

Implementation of Competency Based Assessment in Kenya: Extent of Utilization of Competency Based Assessment Tools and Types

Isaac Situma Macheso¹, Robert O. Kati², Robert W. Wafula³

^{1,2}Kibabii University, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

³Kibabii University, Department of Education Psychology

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.806236>

Received: 31 May 2024; Revised: 18 June 2024; Accepted: 22 June 2024; Published: 23 July 2024

ABSTRACT

Competency Based Curriculum (CBC), a curriculum which calls for a paradigm shift in assessment of learners using Competency Based Assessment (CBA) was introduced in Kenya in 2017. The need for a paradigm shift in assessment from 8.4.4 Content Based Curriculum to 2.6.3.3.3 CBC necessitated the need for this study to determine factors influencing implementation of CBA in Kenya by looking at the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types. The objective was to investigate the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types in Grade 6 in selected schools in Kenya. The study was conducted in Trans-Nzoia, Bungoma and Busia Counties. It was grounded on Stafflebeam's CIPP model targeting head-teachers and their respective grade 6 science and technology teachers. Mixed method research design was used. Cluster sampling technique was used to sample the three Counties. Stratified sampling technique on the other hand was used to categorize the schools into public and private whereas simple random sampling was used to choose participating schools and in selecting participating teachers in schools with two or more science and technology teachers. Questionnaire for grade 6 science and technology teachers and interview guide for head-teachers were used to collection data. Analysis was done descriptively in order to bring out the overall descriptions of the extent of CBA tools and types utilization. This study was necessary to determine the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types in Kenya as one of the factors influencing CBA implementation. The study found that CBA tools and types are utilized to some extent in grade 6 in selected schools in Kenya (mean 2.8752, SD 1.1697). The study recommended the government to develop comprehensive policy support to support CBA, place a high priority on allocating necessary resources to schools, establish a robust monitoring and evaluation to continuously assess CBA implementation and organize regular professional development programs on assessment for teachers.

Keywords: Competency Based Curriculum, Competency Based Assessment, Assessment Tools, Assessment Types

INTRODUCTION

Kenya National Examination Council (2021) defines Competency Based Assessment (CBA) as a purposeful systematic continuous process of gathering information from multiple sources for making decisions on what learners know, need to learn, have learned and can do. CBA involves creating opportunities for learners to apply the knowledge, skills attitudes and values they have learnt to successfully perform a task or solve real world problems. The change from the 8.4.4 content based curriculum to 2.6.3.3.3 competency based curriculum in Kenya is aimed at improving on 8.4.4 system shortcomings. CBC therefore calls for a

paradigm shift in assessment of learners using CBA types and tools in order to adjust to the demands of competency based assessment.

Introduction of CBC in South Africa among other African Countries was meant to change the citizens' perception and equip them with employable skills to cope with challenging issues in the 21st century (Mulenga & Kabombwe, 2019). However, there are a number of challenges in its implementation. On assessment for instance, Mulenga and Kabombwe (2019) stated that although Zambia has implemented CBC, the country is still grappling with the conceptualization and realization of assessment criteria and competencies. They stated that it was still not clear how they should be developed in each learning area. A report from Tanzania also indicates that teachers have struggled with inadequate knowledge regarding the objectives of CBC (Mulenga & Kabombwe, 2019). They noted that teachers have not fully moved to the new format of assessment.

East Africa community member countries agreed to put in place a harmonized curriculum framework which is competency based and one that matches global trends (Ondimu, 2018). In the region, CBC is now being implemented in Rwanda, Tanzania and Kenya. Rwanda has had her share of challenges in CBA implementation. Ogan-Bekiroglu (2009) noted that their approach to assessment had not changed and he advised that their approaches to assessment needed to undergo fundamental changes if the assessment practices were to respond to the new goals and demands of CBA. He noted that the examination-dominated high stakes assessment system that were operating in Rwanda could partially account for this mismatch.

