Assessing Training of Primary School Teacher's Readiness to Implement Outcome Based Education in South East Region, Botswana

Letlhokile Motlhabanyane[1, 2,] Dr. Gaelebale Tsheko
Department of Educational Foundations University Of Botswana, Botswana

ABSTRACT: *The Botswana Education and Training Sector Strategic Plan (ETSSP 2015-2020) marks a significant milestone in our collective efforts as a nation to bring about a more diversified, knowledge-based economy. Through a planned and careful development of human capital, the ETSSP seeks to refocus our education and training towards fulfilment of social and economic aspirations identified in our Revised National Policy on Education (RNPE), the National Development Plan, Vision 2016 and as well as the Millennium Development Goals. The ETSSP serves to address poor levels of performance across the sector, through quality changes and improving the curriculum; improving teaching and learning at all levels and undertaking intensive teacher development (training); developing appropriate assessment patterns through setting up a National Assessment Framework to better organize school-based assessment and measuring skills and linking with national assessment. In this study, readiness of primary schools teachers in implementing OutcomeBased Education (OBE) and Outcome Based Assessment (OBA) was assessed in South East region in Botswana. Surveydesign using a questionnaire was conducted with 480 primary school teachers from the four inspectorate areas of the region. Results show that teachers at this level are not trained to implement OBE nor OBA. Recommendation on expedited training on these is made.*

Keywords: Outcome Based Education, outcome based assessment, performance

I. Introduction

Outcome-Based Education (OBE) was born out of a cry to have clear quantifiable goals in education. Rajaee, Junaidi, Taib, Salleh and Munot (2013) maintainthat Outcome Based Education (OBE) is the latest paradigm shift sweeping the education system. The increasing need to produce more able and competitive learners for the globalized world has led to a reform in the education system whereby the learning is no longer a unilateral process but shifted its weight to be borne by the learners. The OBE itself is a recurring education reform model which is based on a student centered learning philosophy and focuses on the output (outcomes) instead of the input (taught). In contrast with traditional education, OBE puts much emphasis on the learning process being actively pursued and managed by the students themselves and the teachers are only acting as facilitators in the students' quest for knowledge. Rajaee, et al (2013) advanced that the role of the teachers is to guide and provide directions for the students to navigate their own learning. Where OBE is implementedof OBE it is accompanied by a revolution in the way the academia view the learning process and its relevant assessment. The assessmentof student learning isno longer solely dependent on objective oriented examinations. With OBE, the assessments methods of various skills, knowledge and attitudes become diverse and various learning pedagogies are introduced to ensure the achievement of the outcomes. Learning tools such as problem based learning, integrated design project, case studies are some of the methods utilized to assess subjective skills

acquired by the students. The defined outcomes must be specific, measureable, achievable, realistic and time-based.

Over the last decade, educational institutions world-wide have been under increasing pressure from governments to demonstrate efficiency and cost effectiveness by more rigorous reporting of program outcomes. Pressure has led to the widespread adoption of systems that use pre-specified descriptions of learning outcomes-known amongst other terms such as 'standard', 'benchmarks', 'competencies' and 'attainment targets'- as a basis for assessing and reporting learners' progress and achievement (Brindley, 1998). The landscape of education has witnessed phenomenal change over the past two decades. Against a backdrop of calls for increased access to higher education and a remarkable growth in the technological and pedagogical innovations that are profoundly affecting how, when, and where our students are able to learn, a chorus of voices at the local, state, and federal level have simultaneously been calling for increasing levels of accountability in higher education. In response, institutions and accrediting agencies have now focused on clearly articulating what it is that students should be expected to learn in school, to what extent they are learning those things, and how, exactly, they can be expected to demonstrate that learning. Learning outcomes assessment is about trying to answer those questions in an effort to identify opportunities to improve the way we serve our students Schneider and Rhodes (2016).

The general aim of assessing learners in outcomes-based education, (Department of Education, 2000b), is for growth, development and support. The purpose of assessment is to monitor a learner's progress through an area of learning so that decisions can be made about the best way to facilitate further learning in terms of expected knowledge, skills, attitudes and values. Assessment provides information about learning difficulties and remedial action necessary to support learners who may be experiencing learning difficulties. The purpose of assessment is not about promotion (pass/ Fail! Conditional Transfer), but about progression (Department of Education, 2000b: 12).

Outcome Based Assessment appears to offer a number of advantages to the key stakeholders in education programs, including transparency of reporting, alignment of teaching and curriculum goals and sensitivity to individual needs. However, Brindley (1998; p.16) lamented that; the introduction of Outcome Based Assessment has on occasion proven problematic for a variety of political, technical and practical reasons. These includes:

- Readiness of institutions in administering Outcome Based Assessment.
- Tensions between summative reporting for accountability purposes and formative assessment for curriculum monitoring and improvement (Gipps, 1994; Teasdale & Leung, 2000).
- Doubs surrounding the validity of outcome statements and the reliability of assessment tools that are used to elicit student performance (O'Leary & Sheil, 1997).
- Difficulties in ensuring the comparability of teacher-developed assessments (Brindley, 1994).
- The high costs, complex logistics and time demands of developing and administering individualised performance assessments (Wolf 1995; Breen et al 1997).

