360-Degree Assessment Practices at the Secondary Stage

A Study of Teachers' Perceptions

Anamika Mishra* and Ankita**

Abstract

The National Educational Policy (NEP) 2020, suggests that assessment should be holistic, 360-degree, and multidimensional; reflecting students' progress in great detail and the unique abilities and learning outcomes of each student across cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. The researchers aimed to examine the degree to which current assessment practices at the secondary school level align with the 360-degree assessment process. A mixed-method research design was used to analyse the data collected from 140 students and 35 teachers. The students' and teachers' responses were collected through questionnaires and a semi-structured interview schedule was used to collect data from the teachers. It was found that the responses of teachers and students were not consistent; even the teachers' responses through the questionnaire and interview process were not aligned. In the response to the questionnaire, it was evident that teachers are using most of the above-stated assessment practices. However, during the interview, it was revealed that the current assessment practices are mainly based on traditional assessment methods, i.e., oral and pen-and-paper tests. Other assessment practices are not given due consideration in making progress reports. Teachers pointed out that it is difficult to make holistic progress cards because of time constraints, high workload, high student-teacher ratio, and low involvement of parents in the teaching-learning and assessment process. As the assessment process is an integral part of the teaching-learning process there is a need to train teachers and focus on fostering teachers' positive attitude towards various assessment practices for holistic development of the students.

Keywords: *360-degree Assessment, Holistic Progress Card, Formative Assessment, Secondary Education, Summative Assessment*

*PhD Scholar, Department of Education, Regional Institute of Education, Bhubaneswar, Odisha (e-mail: anamikamishra50@gmail.com)

**PhD Scholar, Department of Education, Regional Institute of Education, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, (e-mail: moiankita@yahoo.com)

Introduction

The National Education Policy (NEP), 2020 has replaced the 34-year-old policy on education, which was introduced in 1986 in India. With the changing times, a need is felt for updating educational processes and outcomes to fulfill the requirements of the present time. The NEP 2020 focuses on upgrading the country's education system. The changes proposed by NEP 2020 focus on all areas, including curriculum planning, academic restructuring, development of teaching resources, research and innovation, as well as assessment and evaluation. Assessment and evaluation are integral parts of the education process, as they not only measure educational outcomes but also provide guidelines for improvement. Assessment is a process of gathering and discussing information from diverse sources; the process is completed when assessment results are applied to enhance subsequent learning (Huba and Freed, 2000).

The National Curriculum Framework (NCF) 2005, has stated that, "A good evaluation and examination system can benefit both the learners and the education system by providing feedback to the teachers, students, and their parents about the progress, and needs of students for which, it is not essential to conduct frequent tests and examinations, but employing routine activities and exercises can also assess learning". The NEP 2020 discusses shifting our assessment system from a summative evaluation to one that is more regular and continuous, formative in nature, and competency-based, which can assess higher-order thinking skills. The NEP 2020 suggests that assessment should focus more on learning and feedback and less on merely assigning grades. It states that "the purpose of assessment is not to create the threat of exams among the learners or to label the students as slow, bright, and problem students".

360-Degree Assessment as Proposed by the NEP 2020

A 360-degree assessment process is a feedback system in which multiple sources can be used for the assessment process. It is also known as a multi-source assessment. For making a 360-degree progress report feedback can be collected from teachers, students, peer group, parents, and other stakeholders, which will reflect the progress of the students in all three domains with their strengths, weaknesses, and uniqueness. A 360-degree assessment promotes continuous learning as it provides holistic feedback to the teachers,

learners, and all the other stakeholders, stating the areas that need improvement and the areas that need consistency for brilliance. This assessment process would also ensure objectivity by reducing bias as it is holistic and comprehensive, and focuses on various sources for the assessment process. Additionally, 360-degree report cards would create many opportunities for the children as they integrate different dimensions that were not included in the regular assessment process, which would empower and motivate learners for further growth (Parveen, 2020).

Literature Review

Assessment provides data on students' learning and progress as well as feedback on teaching quality (Aslam and Khan, 2021; Guangul et al., 2020). Holistic assessment is crucial for the learning process because it promotes knowledge progression and evaluates the outcomes attained (Jensen et al., 2019). In addition to helping students maximise their learning, assessment is a technique to make teachers responsible for the students' development through feedback (Rohm et al., 2021).

Chetty et al., (2014) stressed that teachers are one of the important resources at the school level who have an influential role in deciding students' academic success and lifelong achievements. They play a crucial role in the assessment of students' academic performance by developing tests, evaluating, and documenting them, as well as reporting the results effectively (Kapunda, 2022). Teachers' assessment abilities and practices are the essential components for addressing students' learning needs (Guskey, 2020; Nenty et al., 2021). Teachers' effectiveness in implementing formative assessment is important for improving student learning outcomes and for assessment of non-academic factors like student effort for learning, their attitude, and motivation for learning (Hemi et al., 2023).