Kenya is in its seventh year of CBC implementation as at 2023, a curriculum which calls for CBA. Because of the need to facilitate learners' competencies acquisition, Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC) recommends utilization of a variety of assessment types (diagnostic, formative and summative) and assessment tools in CBA. Among the assessment tools KNEC recommends are: observation schedules, written tests, learners' profile, rating scales, oral questioning, anecdotal records, journal, projects, rubrics, portfolio, checklists and questionnaires. These assessment tools are recommended because they give opportunities to learners, peers, teachers and parents to track the progress of the learner through real time feedback mechanisms.

Project as an assessment tools should be used in evaluating learners because it involves learners, improve their cooperative learning skills, improves their high order thinking skills and builds good relationships between amongst themselves and with teachers.

Bender (2012) however noted that Project-based learning can seem extremely intimidating especially when it requires teachers to switch from being teacher-minded to facilitator-minded. He said allowing students to have more control over their learning is a major problem for teachers, especially when considering the many different skill levels within their classroom along with all of the pressures of meeting state standards.

In their study on exploring the use of journal writing in mathematics classroom, Suhaimi et al. (2017) concluded that journal writing provides an additional time for the students to independently contemplate and to think about the specific lesson learnt. They said that through this, the students may be able to properly digest the knowledge transmitted by the teacher thus strengthening the teaching and learning process. They pointed out that in addition, students can monitor their own learning and hold responsible for it through journal writing.

Grenfell and Harris (1999) among other critics however feel that journals are not without concerns. They informed that learners self-reporting through journal writing may be inaccurate if they do not report honestly or cannot recall their thinking, or report what they ought to do rather than what they do. Additionally, Suhaimi et al. (2017) informed that teachers don't prefer using journals because they perceive journal them as additional burden to their work.

Rubrics as assessment tools are used to interpret and assess learner's performance in given tasks. They are powerful tool to evaluate and give students feedback (Jonsson, 2014). According to Schmidt (2020), a rubric allows for reliability, validity, and transparency in grading student work. Jonsson (2014) also explains the use of rubrics by emphasizing their essential features. He says that rubrics explicitly describe intended and connected actions related to the criteria, the standards and performance levels expected from the related learning outcomes.

Bolton (2006) opined that while there are many benefits to using rubrics, resistance by teachers to incorporating them into their teaching and evaluation of student performance persists. He indicated that such resistance may stem from lack of familiarity with rubrics or reluctance by teachers to devote the time needed for their development. He also wrote that teachers may also not be aware of the benefit of using rubrics. Thus the need for a study to look at Kenyan teachers' utilization of rubrics.

Komarudin (2017) who used quasi-experiment with the randomized pretest-posttest control group design in his study, about portfolio assessment to enhance students' achievement in learning physical education noted that portfolio assessment is more effective than traditional assessment to enhance students' achievement. This findings were in agreement to those of Mutiso and Odhiambo (2022) who looked at teacher's preparedness in implementation of alternative assessment in primary schools in Machakos County, Kenya. They established that few teachers prefer traditional assessment over alternative assessment when responding on a portfolio item. However, these teachers' preference of alternative assessment over traditional one contradicted teachers use of portfolios in the same study. They established that teachers' knowledge on use of portfolio to assess pupils' performance was below average. They noted that skills in using portfolios is a key tool but partially lacking in teachers, therefore may consequentially jeopardize effectiveness CBA implementation. This informed the need for this study to look at the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types in the classrooms.