Based on the above problems that come with Outcome Based Assessment it is vital that for a country to move from one approach of assessment to the other it needs to be prepared and ready. The teacher training colleges should offer the curriculum that entails Outcome Based Assessment, the institutional resources should be adequate for this kind of assessment. In addition the institutions governing national examinations (e.g. Botswana Examination Council) should be ready as far as Outcome Based Assessment is concerned. .

II.   Statement of the problem

According to the Revised National Policy on Education (RNPE, 1994) the specific aim of Botswana education system is to improve the quality of education, to ensure higher standards of learning, and to improve the quality of instruction for all those who attend school. Teachers in Botswana assessment of students' academic performance is through teacher made tests and other classroom assessments which make up school based assessment (SBA) and through summative national examinations. Classroom assessments are constructed

by teachers based on the topics or content covered (Reynolds, Livingston & Willson, 2009: MacMillan 2001). In Botswana, these assessments are offered during the course of the year mostly on a monthly basis as formative evaluation to monitor students' learning progress and to prepare students for the national standardized examinations. National examinations are taken at the end of primary, junior secondary and senior secondary levels and are used to make decisions about learners as they progress through formal education.Assessment to OBA requires massive readiness on the aspect of training teachers, Therefore this study serves to assess the readiness by teachers in the context of training, for improving learning outcome's through OBE.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the readiness of primary schools' in improving learning outcomes through OBE in South East Region focusing on the training of primary school teachers in preparation for OBA.

Research Questions

This study aimed to answer the following research questions:
1. Have teachers in primary schools in the South East Region received any training on OBE and OBA?
2. Does teacher training of primary school teachers in the South East Region on OBE and OBA differ byposition held by the teacher?
3. Does teacher training of primary school teachers in the South East Region on OBE and OBA differ by gender?

Literature Review

Moodley (2000) noted that proper, practical education and training for OBE practitioners must be forth coming. This will negate the uncertainty some educators experience, about whether what they are doing in class constitutes OBE. Demonstration of lessons, under ideal conditions is not acceptable. OBE practitioners should have been given sufficient time to afford them hands on experience so that they become familiar with the OBE process and its implementation mechanism.Moodley (2000) reminds that, training must include, among others, matters such as interpreting the OBE policy document, lesson preparation, group work, assessment (the different types), record keeping, classroom management and coping with learners of different learning abilities.Guskey (1994:p.53-54) expressed the same sentiments as he alludes that "adapting instructional practices to performance based assessmentwill also demand substantial amount of additional time, resources and training opportunities. These opportunities could offer ideas on how to design activities that promote authentic learning. Adequate treatment of these topics will certainly require more extensive time commitments than a one-day in-service programme''.

Furthermore Guskey(1994) reiterates that, because the challenge involves the expiation of teachers' expertise and instructional repertoires, regular follow up and continuous support will also be important factors.A study was conducted by Singaram (2007) on Outcomes Based Assessment in South Africa aimed to establish whether OBA practices are a true reflection of a learner's performance given the difficulties that teachers experience with regard to the implementation of these assessment practices probably because of the inadequate trainingthat they received on OBE. Using qualitative approaches, purposive and convenient sampling were used to capture narratives of participants   to construct narratives of teachers' experiences of OBA. The findings revealed poor quality of teacher training as a hindrance to empowerment of teachers to effectively employ OBA in a classroom set up.

These findings are in line with the work of other researchers such as MucCutcheon (in Marsh, 1993; p.46), who alluded that 'the teacher is the filter through which the ''mandated'' curriculum passes'. Lubisi, Parker, Wedekind and Gultig (1998) believes that there are widespread misgivings about OBE in general and C2005 specifically. This is corroborated by Van der Horst and McDonald's (in Heale 1997;p.4) skepticism about enough ongoing training and support for teachers by the National Department of Education and other teacher training institutions. This ongoing training and support should, according to Marsh (1993; p.5–9), and Carl (1995; p5) include leadership skills, curriculum management and curriculum ideology for all teachers.

Acquisition of curriculum ideology gives teachers an opportunity to 'create meaning' during educational turbulence or change (Marsh 1993; p. 45). Melenyser (in Carl 1995; p.5) cites professionalism as an important part of teacher empowerment. Professionalism in teacher practice includes not only the 'how' of curriculum implementation but also the 'why'.