The NCF 2005 focuses on the assessment of students' academic achievement as well as their performance in co-curricular activities to understand their growth and potential in different domains. So, several strategies are needed by teachers to reflect on students' holistic progress. In this regard, formative evaluation has emerged as a crucial component of global educational reform (Yan and Brown, 2021). Numerous empirical studies have demonstrated its beneficial impacts on students' learning in various situations, and the review supports that formative evaluation

improves students' learning outcomes (Black and Wiliam, 1998; Dunn and Mulvenon, 2009; Gikandi et al., 2011; Bennett, 2011).

As numerous instructional activities are used in formative assessment, the teachers' views and practices regarding it are influenced by both personal and contextual factors. Students have numerous opportunities to demonstrate their understanding and receive feedback on how to improve. Whereas the summative assessment is like a value judgment at the end of the academic cycle and provides no feedback for improvement. So, formative assessment is not inferior in comparison to summative assessment (Bennett, 2011; Heitink et al., 2016) but formative assessment is a challenging practice for educators, and they struggle to execute it effectively (Bonner, 2016; Wiliam et al., 2004; Yan and Brown, 2021).

Continuous assessment includes both formative and summative assessment. The comprehensive nature of continuous assessment provides feedback to the students for the improvement in learning outcomes. However, there are a few challenges in implementing continuous assessment; for instance, lack of physical and human resources, a huge number of students in a classroom with diverse needs, and teachers' inability to make appropriate assessment tools (Quality Assurance Agency, 2007). Conflicts between teachers' opinions about evaluations, personal values, and external forces also make the assessment process difficult (Tariq et al., 2023).

The assessment of learning by Gagne is a well-known approach that seeks to 'measure' the gap between the levels of learning that the students attain and the level of learning that is sought in the teacher's goal-setting. This helps to track the degree of learning attained at the end of the learning path, but it ignores the individuality of each student (Black et al., 2003). Whereas assessment for learning is an ongoing process of assessing progress. Assessment for learning supports the teaching-learning process by providing constant feedback to all the stakeholders about further learning needs. It integrates feedback and interactions between teachers and students that enable the personalisation of assessment procedures. This formative assessment technique runs parallel to the learning process, and it is continuous (Earl, 2013; Carless, 2014). Assessment as learning is a tool that teachers and students may use to co-create learning goals, make explicit expectations

from each other, define challenges, and design the pathway of learning together. Students participate in monitoring the process and feedback exercises, and receive training on how to reflect on their knowledge, skills, and competencies. A key component of this strategy is the development of students' self-evaluative competence. For self-assessment, cognitive autobiographies, logbooks, student portfolios, and rubrics can be used. All of these assessment strategies have a definite focus and function. So, to make the assessment process holistic, there is a need for the perfect amalgamation of various tools and techniques with different assessment strategies to reach the preferred goal of assessment and evaluation in the education process.

Assessments are an integral part of any curriculum, as they connect teaching and learning. Formative assessment is a crucial component of the curriculum since it allows educators to constantly provide feedback, track student progress, and tailor training to match individual learning needs (Gupta and Srivastava, 2024). Formative assessment allows students to identify areas of strength and weakness (Gupta and Srivastava, 2023). Formative assessment is a continuous assessment measure that is more effective when accompanied by feedback that is given at the earliest (Venkatesh et al., 2024). There is a positive correlation between formative assessment and summative assessment scores, so it can be said that better formative assessment scores result in better summative assessment performance (Meher et al., 2023). Assessment of students' performance is the process of documenting students' acquisition and mastery of knowledge, skills, and competencies, so that educators can make informed decisions about the next steps in the educational process. This necessitates formative assessment (Prasoon, 2024). Formative assessment is not a magical talisman that, when used correctly, transforms students from poor to excellent performers. However, properly designed and thoughtfully implemented formative assessments will help students learn more and more deeply (Sarkar, 2012). The NCF-FS 2022, emphasises the importance of formative assessment by using the phrase "assessment for furthering learning". The NCF 2023 emphasises the importance of regular formative assessment for learning over summative assessment.

Teachers' involvement in assessment practices is moderate at all stages of the assessment process, including planning and

administering assessments in class (Reema, 2017). Teachers frequently fail to create and maintain assessment documents, such as cumulative records, anecdotal records, and student portfolios. They do not create a blueprint before the construction of the question paper, and they are unconcerned about the reliability and validity of the questions. Teachers do not prepare comprehensive answer keys or marking schemes. One of the major challenges in implementing NEP 2020's assessment reforms is ensuring that instructors have the necessary training and resources to use the new assessment methods effectively. So, teachers must be properly trained to implement the new assessment system. They must be skilled at creating tests that correspond to the learning objectives and giving students constructive criticism (Yadav, 2023). Rao (2006), claims one of the major aims of school education is the overall development of the child; however, little attention is paid to the educative process involved and the assessment of students' personal development. The overall goal of education is to facilitate learning by improving the teaching-learning process using assessment data. Thus, involving learners as appraisers of self learning and as resources for their peers, lays the groundwork for self and peer assessment (CBSE, 2010).