Although Kenyan teachers are undergoing trainings to help equip them with new evaluation skills in CBA, studies done indicate that they still have challenges. One done by Waweru (2018) to investigate the extent to which lower primary school teachers were trained to implement CBC in Nyandarua North Sub-county, Kenya reported that 50% of the teachers experienced challenges in designing and using the assessment rubric. On the same note, Ondimu (2018) in his study as quoted by Isaboke (2021) to establish teachers' readiness to implement CBC in private preschools in Dagoretti North, Nairobi County established that majority of pre-primary school teachers in public pre-primary schools lack adequate knowledge and skills on assessing learners. This was echoed by Isaboke (2021) in her study on Teacher Preparedness and Implementation of the Competency Based Curriculum in Public Pre-Primary Schools in Nairobi City County who found out that even teachers who were trained in CBC had challenges conducting assessments. She also established that 46.7% and 37.9% of the untrained teachers in CBC had difficulties conducting both formative and summative assessments respectively even with support.

Apparently, the changing of assessment from the traditional one to CBA also calls for the use of the three types of assessment, diagnostic, formative and summative assessment. Learners should be assessed before, during and after the instructional process aimed to assess students' learning progress.

Curriculum change normally comes along with challenges to teaching, learning and evaluation process. Considering the diverse nature of learners in the classroom, teachers should have differentiated instruction which should be directed by diagnostic assessment. According to Desinguraj and Ebenezer (2021), teacher should plan lessons and learning experiences in advance according to the varied learner needs within the classroom identified by diagnostic assessment. They however noted that it seldom happen because it is a time consuming process and additionally, a greater level of pedagogical knowledge is needed.

Regarding formative assessment, Keeley (2008) noted that formative assessment techniques are missing from many classrooms despite their benefits. Nhor et al. (2022) points out that formative assessment practice requires teacher or assessor to have higher knowledge and understanding of how students should be assessed in informative ways. They quote Black and Wiliam (2009) who reveals that although theorizing formative assessment has the potential to improve practice through a better understanding of the learners' possible responses to feedback, it has shown great surprise at how effective many school classroom teachers have been in the absence of such knowledge.

Whether teachers are utilizing CBA tools and types in Kenya as required can only be determined through this formative curriculum evaluation. Considering the fact that curriculum evaluation is a fundamental pillar in curriculum development process, this study was necessary to establish the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types as one of the factors influencing Competency Based Assessment implementation. According to Tyler (2013), which aspects of a curriculum are effective and which aspects of a curriculum need to be improved can be determined only through evaluation. Although CBC implementation is still in its initial stages, Gredler (1996) opined that curriculum evaluation may be carried out at any stage of the process of curriculum development. This study therefore examined the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types.

Statement of the Problem

Change from the 8-4-4 Content Based Curriculum to 2-6-3-3-3 Competency Based Curriculum requires a paradigm shift in the way learners are to be assessed. The paradigm shift calls for new mode of assessment from the traditional one. On this basis, KNEC proposed a Competency Based Assessment Framework (CBAF), which defines the roadmap to CBA. Despite the fact that the new curriculum has now been in use for seven years in Kenya as at 2023, some teachers and parents still want KNEC to scrap CBA, as many still struggle to understand it with others terming it as an unfortunate event that adds no values to the education system in the country (Mutembei et al., 2024). Teachers' lack of understanding of the new curriculum (Amunga et al., 2020) and whether they are equipped with requisite skills, knowledge and competency to handle CBC have also been raised (Muchungu, 2021) despite the heavy government investment with trainings being held across the country to sensitize teachers on paradigm shift in assessment to CBA. These concerns informed the need for this study to examine the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types in Kenya.

Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by Stufflebeam's Context Input Process Product (CIPP) evaluation model. According to Stufflebeam (2003), this model began after the realization that traditional approaches to evaluation were limited and at times, too rigid for evaluating dynamic contexts. The study looked at a number of factors that influence CBA implementation (product evaluation). Among the factors were the number of learners in class on average (context evaluation) which influences extent of utilization of CBA types and tools in the classroom by teachers (process evaluation) and how it influences CBA implementation (product). Teachers as human resource (input evaluation) and whether they had CBC training was also looked at.