Zorabel(2019) studied teacher education institutions in the Philippines to assess the globally competitivenessof teachers,the teacherqualifications and alignment to standards of the 21st-century learners.The study also served to establish the authenticity of training offered to teachers prior to the implementation of Outcomes-Based Science Instruction OBSI. The study highlighted that teacher training is one of the crucial factors that should be considered before OBE and OBA can be launched.

This is a curiosity that drove Ramsaroop (2003) to undertake a study on; Outcomes Based Assessment in practice: a case study of six educators at a secondary school in Kwazulu-Natal. Unlike in Botswana, South Africa has been long using OBE approach. Ramsaroop (2003) sets out to investigate the perceptions and practices of grade nine language educators with regard to translating outcomes-based assessment into practice. According to Ramsaroop (2003) it is necessary for teachers to be prepared for outcomes based assessment. OBE assessment, at the very simple level, refers to the ability of the teacher to perceive and see what learners can do. Ramsaroop (2003, p.36) is of the view that from this perspective assessment in an OBE approach is the process of identifying, gathering and interpreting information about a learners' achievement, as measured against "national agreed outcomes for a particular phase of learning". In essence it is very imperative that teachers be thoroughly trained and prepared for OBE assessment.

This results concurs with the findings by Willis and Kissane (1995) from a study carried out in Australia among high school students, on outcomes based assessment practices. Willis and Kissane (1995) used a similar qualitative approach on a similar research topic. For their findings it is pointed out that when teachers are prepared and trained in Outcomes Based Assessment it is easy to employ it in the classroom set up. The study showed that teachers who were trained in Outcomes Based Assessment were able to use varied Outcomes Based Assessment methods. Besides the findings by Willis and Kissane (1995) many other researchers have arrived at these findings. For example Reyneke (2008) points out that teachers are committed to their jobs and are trying to make the system work with whatever little training in the practical implementation thereof; these are experienced and well qualified teachers who realise that the type of assessment should always be in line with the desired outcomes and learning activities.

III. Methodology

Research Design

A survey design was used in this study. Salant and Dillman (1994) are of the view that surveys can also be used to assess needs, evaluate demand and examine impact. The survey design was chosen because of its capability to obtain information from large samples of the population. It was also used because it fits well with the frame work of the study. Surveys can be a powerful and useful tool for collecting data on human characteristics, such as their beliefs, attitudes, thoughts and behavior (Dillman, Smtyth & Christian, 2009; Mertens, 2010). In addition the survey design was also considered relevant based on Bell (1996: p.68) remarks when he clarified that, surveys are inclusive in the types and number of variables that can be studied, require minimal investment to develop and administer, and are relatively easy for making generalizations. The design was guided by the Positivists Paradigm**.** Positivists believe that reality is stable and can be observed and described from an objective view point (Levin, 1988). That is without interfering with the phenomena being studied. In this quantitative method employed, investigators are interested in drawing inferences or generalizations from a sample of observations to a broader population (Lankshear & Knobel, 2008). Also a survey is simply a data collection tool for carrying out survey research which yielded quantitative data hence the teachers' questionnaire was used in this regard. Pinsonneault and Kraemer (1993) defined a survey as a "means for gathering information about the characteristics, actions, or opinions of a large group of people" (p. 77). Surveys instrument (questionnaire) can also be used to assess needs, evaluate demand, and examine impact (Salant & Dillman, 1994, p. 2). The term survey instrumentis often used to distinguish the survey tool from the

survey research that it is designed to support. The survey was chosen because the researcher intends to assess primary school readiness in improving learning outcomes through Outcome Based Assessment. Surveys are inclusive in the types and number of variables that can be studied, require minimal investment to develop and administer, and are relatively easy for making generalizations (Bell, 1996, p. 68). Surveys can also elicit information about attitudes that are otherwise difficult to measure using observational techniques (McIntyre, 1999, p. 75). It is important to note, however, that surveys only provide estimates for the true population, not exact measurements (Salant & Dillman, 1994, p. 13). Thus quantitative research approach fits well with the context of this study.

Population

Polit and Hungler (1999:p.37) refer to population as an aggregate or totality of all the objects, subjects or members that conform to a set of specifications. The target population for this study was primary school teachers and these were considered relevant as they were assumed to understand the reforms in education and challenges in teaching because they arethe ones who implement policies and strategies in education. . The total target population for this study was fifteen thousand two hundred and seventy eight primary school teachers, which was the total number of all primary school teachers in Botswana spread through the ten education regions.. This study was conducted in one region thus the accessible population was nine hundred and eighty two primary school teachers which was the total number of primary school teachers in South East Region. Primary school teachers may have a Certificate in primary education, a Diploma in primary education and or a Degree in primary education obtained from local colleges of education or universities.