Rationale

Assessment is like the building block for the whole teaching-learning process. Most of the research studies suggested that continuous assessment provides feedback for both the teachers and the learners to progress throughout the teaching-learning process. Students believe that continuous evaluation offers opportunities to receive feedback on their learning, which motivates them towards continuous learning (Carless, 2014). Students' self-regulation, motivation, and self-efficacy increase when teachers use various innovative assessment practices, such as rubrics, portfolios, and feedback from peers and teachers. According to Opre (2015), summative evaluation focuses on students' grades or achievement in comparison to other students in the class rather than focusing on knowledge or the learning process. Summative progress reports at the end of the year may not reflect positive growth of students, teachers, and the educational processes; there is a potential need for improvement in assessment practices (Xu and Brown, 2016; NCERT, 2005).

The existing literature demonstrates the inadequacy of current assessment practices. Teachers are not well-versed in the use of formative assessment, and they frequently overlook the planning aspects of it. There are many reasons for the lack of awareness of formative assessment, the most important being the absence of clear-cut policies and strategies. Holistic assessment should involve various kinds of activities during the whole academic period rather than just pen-and-paper tests to ensure greater transparency for the assessment of all the domains of learning (Zhang and Burry-Stock, 2003). Various policies and research studies have suggested that assessment should foster learning and should give feedback to teachers to improve their teaching practices (Yan and Brown, 2021; NCERT, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2020). So, there is a need for a shift in the process of assessment, which must include all the domains of learning. Various new and innovative ways of assessment have been suggested by NEP 2020. The 360-degree assessment proposed by NEP 2020 may serve the purpose of assessment for holistic development.

The literature suggests that effective assessment is a cornerstone of the teaching-learning process, providing critical feedback that informs both instructional strategies and student development. Yet, many teachers are not fully aware of or trained in the innovative assessment practices that NEP 2020 advocates; leaving a disconnect between policy intentions and classroom realities. Therefore, this study aims to identify the discrepancies between existing assessment practices and the principles of 360-degree assessment. It examines teachers' awareness and perceptions, aiming to uncover barriers that hinder the implementation of holistic assessment strategies. In this regard, there is a need for '360-degree assessment practices at secondary stage: a study of teachers' perception'.

Operational Definition

360-degree assessment is a multidimensional, continuous, and competency-based assessment. This assessment system is designed to measure the holistic development of students across cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains.

Research Questions

1. What are the current assessment practices in the government CBSE schools at the secondary stage?

2. What is the gap between the current assessment practices and the 360-degree assessment process proposed by NEP 2020?
3. What is the awareness and perception level of teachers toward 360-degree assessment?

Methodology

A mixed-method research design was employed, combining quantitative data from questionnaires with qualitative insights from interviews. The quantitative data were analysed through a chi-square test, while the qualitative analysis focused on in-depth responses regarding teachers' awareness, experiences, perceptions, and challenges related to implementing the 360-degree assessment.

Population and Sample

The population of this study is teachers and students of CBSE government schools in Bhubaneswar. The sample has been conveniently selected from different CBSE government schools. The researchers have collected data from two Kendriya Vidyalayas, one Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, one Odisha Adarsh Vidyalaya, and the Demonstration Multipurpose School, Regional Institute of Education (RIE) Bhubaneswar. Six teachers and 20 students from each school were the samples for this study. The sample included 30 teachers (six teachers from each school) and 120 students (20 students from each school).

Tools and Techniques for Data Collection

The researchers used three tools to collect data.

1. A self-made semi-structured interview schedule containing 16 questions for the teacher, to asses their awareness and perceptions of the 360-degree assessment process, explore their knowledge of the assessment terminology, and the challenges they perceive in implementing holistic assessment practices.
2. A self-made questionnaire containing 19 items for the teachers to identify the specific methods and techniques currently employed by them in schools at the secondary stage. This included assessing traditional practices, such as pen-and-paper tests, as well as innovative techniques like portfolios, peer assessments, and project-based evaluations.

3. A self-developed questionnaire containing 19 items was used to collect data from the students for validating and triangulating the data collected from the teachers.

For both questionnaires, a three-point rating scale (Never, Often, and Always) was used. The participants (teachers and students) were directed to select the appropriate option depending on how frequently the teachers were using the proposed assessment practices in the classroom.

The interview schedule and items in both the questionnaires were framed keeping in mind—the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor—all three domains of learning. All the dimensions associated with the 360-degree assessment proposed by NEP 2020 were kept in consideration while framing the questions for each domain, for example, assessment by the teacher, self-assessment, peer-assessment, parental input, etc. Expert advice was taken to validate all three tools.

Participants' consent was taken during the data collection process. No personal information of the participants has been revealed by the researchers at any point. The responses from both questionnaires and interviews were triangulated to provide a comprehensive understanding of the current assessment practices and to validate findings.