METHODOLOGY

The research design that was used in this study is mixed method research design. The study was conducted in three Counties, Trans-Nzoia, Bungoma and Busia Counties. The study targeted primary schools head-teachers with their respective grade 6 science and technology teachers from 2,421 primary schools in the counties. Cluster sampling technique was used to get the Counties. Stratified sampling was used to put schools into their two distinct categories, public and private. In each school category, simple random sampling was used to choose on 246 participating schools, 167 public and 79 private. The sample size was

calculated where a desired minimum percentage of 10% in each County, for each school category was used (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). For schools with more than one science and technology teacher, simple random sampling was used to choose on one. Each head teacher from the selected school was interviewed. Data was collected through questionnaires and interview guide and was analyzed descriptively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The findings bring out the overall descriptions of the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types.

CBA Tools Usage in the Classroom

Utilization of the eleven assessment tools recommended by KNEC to be used in CBA, both in public and private primary schools were looked at. They included; observation schedules, written tests, rating scales, oral questioning, anecdotal records, journal, projects, rubrics, portfolio, checklists and questionnaires.

To establish the extent of how teachers in public and private primary schools use CBA tools, the means were computed giving a summary of the findings in Table 1. Overall, the findings in the table give a summary of the means and standard deviations for public and private primary schools utilization of CBA tools and their aggregate mean.

Table 1: CBA Tools Usage Means in Public and Private Schools

School Category		Observation Schedule	Written Tests	Rating Scale	Oral/aural Questioning	Anecdotal Records	Journal	Projects	Rubrics	Portfolio	Checklists	Questionnaire
Public	N	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167	167
	Mean	1.8024	4.7365	2.3713	3.8743	1.5928	1.5868	3.1617	3.7665	3.1796	2.0659	1.5210
	Std. Dv	.99541	.58293	.69846	.97671	1.01883	.97094	1.04891	1.08075	.97749	1.11473	.84196
Private	N	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	79
	Mean	3.5570	4.8608	3.7342	4.8101	2.9620	2.7975	4.1899	4.8734	4.8354	3.5949	2.8608
	Std. Dvn	.85854	.41554	.79597	.55645	.89790	.91118	.39471	.64782	.43649	.84001	.69308
Total	N	246	246	246	246	246	246	246	246	246	246	246
	Mean	2.3659	4.7764	2.8089	4.1748	2.0325	1.9756	3.4919	4.1220	3.7114	2.5569	1.9512
	Std. Dvn	1.25694	.53720	.96895	.96782	1.17063	1.10630	1.01315	1.09235	1.14376	1.25634	1.01301

Source: Field Data 2024

Legend: 4.20-5.00 (Very large extent), 3.40-4.19 (Large extent), 2.60-3.39 (Some extent), 1.80-2.59 (Very little extent), 1.00-1.79 (Not at all)

Table 1 show a comprehensive comparison of the means and standard deviation values for each Competency Assessment tool in public and private schools. The results demonstrate that written tests (M

4.7764), oral/aural questions (M 4.1748), rubrics (M 4.1220) and portfolios (M 3.7114) are extensively used by teachers in assessing learners. The implication is that teacher tend to prefer these assessment tools more when assessing learners in CBC. Questionnaires (1.9512), journal (1.9756), anecdotal (2.0325), rating scale (2.8089) and observation schedules (2.3659), in contrast, are used less frequently by teachers, implying that they are not as frequently integrated in assessing learners as compared to tests, oral/aural questions, rubrics, and portfolios. Assessment tools used by teachers to a very little extent are new constructivist assessment tools and most teachers feel comfortable using those they are used to just like it was noted in Turkey in a study done by Gelbal and Kelecioğlu (2007) on assessment strategies used by primary school teachers as quoted by Otieno. R. V. (2015). They noted that teachers normally have challenges implementing new assessment and evaluation techniques in their classrooms due to their lack of knowledge about implementation of new assessment tools. They also noted that teachers find constructivist assessment tools time consuming leading to extra work for them.