Sampling

The study used two sampling procedures to reach the accessible population of teachers. Teachers are nested in schools and therefore schools were sampled first. South East Region was conveniently sampled for ease of accessibility to researchers. South East Region has forty eight schools divided into four inspectorate areas being, Gaborone North, Gaborone South, Gaborone West and South East Sub Regions. In this case all the four inspectorate areas were included in the sampling frame. Secondly, simple random sampling method was then used to select 50% of schools within each inspectorate area (See Table 1). Each school has an average of20 teachersmaking a total sample from the 24 schools 480.

Table 1

Number of *sampled schools per inspectorate area*

Inspectorate Areas	Number of Schools per inspectorate	Sample of Schools	Number of teachers sampled
Gaborone North	11	5.5	110
Gaborone South	9	4.5	90
Gaborone West	9	4.5	90
South East Sub Region	19	9.5	190
Total	**48**	**24**	**480**

Data Collection Instruments

The researchersused aquestionnaire as a data collection instrument. The important factor about collecting data using a questionnaire is that they cover a lot of information and reaches a large sample in a short

period. In the first section of the questionnaire, teachers provided their demographic information: gender, age group, qualifications, teaching experience, position held and their inspectorate areas. Section B posed statements on the perceptions of teachers on the readiness of primary schools in improving learning outcomes through OBE.All statement were to be rated on a 5-point Likert-Scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" options was used to measure perceptions of teachers**.**
The questionnaire was tried out on 30 respondents. The pilot data was analysed to establish a reliability index and this yielded a Cronbach alpha(α) of .97. There were no changes made to any of the original questions.

Data Analysis Plan

The data obtained from the questionnaire was first analyzed quantitatively, using simple measures of central tendency, and subsequently used to develop a general profile of work exploration of assessment of primary school readiness in improving learning outcomes through OBA. Inferential statistical analysis was employed in this research question (see Table 2).

Table 2
An overview of data analysis plan

Research Question	Population	Data Collection	Data Analysis
1. Have teachers in primary schools in the South East Region received any training in OBE?	Teachers	questionnaire	Descriptive Statistics
2. Does teacher training of primary school teachers in the South East Region on OBE differ by position held by the teacher?	Teachers	questionnaire	ANOVA α=.05
3. Does teacher training of primary school teachers in the South East Region on OBE differ by gender?	Teachers	questionnaire	t-test α=.05

IV.   Results

The study was aimed at assessing   teachers' readiness in the context of training, for improving learning outcomes through OBA. The results are presented in accordance with the sequence of the research questions with reference to the data analysis plan (refer to Table 2).

Description of sample

Data were collected from four hundred and eighty (480) teachers in four inspectorate areas in South East region. The majority (79%) of the teachers were female. The dominant age group   was 41-50 years representing 35.8%. The results showed that majority (64.2%) of the respondents had a Diploma qualification. In addition, the results showed over two fifths (42.1%) had a teaching experience of 21 years and above with only 14.8% with a teaching experience of 0-5 years.Most of the respondents (41.3%) were classroom teachers with only 18.8% heads of departments.(see Table 3).
Table 3

 Demographic information

Demographic	Category	Frequency	
Age	20-30 Years	58	(12.1%)
	31-40 Years	142	(29.6%)
	41-50 Years	172	(35.8%)
	50-60 Years	106	(22.1%)
	61 & Above	2	(.4%)

Qualification	Med	3	(.6%)
	BEd	149	(31.0%)
	DPE	308	(64.2%)
	PTC	14	(2.9%)
	PHD & Other	6	(1.3%)
Teaching Experience	0-5 Years	71	(14.8%)
	6-10 Years	83	(17.3%)
	11-20 Years	124	(25.8%)
	21 Years & Above	202	(42.1%)
Post Held	Teacher	198	(41.3%)
	Senior Teacher	195	(40.6%)
	Head Of Department	87	(18.1%)
Participants' Inspectorate Areas	Gaborone North	110	(22.9%)
	Gaborone West	90	(18.8%)
	Gaborone South	90	(18.8%)
	South East Sub Region	190	(39.6%)

Research Question 1:Are teachers in primary schools in the South East Region trained in OBE and OBA?

To address this research question, teachers were asked if they had received training in outcomes based education as well as in outcomes based assessment. The analysis shows that the majority (62.9%) of the teachers had not been trained in OBE nor in OBA. At a glance, it may seem that the introduction of OBA through OBE into Botswana schools made complete sense and the move to introduce OBA under ETSSP was progressive. However, this did not come without problems in that some of these types of assessments were difficult to implement in classrooms, given the contexts in which teachers currently work. While the different types of assessments may seem appealing on paper, they have not been so simple to put into practice.

2. Does training of primary school teachers in the South East Region on OBE and OBA differ by position held by the teacher?