Table 1: Dimensions of the Research Tools

Dimensions of Assessment	Tools and Techniques for Assessment
Affective Domain	Observation, checklist, rating scale and community participation
Psychomotor Domain	Group projects, debate and discussions, field trips, dramatisation, role-play, presentations and co-curricular activities
Peer Assessment	Feedback and involvement of peer group in the assessment process
Self Assessment	Reflective diary, journal writing and portfolio
Parents' Involvement	Parents involvement and feedback in students' progress
Cognitive Domain	Formative and summative assessment, oral test and practicals

The data collected through the questionnaires for the teachers and the students have been analysed under the following table headings. The tables are designed to consider various assessment tools and techniques under one dimension. There might be some overlap in the tools and techniques of assessment under these table headings, but the researchers have tried to differentiate among them based on the collected data.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 2: Affective Domain

S. No.	Suggested Activities for the 360-degree Assessment Process	The χ^2 Value of Students	The χ^2 Value of Teachers
1.	Rating Scale	46.9*	22.5*
2.	Observation and Feedback	12.7*	23.5*
3.	Community Engagement	0.980	7.80*
4.	Checklist	29.7*	4.80

*Note: * Significant at a = 0.05; df = 2*

In Table 2 the calculated χ^2 value for students' response is 46.9, and for teachers' response, it is 22.5 for item 1. For Item 2, it is 12.7 for students' response and 23.5 for teachers' response with df=2. So, for both items, the χ^2 values for both teachers and students are significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that the stated assessment practices are in use, and continuous feedback is also provided to the students.

For Item 3, the calculated χ^2 value for students' responses is 0.98, and for teachers' responses, it is 7.80 with df = 2. The χ^2 value for students is not significant at the 0.05 level, whereas the χ^2 value for teachers is significant at the 0.05 level. So, the result implies that there is a discrepancy in the data provided by the teachers and students. As per the students' response, assessment of social, ethical, and moral behavior through community engagement is not done. But as per the teachers' response, it is a regular practice.

For Item 4, the calculated χ^2 value for students' responses is 29.7, and for teachers' responses, it is 4.80 with df = 2. The χ^2 value for students' response is significant at the 0.05 level, whereas the calculated χ^2 value for teachers' response is not significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that students' self-expression and interpersonal behaviour in the classroom are assessed. But as per the teachers' response, it is not done.

Table 3: Psycho–motor Domain

S. No.	Suggested Activities for the Assessment Process	The χ^2 Value of Students	The χ^2 Value of Teachers
1.	Field trips are planned frequently	30.4*	12.2*
2.	Drawing, painting, and multimedia presentations by students	3.98	1.20
3.	Debates and discussions	12.7*	8.60*
4.	Speech/drama/sports and other practical activities	22.0*	6.20*
5.	Group projects and group discussions	1.46	11.4*
6.	Role-play in different subjects	8.54*	7.8*
7.	Individual projects and working models	0.860	5
8.	Students' activities and interaction outside the classroom.	37.8*	7.80*

*Note: * Significant at a = 0.05; df = 2*

In Table 3, the calculated χ^2 value for students' responses is 30.4, and for teachers' responses it is 12.2 for Item 1, so the χ^2 values for both teachers and students are significant at the 0.05 level. It means that the assessment of various personality factors through field trips is done.

For Item 2, the calculated χ^2 value for students' response is 3.98, and for teachers' response, it is 1.20 with df = 2; both values are not significant at the 0.05 level. It implies that the students' creative ideas, like drawing, painting, and other presentations, are not part of regular assessment practices.

For Items 3 and 4, the calculated χ^2 values are 12.7, 22.0 for students' responses and 8.60, 6.20 for teachers' responses, respectively, with df = 2, so these χ^2 values for both teachers and students are significant at the 0.05 level. This implies that debate, discussions, drama, speech, and other activities requiring physical involvement are frequently carried out in the classroom to assess the psychomotor domain.

The calculated χ^2 value for students' response is 1.46, and for teachers' response it is 11.4 for Item 5, so the χ^2 value for students is not significant at the 0.05 level, whereas for the teachers it is significant at the 0.05 level. These values imply that students and teachers are not in agreement that group projects and group discussions are organised frequently. Teachers' response reflects that these activities are organised frequently, but students' response reflects that it is not.

For Item 6, the calculated χ^2 value is 8.54 for students' and for teachers' responses, it is 7.8, so the χ^2 values for both teachers and students are significant at the 0.05 level. It means that role-play assesses various aspects of students' personalities.

For Item 7, the calculated χ^2 value for students' response is 0.86, and for teachers' response, it is 5 with df = 2; both values are not significant at the 0.05 level. It reflects that students' assessment through engagement in preparing individual projects and working models is not a regular practice.

For Item 8, the calculated χ^2 value for students' response is 37.8, and for teachers' response it is 7.80, so the χ^2 values for both teachers and students are significant at the 0.05 level. It means that students' activities and interactions outside the classroom are also part of the assessment process.

