). *Convenience sampling*. Retrieved from http://explorable.com/convenience-sampling":

Falayajo, W. (1986). *Philosophy and theory of continuous assessment*. A paper presented at a workshop for Inspectors of Education in Odor State, Nigeria. 4th December.

Gupta, M. & Gupta, D. (2011). *Research methodology*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Haki Elimu, (2006). *Situational analysis of science teaching in secondary schools*. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Jordan, A. (2007). *Introduction to inclusive education*. Mississauga, ON: John Wiley and Sons Canada Ltd.

Kimaro, H. W. (2011). *Field experience: Current situation of the implementation of competence based curriculum in secondary schools.* A paper presented at the Fourth Community conference of Practice for Learner-Centred Education in Morogoro. 11th December.

Kitosi J. A. D. (1982). *The extent to which continuous assessment and the national Form Four Examination are valid measures of attainment in biology*. MA (Ed.) Thesis, University of Dar es Salaam.

Kimaro, H. W. (2011). *Field experience: Current situation of the implementation of competence based curriculum in secondary schools*. A Paper presented at the Fourth Community of Practice for Learner-centred Education in Dar es Salaam, Desember 2011 (unpublished).

Lauwery, J. A. & Scanlon, D. G. (1969). *The world year book of educational examinations*. Evan's Brothers Ltd. London.
Lissu, H. (2008). *Public awareness on the administration and contribution of science continuous assessment marks in Ordinary Level secondary schools in Tanzania*. Unpublished Master of Arts in Education dissertation, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
Ministry of Education and Culture. (1995). *Education and Training Policy*. Dar es Salaam: Author.
Ministry of Education and Vocational Training. (2011). *Waraka wa Elimu No. 6 wa mwaka 2011: Kupiga Marufuku Utitiri wa Mitihani*. Dar es Salaam: Author.
Mtani, S. K. (1976). *Continuous assessment in secondary schools*. Occasional Paper. University of Dar es Salaam.
National Examinations Council of Tanzania. (1991). *Guidelines on the conduct and administration of continuous assessment in secondary schools and Teacher Training Colleges*. Dar es Salaam: Author.
National Examinations Council of Tanzania. (2004). *Thirty years of the National Examinations Council of Tanzania 1973-2003*. Dar es Salaam: Author.
Njabili, A. F., Abedi, S., Magesse, N. W., & Kalole, A. M. (2005). *Equity and school-based assessment: The case of Tanzania*. A Paper Presented at The 31st Annual Conference of the International Association for Educational Assessment., Abuja, Nigeria 4th -9th.
Njabili, A. F. (1999). *Practical guide for classroom measurement and testing*: *The basic essentials* (3rd ed.). Dar es Salaam: Mture Publishers.
Njabili, A. F. (1987). *Continuous assessment: The Tanzanian experience*. A paper presented at a seminar on Examination Reform for Human Resource Development, at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex.
Njabili, A.F. (1985). *An analysis of some aspects of the role and performance of an "O"-level biology examination as an instrument for curriculum evaluation. A case study of the 1983 "O"-level biology examination in Tanzania*. Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Hull.
Qorro, M. (2006). *Does language of instruction affect quality of education?* Retrieved from http://hakielimu.org/files/publications/document101does_lang_instruc_fct_qual_edu_en.pdf (August 10, 2013)
Tanzania Institute of Education. (2011). *Improved ordinary secondary school curriculum (Draft)*. Dar es salaam: Author.
Tanzania Institute of Education. (2004). *NCDF*: *A guide to assessment and examination*. Dar Es salaam: Author.
Tilya, J. J. (2013). *Educational assessment: Are we doing the right thing?*. University of Dar es Salaam. Retrieved from www.tenmet.org/Droop/Docs/COP%202013/Tilya.pdf (August 7, 2013)
Tomlinson, C. A. (2005). Grading and differentiation: Paradox or good practice? *Theory into Practice*, *44(3),* 262-270.