To assess if training differed by position held by the teachers a oneway ANOVA test was run.This was to find out if there was a statistical significance difference in training on OBE and OBA by position held by the teacher.To run the ANOVA test, first assumptions for ANOVA test statistic were assessed. Assumptions for ANOVA are normality, homogeneity of variance and independence. To test for normality was conducted using Q-Q plots. The results showed that the data was normally distributed as almost all the scores were on the line of best fit.. Therefore the assumption of normality was met. For homogeneity of variance assumption, Levene's test showed a p-value of .085 which is higher than the set .05 hence the assumption of equal variances was met. The assumption of independence was met given that the sample of teachers was random and that respondents answered t questionnaires independently of each other.

The results of ANOVA showed F (2, 477) =4.699, p=.010 which is significant at α=.05. This meantthat the training differed by position held by teachers. To identify where the difference was coming from, a Turkey HSD post-hoc test was run.

Table 4

Training by position held

	(I) Post Held	(J) Post Held	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	Teacher	Senior Teacher	1.60064	.82040	.126	-.3282	3.5294
		Head of Department	3.07232	1.04595	.010	.6132	5.5314
	Senior Teacher	Teacher	-1.60064	.82040	.126	-3.5294	.3282
		Head of Department	1.47168	1.04840	.340	-.9932	3.9365
	Head of Department	Teacher	-3.07232	1.04595	.010	-5.5314	-.6132
		Senior teacher	-1.47168	1.04840	.340	-3.9365	.9932

The Post hoc analysis indicates that the significant difference observed was between the HODs and teachers in training on OBE and OBA. This implies that training is not offered with the same magnitude for classroom teachers and HODs. Given their means, it seems to be offered more to HODs than classroom teachers.

3. Does teacher training of primary school teachers in the South East Region on OBE and OBAdiffer by gender?

To assess if training differed by gender of teachers, an independent t-test was run.This was to find out if there was a statistical significance difference in training on OBE and OBA by gender of the teacher.To run the t-test, first assumptions for t-test statistic were assessed. Assumptions for t-test are normality, homogeneity of variance and independence. To test for normality was conducted using Q-Q plots. The results show that the data was normally distributed thus assumption of normality was met. For homogeneity of variance assumption, Levene's test showed a p-value of .085 which is higher than the set .05 hence the assumption of equal variances was met. The assumption of independence was met given that the sample of teachers was random and that respondents answered the questionnaires independently of each other.

Though the descriptive statistics on training scores were higher for women (*M*=26.1879, *SD*= 8.33) than for men (*M*=25.69, *SD*=7.68), the t-tests did not show the difference to be statistically significant: *t* (478) =.538, p<.591. This therefore means that training for male and female teachers is similar.

V.   Discussions

According to the findings teachers have not been trained on OBE and the resultant OBA. Reflecting on these findings, King and Newman (2000) states, "Since teachers have the most direct, sustained contact with students and considerable control over what is taught and the climate for learning, improving teachers' knowledge, skills and dispositions through professional development is a critical step in improving student achievement." In addition the findings are consistent with what Moodley (2000) found out. In her study Moodley (2000) lamented that, "findings of the empirical investigation suggest that there is lack of OBE training for educators in South Africa''. Moreover just like the situation experienced in South Africa prior to

implementation of OBE most teachers in South east region in Botswana are not aware of the ETSSP which is the road map to OBE. On the other hand teachers are the policy and strategy implementers in education. The success of any policy and strategy in education rely upon the rigorous training of teachers in that reform as they are the core implementers'. Furthermore the findings in this study are similar to those arrived at by Moodley (2000) who noted that proper, practical education and training for OBE practitioners must be forth coming. This will negate the uncertainty some educators experience, about whether what they are doing in class constitutes OBE. Demonstration of lessons, under ideal conditions is not acceptable. OBE practitioners should have been given sufficient time to afford them hands on experience so that they become familiar with the OBE process and its implementation mechanism.

Moodley (2000) found out that, training must include, among others, matters such as interpreting the OBE policy document, lesson preparation, group work, assessment (the different types), record keeping, classroom management and coping with learners of different learning abilities. Interestingly (Moodley 2001; King and Newman, 2000) arrived at the same findings as they observed that the need for formal training for teachers need not be overemphasised. However, where an entire system or ways of doing things are changed, it is acutely needed. To give effect to proposed changes or to enhance the level of efficiency and productivity, employers need a diversity of training and development programmes. It therefore follows that every teacher should be trained in OBE before it can be implemented.

The findings also match those observed by Jansen and Christie (1999:249) who found out that poor quality of teacher training and the deep divisions within the system might militate against the success of this form of education system (OBE), as it did in other developing countries. Through their work they tried to demonstrate that OBE guidelines and policies could not be implemented effectively unless teachers understood how to facilitate through OBE mode. This implies that before a country can embark or shift to OBE teacher training has to be offered so that teachers can be well equipped of the new system.