The results also show the extent of utilization of CBA assessment tools in public primary schools with low mean (2.2640) and private primary schools with high mean (3.91160). This findings show that public schools utilize CBA assessment tools to a very little extent whereas private schools utilize them to a large extent. The difference is attributed to the sizable number of learners in private schools as compared to above average number of learners in public schools. Teachers in private schools can comfortably follow up on each learner using most recommended assessment tools within allocated class time as compared to those in public primary schools that require more time yet time allocation is the same in both private and public primary schools. This makes public primary schools teachers to only use a few assessment tools that are not time consuming.

The aggregate mean for CBA tools usage in both private and public primary school was moderate (3.0880) on the scale rating. This implies that overall, Competency Based Assessment tools are used to some extent in Kenyan primary schools considering that most of these assessment tools are a new territory in their use at classroom level in Kenya (Mutiso & Odhiambo, 2022).

Diagnostic Assessment

Diagnostic assessment is one of the assessment types looked at in this study. It is an assessment tasks used to determine learners’ level of knowledge, skills, and understandings at the beginning of a course, grade level/class, unit and/or lesson. This evaluation allows the teacher to know the strengths and weaknesses of learners so as to plan for them. The extent of how it is used, both in public and private primary schools was looked at by this study as shown by the means and standard deviations in Table 2.

Table 2: Diagnostic Assessment Usage Means in Public and Private Schools

School category		I rarely use diagnostic assessment because is time consuming.	I don't always use diagnostic assessment to evaluate learners' prior knowledge	I don't always ask learners questions to assess their prior knowledge before commencing the lesson	I don't use diagnostic assessment regularly because it is very tedious to administer promptly and regularly.	I hardly give diagnostic assessment because of the large class size.	I seldom use diagnostic assessment because it increases teachers' workload
Public	N	167	167	167	167	167	167
	Mean	3.3413	2.6886	2.1018	3.7725	3.5150	2.1317

	Std. Dev	1.4344	.098729	.91595	1.34736	1.45145	.82543
Private	N	79	79	79	79	79	79
	Mean	1.5443	1.5570	1.3291	1.5570	1.5316	1.4557
	Std. Dev	.90295	.90223	.76335	.91633	.85987	.76456
Total	N	246	246	246	246	246	246
	Mean	2.7642	2.3252	1.8537	3.0610	2.8780	1.9146
	Std. Dev	1.53640	1.09541	.94056	1.60368	1.58866	.86475

Source: Field Data 2024

Legend: 4.20-5.00 (Very low), 3.40-4.19 (low), 2.60-3.39 (Moderate), 1.80-2.59 (high), 1.00-1.79 (Very high)

From the findings in Table 2, it was established that public schools mean for utilization of diagnostic assessments was moderate (M 2.9252, SD 1.1603) while very high (M 1.4958, SD 0.8515) for private schools. The aggregate mean on the other hand was high (M 2.4661, SD 1.2716).

The results' implication is that diagnostic assessments in public primary schools are used to some extent whereas in private primary schools, teachers use diagnostic assessments to a high extent to help adjust the curriculum as per the needs of each learner as required by diagnostic assessment.

The aggregate mean results implies that public and private schools science and technology teachers for grade 6 uses diagnostic assessment to a large extent. These finding were affirmed by most head-teachers during interview schedule. When asked about the extent of diagnostic assessment in her school, one of them said: "As far as I am concerned, my teachers in most cases cross-examine pupils to determine their entry behaviors before they start a lesson, strand or sub-strand (H/T53)."

Findings in this study about diagnostic assessment are contrary to those of Desinguraj and Ebenezer (2021). In their study about need for differentiated instruction in the classroom, they noted that most teachers have issues with diagnostic assessments. They opined that the reason behind is diagnostic assessment needs greater effort and skill on pedagogical knowledge on part of the teacher and it is a time consuming process.