Table 4: Peer Assessment

S. No.	Suggested Activities for the Assessment Process	The χ^2 Value of Students	The χ^2 Value of Teachers
1.	Involvement in assessing classmates/peer assessment	26.5*	11.4*
2.	Students' feedback on peers' performance is considered while making the progress report	15.7*	2.6

*Note: * Significant at a = 0.05; df = 2*

In Table 4 the calculated χ^2 value for Item 1 for students' response and teachers' response are 26.5 and 11.4, respectively, with df=2; these values are significant at the 0.05 level. It implies that students participate in the peer assessment process. For Item 2, the calculated value for students' responses is 15.7, and for teachers' responses, it is 2.6 with df = 2. It reflects that the χ^2 value for students' responses is significant at the 0.05 level, whereas the χ^2 value for teachers' responses is not significant at this level. This result implies that students' feedback for their peers' performance is not considered for making progress reports.

Table 5: Self-assessment

S. No.	Involvement in the Following Activities for the Assessment Process	The χ^2 Value of Students	The χ^2 Value of Teachers
1.	Reflective diary, journal writing by students	22.0*	(5) 1.40
2.	Portfolio	57.4*	(1)13.4*

*Note: * Significant at a = 0.05; df = 2*

In Table 5, the calculated χ^2 value for Item 1 for students' response is 22.0, and for teachers' responses, it is 1.40 with df = 2. It means that the calculated χ^2 value for students' responses is significant at the 0.05 level and that the χ^2 value for teachers' responses is not significant at the 0.05 level. It implies that reflective diary and journal writing is not a regular practice, as per teachers' response, but as per students' response, it is a regular practice.

The calculated χ^2 value for item 2 for students' response is 57.4, and for teachers' response, it is 13.4 with df = 2. These calculated values are significant at the 0.05 level of significance. It implies that students' portfolios are an essential part of the assessment process.

Table 6: Parents' Involvement

S. No.	Suggested Activities for the Assessment Process	The χ^2 Value of Students	The χ^2 Value of Teachers
1.	The progress report is frequently shared with parents	14.5*	(6) 13.4*
2.	Parents' continuous feedback on students' progress report cards	10.6*	(7) 25.8*

*Note: * Significant at a = 0.05; df = 2*

In Table 6, the calculated χ^2 value for students' responses for Items 1 and 2 are 14.5 and 10.6, whereas for teachers' responses, it is 13.4 and 25.8, respectively, with df = 2, which is significant at the 0.05 level. It reflects that parents are involved in the assessment process.

Table 7: Cognitive Domain

S. No.	Suggested Activities for the Assessment Process	The χ^2 Value of Students	The χ^2 Value of Teachers
1.	Summative and formative assessment, oral test, and practical	43.8*	(15) 9.80*

*Note: * Significant at a = 0.05; df = 2*

In Table 7 the calculated χ^2 values for students' responses and teachers' responses are 43.8 and 9.80, respectively, with df = 2, which is significant at the 0.05 level. It implies that summative and formative assessments, and oral tests are used in the classroom for the assessment of the cognitive domain.

Findings of the Study

Objective 1: What are the current assessment practices in the government CBSE schools at the secondary stage?

The analysis of all the data collected through the questionnaire and interview suggests that, current assessment practices in school are very close to the traditional approach: which focuses only on pen-and-paper tests and grading the student's academic achievement.

From the above tables, it is evident that the χ^2 value for 12 out of 19 items is significant at 0.05 level for the responses given by the teachers as well as students, which means that most of the above-stated innovative techniques of assessment practices are in current use. But the data collected through the interview process was not in alignment with data collected from both teachers and students through questionnaires.

Through Table 6 it is evident that, parents are participating in the assessment of their ward. But, as per interview data, parents' involvement in assessment practices is very minimal.

In the interview, they accepted that even after recommendations of various policies, assessment in schools is mainly based on pen and paper tests.

Objective 2: What is the gap between the current assessment practices and the 360-degree assessment process proposed by NEP 2020?

1. The researchers found a huge gap in the current assessment practices, and NEP proposed 360-degree or holistic assessment.
2. Most of the teachers said that they rarely use portfolios, rating scales, observation, role-play dramatisation, co-curricular activities, presentations, field trips, and group work, etc., for assessing affective and psycho-motor domains for assessment. They expressed that they are using some of these strategies to make the teaching-learning process interesting but not as assessment practice because "it is very difficult to assess the whole class through these assessment strategies as we are dealing with 40–50 students in a classroom".
3. According to students' responses (Table 5), they write reflective diaries for self-assessment, but teachers accepted in the questionnaire and during the interview process that it is not a regular practice.

4. Teachers' as well as students' responses reflect that peer assessment is taking place, but in the teachers' interview process, as well as through questionnaire responses teachers said that it is used just as a teaching-learning activity but not as an assessment tool.

So, we can say that there exists a huge gap between the current assessment practices and the NEP 2020 proposed 360-degree assessment practices. Teachers pointed out different reasons for the gap between the current and 360-degree assessment practices. They also pointed out various challenges regarding the same. They discussed the challenges of making holistic progress cards that if in the future they get involved in preparing the proposed holistic progress card, it would become a very tedious task as they are already having the pressure of completing the syllabus on time, taking exams, making question paper, organising co-curricular activities, their involvement in administrative works, etc.