The findings of Jansen and Christie (1999) are consistent with Le Roux and Loubser (2000:101) who also expressed that as they mentioned that the introduction of OBE and the new curriculum undoubtedly influence how teachers teach. Practicing teachers and principals have to undergo training to enable them to implement the new system if it is to succeed. In the same vein, Potenza and Monyokolo (1999:236) corroborates the ideas of (Jansen and Christie 1999; Le Roux and Loubser 2000:101) who supports that teachers are in many ways the most important educational resource and they will determine whether the new curriculum has succeeded or not. This therefore attributes the fact that classroom teachers must be given the priority in terms of training. The success of the new curriculum therefore depends on the training and support that classroom teachers and principals receive from district officials and their ability to mobilise and manage resources around them to implement the curriculum. This means that teachers need to be adequately trained in order to implement the outcomes based approach. Sohnge and Moletsane (1997:274)'s findings reinforce that in South Africa the implementation of OBE depends on the adequate preparation of teachers in the principles that guide the teacher; the development of the curriculum, the policy documents and guidelines and the implementation of OBE.

In contrast to earlier findings Chisholm (2000:14) noted that the implementation of an OBE curriculum framework ultimately rests upon adequately prepared teachers, motivated to teach and supported in their work. Teachers can only be committed and motivated to do their work if they have been adequately trained and they know exactly what is expected of them. Vermeulen (1998:60) also observed that only empowered teachers and parents will be able to overcome the possible detrimental effects of OBE as it was experienced in other parts of the world. In addition Chisholm (2000:19)'s findings indicated that teachers were trained in OBE. However Chisholm (2000:19) also observed the duration and quality of training offered to teachers. She arrived at the following findings in her study in her study, teachers were previously trained for only a few days and they then returned to their schools to train other colleagues. Chisholm (2000:53) found out that the training model-commonly referred to as the 'cascade model'-became the primary means of preparing the majority of teachers for improving learning outcomes through OBE.

VI.   Conclusion

According to Spady (1994) it can be assumed that any educational organization is made up of two broad parts. One is its operational system-the curricular and instructional elements that relate directly to the teaching and learning process. The other is its support system-the administrative, logistical and resource components that enable the teaching and learning process to exist and function. From this systems perspective, an outcome based system is one in which exit outcomes and the four principles (clarity of focus, designing down, high expectations and expanded opportunities) influence and 'drive' all of the key structural and functional components of the operational and support systems. As a matter of fact once the curriculum is redesigned into OBE, teachers are trained in OBE, assessment is aligned to OBE mode and necessary resources for OBE are provide then a country is ready to launch OBE. This study has shown that primary schools in South East Region are not ready to improve learning outcomes throughOBA.

Recommendation

Drawing from the findings of this research it is recommended that:-

- Training in OBE, OBA and ETSSP should be done across all levels operation i.e. teachers, senior teachers and HODs should be trained as a matter of urgency if the desired direction in the Botswana general education is to be achieved.

References

[1.]   Albanese, M. A., Mejicano, G., Mullan, P., et al. (2008). *Defining characteristics of educational competencies.* Medical Education, 42, 248–255.

[2.]   Arshada, I, Razalia, S & Mohamed, Z 2012. *Programme outcomes assessment for civil & structural engineering courses at University*Kebangsaan Malaysia. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 60(1), pp.98-102.

[3.]   Babbie, E. (1992). *The Practice of Social Research.* California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

[4.]   Badat, S. (1995). Educational Politics in the transition period, Comparative Education, 31, pp 141-159.

[5.]   Barkley, E & Major, C 2016. Learning assessment techniques: A handbook for college faculty. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

[6.]   Bell, S. (1996). Learning with information systems: Learning cycles in information systems Development. New York: Routledge.

[7.]   Berg D.V. (2000).Outcomes-Based Assessment: Challenges for the Teaching of Criminology. Retrieved on 20.02.2019 from   http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.130.9770&rep=rep1&type=pdf

[8.]   Biggs, J & Tang, C. (2007). Teaching for quality learning at university (3rd ed.). The Society   for   Research into Higher Education. Open University Press, Maidenhead.

[9.]   Block, T. (2018). What is random sampling? Retrieved from; https://www.displayr.com/what-is-random-sampling/

[10.]   Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay Company.

[11.]   Blumberg, B, Cooper D.R, & Schindler P.S. (2005). *Business Research Methods*, Mc Graw Hill: Berkshire.

[12.]   Breen, M., Barratt-Pugh, C., Derewianka, B., House, H., Hudson, C., Lumley, T. and Rohl, M. (1997).Profiling ESL children. Volume 1: Key issues and findings. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs

[13.] Brindley, G. (1994). Competency-based assessment in second language programs: some issues and questions. Prospect 9, 41–55. - 1997: Assessment and the language teacher: trends and transitions. The Language Teacher 21, 37, 39.