Jimola and Ofodu (2019) also had contrast views as in this study, they established in their study on ESL teachers and diagnostic assessment that most teachers (80%) rarely use diagnostic assessment to evaluate students' prior knowledge. They attributed it to some teachers not having sufficient knowledge of what diagnostic assessment requires nor the reasons for using it. They also established that most of the teachers believe that diagnostic assessment is only meant to give marks to learners at the end of every term and therefore should only take place at the end of the teaching task.

Formative Assessment

To get a better understanding of how public and private grade 6 primary teachers utilize formative assessment and the extent of formative assessment implementation in two categories of primary schools, the means were compared and the findings tabulated in Table 3.

Table 3: Formative Assessment Usage Means in Public and Private Schools

School Category		I most frequently assess my learners during teaching & learning	I always administer assessments in each lesson, after each sub-strand and each strand	Formative assessments should not be reduced to give more time for teaching	Too frequent assessments does not hampers students' independent learning	I prefer formative assess' because through it, I'm able to identify learners' weak point & plan to give remedies	I always systematically collect information and document what each learner knows and can do
Public	Mean	2.2874	2.6946	2.9641	2.9281	2.4311	2.4132
	N	167	167	167	167	167	167
	Std. Dev	1.19790	.90987	1.08045	1.10622	.90832	1.25269
Private	Mean	3.4937	3.9873	4.2025	4.0633	3.9241	4.4937
	N	79	79	79	79	79	79
	Std. Dev	.67697	.70699	.79065	.85247	.74717	.74890
Total	Mean	2.6748	3.1098	3.3618	3.2927	2.9106	3.0813
	N	246	246	246	246	246	246
	Std. Dev	1.19861	1.04205	1.15140	1.15869	1.10663	1.47962

Source: Field Data 2024

Legend: 4.20-5.00 (Very High), 3.40-4.19 (High), 2.60-3.39 (Moderate), 1.80-2.59 (Low), 1.00-1.79 (Very Low)

Formative assessment means in table 3 indicate that public primary schools had a moderate mean (M 2.6198, SD 1.0759) as compared to private primary schools which had a very high mean (M 4.0227, SD 0.7539). This implies that teachers in private schools use formative assessment as a type of assessment to monitor student progress, use the feedback got to adapt teaching and learning in order to facilitate the students' needs during instruction to a very large extent as compared to their counterparts in public schools who uses this type of assessment to some extent. Averagely, the mean for both public and private primary schools was moderate (M 3.0718, SD 1.1895). This aggregate mean implies that grade six science and technology teachers teaching in both public and private schools use formative assessment, whose purpose is to help students develop their own "learning to learn" skills to some extent.

These findings were different from those of Nhor et al. (2022) who carried out a study on teachers' and learners' perceptions of formative assessment practice in enhancing learning. They established that more teachers are likely to employ formative evaluation in their classes. On the other hand, Hunt and Pellegrino (2002) while looking at issues, examples and challenges in formative assessments noted that less teachers utilize formative assessment. They argued that formative assessment requires teachers to be experts at it, such as knowing in advance both the materials that students are supposed to grasp and the different alternative and problematical ways in which students may fail to grasp them. In a study on developing the

theory of formative assessment, Black and Wiliam (2009) also revealed the reason why many classroom teachers do not use formative assessment. They noted that it's because teachers are in the absence of required knowledge.

Given the more than average number of learners in the Kenyan classrooms, a fraction of teachers not using formative assessment in the classroom as it is required complained of limited time noting that they have a lot to do within the limited given time. One of them responded to open ended question on challenges faced in using assessment types by saying:

Personally I am handling two learning areas in a class of 63 pupils, I find it challenging using formative assessment to monitor each of my pupil's progress in each of the learning area, then use the feedback got to adapt teaching and learning that fits each of my learner as it is expected within the given time considering the a big number of pupils in my class (STT).

Similar findings were also found by Asghar (2012) while looking at the experience of formative assessment practice in a British university. Respondents in their highlighted the constraint of time in making learning happen through formative assessment and the challenge of engaging students as the reason as to why it's not used.