Objective 3: What is the awareness and perception level of teachers toward 360-degree assessment?

As NEP 2020 came in July 2020 and is being implemented in a phase-wise manner in the schools, it was surprising that teachers were not able to explain what, why, and how about 360-degree or holistic assessment during the interview process. They were not even able to differentiate between assessment for, assessment of, and assessment as learning. Most of them said all these terms belong to formative assessment; for a few teachers, these are activity-based assessments; three of them said nothing about it, and some of them accepted that they had forgotten the technical terms used in NEP 2020 for assessment practices. One of the teachers said, "Assessment of learning is meant for teachers' assessment, and assessment for learning is for both teachers and students". Another teacher said, "Assessment for learning is for understanding the concept, and assessment of learning is applying those concepts in day-to-day life".

1. The researchers found that teachers are not well aware of the concept of 360-degree assessment, and they were even confused even regarding the basic terms used for the assessment process.
2. Teachers accepted that they need proper training for implementing a 360-degree or holistic assessment.

3. Teachers' perception regarding implementing holistic assessment is not positive, as they discussed it as a complicated task that takes up much time and effort, which may have no great benefit on students' learning.
4. Teachers proposed that "50:50 weightage should be given to pen-paper tests and other assessment practices".
5. A few teachers even said that, "In our education system, 80 per cent weightage is given to written examination, so assessing students through all these strategies would be of no use as it would not get reflected on the report card".
6. Teachers commented that, "Parents' only complaint is against the lower grade of their ward, their only concern is the achievement of higher grades by their ward, they are not well aware of new policies and recommendations, and they want teachers to assign enough homework to the students to engage them".

Discussion

Teachers suggested that, "To make the 360-degree assessment possible, a 1:30 teacher-student ratio must be maintained in the classrooms. The burden of factual learning should be reduced, and activity-based learning should be focused, which is not happening in the real classroom because of a large number of students in one classroom". The same was debated by different researchers that formative assessment is a challenging practice for educators, and they struggle to execute it effectively (Bonner, 2016; Wiliam et al., 2004; Yan and Brown, 2021). A huge number of students in a single classroom hinders the teachers from offering feedback for formative assessment (Clark, 2012; Offerdahl and Tomanek, 2011).

One of the teachers commented, "Holistic development is not helpful because it would not help students' future development as the child's personality is not constant and they behave differently in different circumstances". So, it is important to create awareness and provide proper training about 360-degree assessment practices and their positive impact on the teaching-learning process among teachers, as the focus of holistic assessment is to gauge the progress of students and help them in the same. Teachers should emphasise assessment and use self-created assessments rather than ready-made ones (Yusoff et al., 2023; Sharma and Mishra, 2022).

Conclusion

Now that we have a valuable guide in the form of NEP 2020, it is important to utilise it effectively to reap maximum benefits in the field of school education. The assessment process is a crucial aspect of the teaching-learning process, and it is essential to focus on developing teachers' awareness and positive attitudes toward various assessment practices to ensure the holistic development of students. The traditional assessment practices that are still prevalent are not very useful in assessing competency-based learning. So, there is a need to shift to a more practical and diverse approach to assessment. It will give a clear picture of the current knowledge and competency, and the future areas of improvement for all the stakeholders in the field of education. The holistic progress card would provide feedback to the learners in understanding their strengths and weaknesses to work towards further improvement. The teacher's role is crucial in the whole assessment process. Complete objectivity and an unbiased attitude are required on their part to achieve the real essence of the assessment and evaluation process. Creating innovative methods, tools, and techniques, along with providing proper training and awareness to teachers and administrators about 360-degree assessment, can lead to the desired change in the nation's education system and contribute towards achieving educational goals.

Suggestions

The present study suggests that there is a need to give proper training to teachers to implement 360-degree assessment in school education, as there is a significant effect of the teachers' assessment ideas on the assessment practices at the micro level (Yan and Brown, 2021; Brown and Ramesal, 2012). Various studies have also indicated that teachers still struggle to follow the recommended classroom assessment practices, and have a limited understanding of testing and measurement techniques (Tariq et al., 2023; Campbell and Evans, 2000). There is also a need to address the challenges teachers face in implementing assessment practices, including reducing the student-teacher ratio in the classroom, providing ample opportunities for teachers to use alternative assessments, reducing curriculum load, developing various innovative assessment tools, and enhancing parents' involvement in the assessment process. Different research studies

have suggested that a lack of in-service training, poor reading culture, a lack of facilities, a large number of students in classes, and negative attitudes toward teaching careers among teachers affect assessment practices (Senjiro and Lupeja, 2023; Ghaicha and Oufela, 2021). Peer and self-assessment should also be the focus for developing the affective domain, as various studies have revealed that with peer and self-assessment, a system of collaboration and feedback develops, which supports learning and builds a sense of responsibility among learners towards their learning (Ndoye, 2017).