[14.] Brindley, G. (1998). Outcomes-based assessment and reporting in language programs: a review of the issues. Language Testing 15, 45–85.

[15.] Brown, A.L., & Campione, J.C. (1994). *Guided discovery in a community of learners. Pp. 229-270 in Classroom Lessons: Integrating Cognitive Theory and Classroom Practice*, K. McGilly, ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[16.] Brown, J.D. and Hudson, T. (1998).*The alternatives in language assessment.* TESOL Quarterly 32, 653–75.

[17.] Calaprice, A. (2010). The ultimate Quotable Einstein. Princeton University Press. Princeton: New Jersey.

[18.] Careless (2015). Excellence in University assessment: Learning from award-winning practice. Routledge; Abingdon, UK.

[19.] Chisholm, L. (2000). *A South African curriculum for the twenty first century: report of the review committee on curriculum 2005*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

[20.] Chun, M. (2010, March). "*Taking teaching to (performance) task: Linking pedagogical and assessment practices." Change: The Magazine of Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://www.edutopia.org/blog/performance-based-assessment-reviewing-basics-patricia-hilliard

[21.] Collier, D. (2000*). Assessment based on outcomes of significance. A paper to be presented at The Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Evaluation in Education in Southern Africa*, Port Elizabeth, South Africa. 26-29 September.

[22.] Cox, S. (2009). *Case studies for active learning. Learning and Teaching Guides, Higher Education Academy Network for Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism*, New York, UK.

[23.] Department Of Education, (2001). *Guidebook 1. Assessing Performance* Johannesburg: Gauteng Institute for Curriculum Development.

[24.] Department of Education (2000a). *OBE Assessment. Facilitator's Guide.* C200S Pilot. Pretoria. Government Printers.

[25.] Department of National Education (1997a). *Curriculum 2005. Lifelong Learning for the 21st century*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

[26.] Department of National Education (1997a). *Curriculum 2005. Lifelong Learning for the 21st century*. Pretoria. Government Printers.

[27.] Deneen, C &Boud, D. (2014). *Patterns of resistance in managing assessment change. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(5), pp.577-591.

[28.] Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode Surveys: The tailored design method (3rd Ed.).* Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

[29.] Dreyer, C. (2000). Journal of Language Teaching, Vol. 34, November. *Assessment on OBE: A guide for teachers.* p. 266 - 284.

[30.] Dye, T.R. (1995). *Understanding Public Policy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc...

[31.] Fadel, C. (2015).*The Competencies Learners Need to Succeed.*Retrieved on 11-09-2018 from https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2017/12/13/we-need-to-modernize- education-

[32.]   Faleyalo, A. (1986). *Classroom based Evaluation in second language education*. Cambridge University press

[33.]   Felder, Richard and Brent, Rebecca (2003). *"Designing and Teaching Courses to Satisfy the ABET Engineering Criteria," Journal of Engineering Education, 92* (1), 7-25 (2003)

[34.]   Fraser, W. J. (1999). *The Foundations of Continuous assessment: its link to performance-based, authentic, competence-based and outcomes-based assessment*. University of Pretoria. Unpublished article.

[35.]   Gay, L. R. Mills, G. E., &Airasian, P. (2009*). Educational research competencies for Analysis and applications.* Columbus: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

[36.]   Gipps, C. (1994).*Beyond testing.* London: The Falmer Press.

[37.]   Guskey, T.R. (1994). What You Assess May Not Be what You Get. *Educational Leadership.   51* (6): 51-54.

[38.]   Harden, R. M., Crosby, J. R., & Davis, M. H. (1999). AMEE Guide No 14: Outcome-based education: Part 1—an introduction to outcome-based education. *Medical Teacher, 21*, 7–14.

[39.]   Henry, N. (2001). *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

[40.]   Hendry, G. (2014). *An evidence-based educational development strategy for assessment using discipline-specific case studies*. 10th International Consortium for Educational Development (ICED) conference (Educational Development in a Changing World), Stockholm, Sweden 16-18 June 2014. Viewed 23 January 2016 at http://www.iced2014.se/proceedings.shtml.

[41.]   Hughes, C.,(2013). *A case study of assessment of graduate learning outcomes at the   programme, course and task level*. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, *38*(4), pp.492-506.

[42.]   Hughes, A. (1989).*Testing for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[43.]   Hitchcock, G.N. (2017).*Competency-based education has a history*. Retrieved from retrieved   from: http://www.intrust.org/Magazine/Issues/New-Year-2017/Competency-based-education-has-a-history.

[44.]   Hodge, S. (2007). *The origins of competency-based training*. Australian Journal of Adult Learning, *47*, 179–209.