In summary, the findings for this study which sort to establish the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Extent of CBA implementation in Grade 6 in selected schools in Kenya

	School Category	Mean	SD	Level
CBA Tools Usage	Public Pri. Sch	2.6963	0.9370	Moderate
	Private Pri. Sch	3.9160	0.6771	High
Aggregate mean & SD		3.0880	1.0479	Moderate
Diagnostic Assessment Usage	Public Pri. Sch	2.9250	1.1603	Moderate
	Private Pri. Sch	1.4958	0.8515	Very high
Aggregate mean & SD		2.4661	1.2716	high
Formative Assessment Usage	Public Pri. Sch	2.6198	1.0759	Moderate
	Private Pri. Sch	4.0274	0.7539	High
Aggregate mean & SD		3.0718	1.1895	Moderate
Grand Aggregate mean & SD		2.8752	1.1697	Moderate

Source: Field Data 2024

Legend: 4.20-5.00 (Very High), 3.40-4.19 (High), 2.60-3.39 (Moderate), 1.80-2.59 (Low), 1.00-1.79 (Very Low)

Considering assessment tools and types looked at, the grand aggregate mean for public and private primary schools was moderate (M 2.8752, SD 1.1697). The implication is that Competency Based Assessment tools and types are utilized to some extent in grade 6 in selected schools in Kenya. This is attributed to very involving constructivist assessment tools and types, in more than average number of leaners in classes, with many learning areas per class to be taught by few teachers within limited time. A good number of teachers feel that assessment tools and types are too involving given overpopulated classrooms they are handling as it was noted by one of the teachers from open ended responses who said:

I would have wished to utilize all the recommended assessment tools and types, but I'm limited by the many

pupils I have in my class. For instance, if I chose to use 3 minutes to record an account of a significant event for each of my 60 learner's in my class, then I will need 3 hours just working on anecdotal records (STT 47).

Teachers need to have a paradigm shift on how learners are to be assessed in CBC as it was noted by Green (2018) that unlike traditional tests, tasks and activities used for CBA are supposed to be designed and administered by classroom teachers themselves as they are considered to be part of the ongoing flow of the classroom.

CONCLUSION

The paper examined the extent of utilization of CBA tools and types. The study concluded that CBA tools and types are utilized to some extent in grade 6 in selected schools in Kenya. This implies that recommended assessment types and tools required to be used by a teacher to determine the extent to which a learner has achieved specified learning outcomes have not been implemented fully.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study recommended the government to develop comprehensive policies that explicitly support utilization of CBA tools and types, allocate resources, among them funding, building more classrooms in schools and employing more teachers to reduce teacher students' ratio to make CBA a reality. The government should also establish a robust monitoring and evaluation system to continuously assess utilization of CBA tools and types in the classroom by incorporating regular assessments, feedback mechanisms, and support structures to enhance utilization of CBA tools and types as required.

REFERENCE

1. Amunga, J., Were, D., & Ashioya, I. (2020). The teacher-parent nexus in the competency based curriculum success equation in Kenya. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(1), 60–76. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ijeaps2020.0646>
2. Asghar, M. (2012). The lived experience of formative assessment practice in a British university. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 36(2), 205-223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2011.606901>
3. Bender, W. N. (2012). *Project-based Learning: Differentiating Instruction for the 21st Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
4. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educ Asse Eval Acc*, 21(1), 5-31. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
5. Bolton, F. C. (2006). Rubrics and adult learners: Andragogy and assessment. *Assessment Update*, 18(3), 5–6.
6. Desinguraj, S. D. & Ebenezer, G. J. (2021). Need for differentiated instruction in the classroom. *International Journal of Hhumanities and Social Sciences*, 10(2), 5-10.
7. Gredler, M. E. (1996). *Program evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
8. Green, A. (2018). Assessment for learning in language education. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 6(3), 9–18.
9. Grenfell, M & Harris, V (1999). *Modern language and learning strategies: In theory and practice*. New York: Routledge.
10. Hunt, E., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2002). Issues, examples, and challenges in formative assessment. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 89(2002), 73-85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.48>
11. Isaboke, H. (2021). Teacher preparedness and implementation of the competency based curriculum in public pre-primary schools in Nairobi city county, Kenya. *International Journal of Current Aspects*, 5(3), 32-53.