References

Aslam, R., & Khan, N. (2021). Secondary school teachers' knowledge and practices about constructive feedback: Evidence from Karachi, Pakistan. *Cakrawala Pendidikan.* 40 (2), 532–543. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v40i2.35190

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). Assessment for learning—Putting it into practice. In Open University Press eBooks. https://www.mheducation.co.uk/assessment-for-learning-9780335212972-emea-group

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice.* 5(1), 7–74. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: A critical review. *Assessment in Education Principles Policy and Practice.* 18(1), 5–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2010.513678

Bonner, S. M. (2016). Teachers' perceptions about assessment: Competing narratives. In G. T. L. Brown & L. R. Harris (Eds.), *Handbook of Human and Social Conditions in Assessment.* 21–39. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315749136

Brown, G. T. & Remesal, A. (2012). Prospective teachers' conceptions of assessment: A cross-cultural comparison. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology.* 15(1), 75–89. https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_SJOP.2012.v15.n1.37286

Campbell, C. & Evans, J. A. (2000). Investigation of preservice teachers' classroom assessment practices during student teaching. *The Journal of Educational Research.* 93(6), 350–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670009598729

Carless, D. (2014). Exploring learning-oriented assessment processes. *Higher Education.* 69(6), 963–976. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9816-z

Central Board of Secondary Education. (2010). *Continuous and comprehensive evaluation manual for teachers of classes VI to VIII.*

The Secretary, Central Board of Secondary Education. New Delhi. https://cbseacademic.nic.in/web_material/publication/archive/CCE_Manual_Class_VI_VII_2010.pdf

Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N. & Rockoff, J. E. (2014). Measuring the impacts of teachers II: teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood. *American Economic Review.* 104(9), 2633–2679. https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.104.9.2633

Clark, I. (2012). Formative assessment: Assessment is for self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review.* 24(2), 205–249. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-011-9191-6

Dunn, K. E. & Mulvenon, S. W. (2009). A critical review of research on formative assessments: The limited scientific evidence of the impact of formative assessments in education. *Practical Assessment & Research and Evaluation.* 14(7), 1–11. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237409416_A_Critical_Review_of_Research_on_Formative_Assessment_The_Limited_Scientific_Evidence_of_the_Impact_of_Formative_Assessment_in_Education

Earl, L. M. (2013). *Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning.* Corwin Press. https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Assessment_as_Learning.html?id=XKhl7I01o6MC&redir_esc=y

Ghaicha A. & Oufela Y. (2021). Moroccan EFL secondary school teachers' current practices and challenges of formative assessment. *Canadian Journal of Sociology.* 17(1), https://doi.org/10.3968/12015

Gikandi, J., Morrow, D. & Davis, N. (2011). Online formative assessment in higher education: A review of the literature. *Computers & Education.* 57(4), 2333–2351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. compedu.2011.06.004

Government of India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020.* Ministry of Education. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf

Guangul, F. M., Suhail, A. H., Khalit, M. I. & Khidhir, B. A. (2020). Challenges of remote assessment in higher education in the context of COVID-19: A case study of Middle East college. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability.* 32(4), 519–535. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33101539/

Gupta S & Srivastava T. (2023). Systematic review of assessment in undergraduate competency-based medical education and extrapolation of an assessment framework for Indian context—A study protocol. *J EducHealth Promot.*10.4103/jehp.jehp_1434_22

———. (2024). Assessment in undergraduate competency-based medical education: A systematic review. *Cureus.* 10.7759/cureus.58073

Guskey, T. R. (2020). Flip the script on change: Experience shapes teachers' attitudes and beliefs. *Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology Faculty Publications.* 41(2), 45. https://uknowledge.uky.edu/edp_facpub/45

Heitink, M., van der Kleij, F., Veldkamp, B., Schildkamp, K. & Kippers, W. (2016). A systematic review of prerequisites for implementing assessment for learning in classroom practice. *Educational Research Review.* 17, 50–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.12.002

Hemi, A., Madjar, N. & Rich, Y. (2023). Perceived peer and teacher goals: Relationships with students' academic achievement goals. *The Journal of Experimental Education.* 91(1), 145–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2021.1906199

Hernández, R. (2012). Does continuous assessment in higher education support student learning? *Higher Education.* 64(4), 489–502. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9506-7

Huba, M. E. & Freed, J. E. (2000). Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning. Allyn & Bacon. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED438867

Jensen, B., Wallace, T. L. Steinberg, M. P., Gabriel, R. E., Dietiker, L. Davis & D. S., Kelcey. (2019). Effectiveness research: Reflections from the MET Study. *Education Policy Analysis Archives.* 27(2), 7–17. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3923

Kapunda, S. (2022). The administration and management of school-based assessment for learning in the teaching and learning of mathematics at Kambule Technical Secondary School in Mongu district, Zambia. The University of Zambia. http://dspace.unza.zm/handle/123456789/7677

Meher, A., Mohapatra, D. Devi, E. Behera, M. & Mishra, T. (2023). Effectiveness of implementation of formative assessments as a part of competency-based medical education on summative assessment: A pilot study. *National Journal of Physiology Pharmacy and Pharmacology.* 13(10), 1. https://doi.org/10.5455/njppp.2023.13.02107202303032023