[45.]   Hofmeyr, J, & Buckland, P. (1992). *Education System Change in South Africa*, in R.   McGregor   &   A. McGregor (Eds). McGregor's Education Alternatives. Juta:Kenwyn.

[46.]   Jansen, J. & Christie, P. (1999). *Studies of outcomes-based education in South Africa*. Kenwyn: Juta.

[47.]   King, M. B. & Newman, F.M. (2001). *Building school capacity through professional development: conceptual and empirical considerations. The International Journal of Educational Managemen*t, *15*(2),86-94.

[48.]   Killen, R. (2000). *Outcomes-based education: Principles and possibilities*. University of Newcastle. Retrieved from   https//drjj.uitm.edu.my/DRJJ/CONFERENCE/UPSI/OBEKillen.pdf

[49.]   Killen, R. & Spady, W. (1999). *Using the SAQA critical outcomes to inform curriculum planning in higher education in South Africa.* South African Journal of Higher Education, *14*(1), 200-208.

[50.]   Kgosikebatho, K. (2013). *Experts pinpoint causes of poor results*. Retrieved 19 August, 2013   from: www.thepatriotonsunday.co.bw/experts-pinpoint-causes-of-poor-results.

[51.]   Kramer, D. (1999). *Teaching Toolbox. OBE Strategies, Tools, Techniques for Implementing Curriculum 2005*. Vivlia Publishers. Cape Town.

[52.]   Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2008). *A handbook for teacher research: From design to Implementation*. New York: Open Press University.

[53.]   Laubscher, T.A. (20003). *Staff development by school management teams (SMT's) for the implementation of OBE in primary schools*. Auckland Park: Rand Africans   University. (M.Ed-Mini-Dissertation).

[54.]   Le Roux, C.S. & Loubser, C.P. (2000). Inset programmes for enhancing environmental education teaching skills: cursory comments based on three case studies. *Edu care,*   *29*(1, 2):98-114.

[55.]   Levin.B. (1997).*The lessons of International Education Reform in Journal of Education Policy.vol 12*.253-266.

[56.]   Lixun, W (2011). Designing and implementing outcome-based learning in a linguistics course: *A case study in Hong Kong. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 12*(1), pp.9-18.

[57.]   McIntyre, L. J. (1999). *The practical skeptic: Core concepts in sociology*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

[58.]   Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology. Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative and mixed methods (3rd Ed.).* California: Sage Publications, Inc.

[59.]   McMillan, J. M. (2001). Secondary teachers' classroom assessment and grading Practices. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 20,* 20-32.

[60.]   Moodley, P. (2000). *The Implementation OF Outcomes based Education in the Foundation Phase in the North Durban Region, In Different School Climates*. University of Durban-Westville.

[61.]   Mokhaba, M.B. (2004). *Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa Since 1994: Policy Objectives And Implementation Complexities*. Philosophiae Doctor (Public Affairs). University of Pretoria.

[62.]   Pinsonneault, A., & Kraemer, K. L. (1993). Survey research methodology in management information systems: An assessment. Journal of Management Information Systems, 10, 75-105.

[63.]   Potenza, E. &Monyokolo, M. (1999). *A destination without a map: premature implementation of Curriculum 2005*, in Jansen, J.D. & Christie, P (eds). Changing curriculum: studies on outcomes-based education in South Africa. Kenwyn, Cape Town: Juta.

[64.]   Rajaee, E. Junaidi, S.N.L. Taib, S.F.Salleh, M.A. Munot (2013). *Issues and Challenges in Implementing Outcome   Based   Education   in   Engineering   Education*.   Retrieved   from   file:///C:/Users/201305714/Downloads/121-Article%20Text-312-1-10-20170121.pdf

[65.]   Ramsaroop, J. (2003). *Outcomes-Based Assessment in Practice: a Case Study of Six Educators At a secondary School in Kwazulu- Natal.* A dissertation submitted in   partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Education University of Natal Pietermaritzburg

[66.]   Schneider, C.G. and Rhodes,T.L. (2016). Outcomes-Based Assessment of Student Learning at Berea college. Retrieved   from   https://www.berea.edu/academic-assessment/wp-content/uploads/sites/56/2017/03/Bereas-Outcomes-Based-Assessment-Plan-for-Academic-Programs.pdf

[67.]   Singaram, D.T. (2007). *Outcomes-based assessment as a non-reflection of learner performance*. University of Johannesburg.

[68.]   Spady, W. G. (1994).*Outcomes-based Education: Critical Issues and Answers* (Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators).

[69.]   Van Der Horst, H. &Mcdonald, R. 1997. *Outcomes-Based Education: A Teachers Manual.* Pretoria: Kagiso Publishers.

[70.]   Willis, S. and Kissane, B. (1995). *Outcomes-Based Education. A_Reviewof the Literature.* Education Department of Western Australia. October.