12. Jimola, F. E. & Ofodu, G. O (2019). ESL teachers and diagnostic assessment: perceptions and practices. *Elope*. 16(2), 33-48(140). <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.16.2.33-48>
13. Jonsson, A. (2014). Rubrics as a way of providing transparency in assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 840–852. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.875117>
14. KNEC, (2021). *Understanding the competency based assessment (cba)*. Nairobi. <https://www.knec.ac.ke/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/UNDERSTANDING-THE-COMPETENCY-BASED-ASSESSMENT-CBA-pdf.pdf>
15. Komarudin, (2017). Portfolio assessment to enhance students' achievement in learning physical education. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research* 128.
16. Muchungu D. (2021). Survey reveals 80 per cent of teachers not trained on CBC. *Nation*. <https://nation.africa/kenya/news/education/revelead//revealed-80pc-of-teachers-not-trained-on-cbc-354797>
17. Mugenda M. A & Mugenda A. (2003). *Research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*, African center for technology studies. Nairobi, Kenya.
18. Mulenga I. M & Kabombwe Y. M (2019). A Competency-Based Curriculum for Zambian Primary and Secondary Schools: Learning from Theory and some Countries around the World. *International Journal of Education and Research* 7(2):1-14.
19. Mutembei P., Gikandi B., Luisigi B., Ndiema M., Owino S. and Kimutai G. (2024, January 23). Teachers, parents want KNEC to scrap the KPSEA grading system. *The Standard*, p. 6-7.
20. Mutiso, P. M & Odhiambo. K. T. (2022). Teachers' preparedness in implementation of alternative assessment in primary schools within the competency based education system of Kenya. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. VI, (III), 2454-6186.
21. Nhor, R., Pang, S. & Em, S. (2022). Teachers' and learners' perceptions of formative assessment practice in enhancing learning in EFL courses. *Jurnal As-Salam*, 6(2), 181–201. <https://doi.org/10.37249/assalam.v6i2.434>
22. Ogan-Bekiroglu, F. (2009). Assessing assessment: Examination of pre-service physics teachers' attitudes towards assessment and factors affecting their attitudes. *International Journal of Science Education*, 31(1), 1–39.
23. Ondimu, S. M. (2018). *Teachers' preparedness for implementation of the competency based curriculum in private pre-schools in Dagoretti North sub-county, Nairobi city county*. [Doctoral dissertation, university of Nairobi].
24. Otieno. R. V. (2015). Using Written tests to assess holistic development of lower primary school learners in Kenya. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 369.
25. Schmidt, L. F. (2020). Developing classroom and program assessment rubrics. *Radiologic Technology*, 92(2), 210–213.
26. Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). *The CIPP model for evaluation*. International handbook of educational evaluation. https://beckassets.blob.core.windows.net/product/readingsample/336182/9781402008498_excerpt_003.pdf
27. Suhaimi, Z., Shahrill, M., Abbas, N.A.H., Tengah, K.A., Roslan, R., & Yusof, N. (2017). Exploring the use of journal writing in mathematics classroom. *International Journal on Emerging Mathematics Education*, 1(1), 41-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12928/ijeme.v1i1.5683>.
28. Waweru, J. W. (2018). *Influence of Teacher Preparedness on Implementation of Competency- Based Curriculum in Public Primary Schools in Nyandarua North Sub- County, Kenya*. [Unpublished master of education research project in curriculum studies]. UoN.