National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2005). *National Curriculum Framework 2005.* NCERT. https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/nc-framework/nf2005-english.pdf

———. (2022). *National Curriculum Framework for Foundational Stage* (NCF-FS). https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/National_Curriculum_Framework/NCF-FS-English.pdf

Ndoye, A. (2017). Peer/Self-assessment and student learning. *International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.* 29(2), 255–269. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1146193.pdf

Nenty, H., Adedoyin, O., Odili, J. N. & Major, T. (2021). Primary teachers' perceptions of classroom assessment practices as means of providing quality. *International Journal of Education Research and Reviews.* 9(2), 1–8. https://www.internationalscholarsjournals.com

Offerdahl, E.G. & Tomanek, D. (2011). Changes in instructors' assessment thinking related to experimentation with new strategies. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education.* 36(7), 781–795. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2010.488794

Opre, D. (2015). Teachers' conceptions of assessment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences.* 209, 229–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.222

Parveen, S. (2020). 360-Degree holistic assessment: A new approach to shape the personality of a learner as visualized by National Education Policy 2020. *International Journal of Reflective Research in Social Sciences*. 3(2), 4–8. www.reflectivejournals.com

Prasoon, C. P. & T. (2024). Inclusive practices of formative assessment for self-representation of culturally marginalised tribal students. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Calicut]. Shodhganga. http://hdl.handle.net/10603/579883

Rao Manjula, P. (2006). Impact of training in continuous and comprehensive evaluation on the evaluation practices of teachers of primary schools in Tamil Nadu. *Indian Educational Review.* 42(1), 60–78. https://publications.deshbhagatuniversity.in/wpcontent/uploads /2024/07/2017ED-13.pdf

Reema, C.P. (2017). A critical study on assessment practices in secondary schools of Kerala. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Calicut]. C.H. Mohammed Koya Library. https://find.uoc.ac.in/Record/125163

Rohm, A. J., Stefl, M. & Ward, N. (2021). Future proof and real-world ready: The role of live project-based learning in students' skill development. *Journal of Marketing Education.* 43(2), 204–215. https://doi.org/10.1177/02734753211001409

Sarkar, T. K. (2012). Assessment in education in India. *SA-eDUC*. 9(2). https://law.nwu.ac.za/sites/law.nwu.ac.za/files/files/psaeduc/New_Folder_1/1_Assessment%20in%20Education%20in%20India.pd

Senjiro, U. & Lupeja, T. (2023). The influence of formative assessment practices in promoting 21st century skills development among secondary school students in Tanzania. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education.* 12(6). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2023.29x

Sharma, R. & Mishra, S. (2022). Innovative assessment practices at secondary school level: Case study of a school in Sikkim. *International Journal of Science and Research.* 11(5). https://doi.org/10.21275/SR22516161210

Tariq, N. E. Asif, N. A. & Nazirullah, N. (2023). Assessment practices and assessment skills of teachers at secondary school level: Factorability and associative perspective. *Journal of Peace Development & Communication.* 7(1), 101–116. https://doi.org/10.36968/JPDC-V07-I01-10

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. (2007). Balancing assessment of and assessment for learning. In *Enhancement Themes Guides to Integrative Assessment* (Report no 2). https://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/docs/ethemes/integrative-assessment/guide-no-2---balancing-assessment-of-and-assessment-for-learning.pdf?sfvrsn=8e2cf981_12

Venkatesh, K., Muthukumar, D., Kamala, E. & Muhil, M. (2024). Study of efficacy of a novel formative assessment tool: Keywords recall. *Cureus.* 16(9). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.69881

Wiliam, D. Lee, C. Harrison, C. & Black, P. (2004). Teachers developing assessment for learning: Impact on student achievement. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice.* 11(1), 49–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594042000208994

Xu, Y. & Brown, G. T. (2016). Teacher assessment literacy in practice: A reconceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 58, 149–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.05.010

Yadav, H. (2023). Assessment reforms in Indian education: A study of NEP 2020. *Shodh Samagam.* 6(4). https://shodhsamagam.com/uploads/issues_tbl/1697785778ssessment-Reforms-in-Indian-Education-A-Studyss-of-NEP-2020.pdf

Yan, Z. & Brown, G. T. L. (2021). Assessment for learning in the Hong Kong assessment reform: A case of policy borrowing. *Studies in Educational Evaluation.* 68, 100985. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.stueduc.2021.100985

Yusoff, S. B. M., Leng, C. H. Razak, R. A. & Farhan, A. (2023). Towards successful assessment practice: examining secondary school teachers' conceptions of assessment. *JuKu: Jurnal Kurikulum & Pengajaran Asia Pasifik*. 11(1), 1–7. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369412673

Zhang, Z. & Burry-Stock, J. A. (2003). Classroom assessment practices and teachers' self-perceived assessment skills. *Applied Measurement in Education.* 16(4), 323–342. 10.1207/S15324818AME1604_4