

A WAY TO METANOIA

AN ACTION RESEARCH ON THE TEACHERS AND PARENTS  
VIEWS OF THE RATING SYSTEM IN COMPARISON TO THE  
GRADING SYSTEM

RANIA EL HAGE  
CHANTAL LAHAD  
BILAL BASHA

SAINT MARY'S ORTHODOX COLLEGE

2009

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Saint Mary's Orthodox College (SMOC) is a K-12 trilingual co-educational school affiliated to the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Beirut that follows the Lebanese official curriculum. The school operates as part of a chain of four Beirut Orthodox Schools (BOS): Saint Elie, Ecole Des Trois Docteurs, Beirut Annunciation College. The school comprises of 1,100 students that come from middle and high socio-economic backgrounds who share the school's common interests and values. Teachers at Saint Mary's Orthodox College are all educators holding relevant university degrees and are exposed to various experiences and practices. The school's practices stem from an educational philosophy that considers students as unique and interactive participants in the formulation of their learning experiences. This approach views education in a holistic perspective where the learning process integrates the body, the mind and the spirit. This proposes practices that actively involve cross curricular values and competencies in the teaching/learning process. Accordingly, all adopted methods of planning, teaching and assessment, aim at assisting students in the process of continuous development. Education, in our perspective, is therefore a transforming process rather than just simple transmission of information. This is reflected in the school's mission statement which shows commitment not only to *"knowledge transfer; rather we look to achieving transformations within the inner self of the person and through that, within the community in the future."* (Extracted from SMOC's mission statement)

SMOC was chosen to be part of the American University of Beirut project (TAMAM) sponsored by the Arab Thought Foundation. The Project aims at developing school based educational reform in the Arab World. The Executive Board at SMOC headed by Reverend Father George Dimas chose Mrs. Rania El Hage, Mrs. Manal Boustany and Mr. Bilal Basha to represent the school in this project. This group has changed after a year when Manal left the school. Rania holds a BA in Education from the Lebanese American University. She has a long experience in teaching. She was the Head of the Elementary Division for 4 years. She headed the Office of Training and Development and she is the Director of the Preschool Divisions in BOS. Her experience varied from dealing with children, supervising staff in addition to other administrative duties related to the general performance of the school. Manal holds a BA in Education from the Lebanese American University. She had been the Head of Preschool Division for 4 years and had various experiences in teaching and dealing with young children as well as supervising teachers in the division. As a result of her resignation, Manal had to leave the team by the end of the first year of the project. Ms Chantal Lahed replaced Mrs. Boustany. Chantal holds a BA in Education from the American University of Beirut. She has a long experience in teaching English as well as heading the Elementary Division. She is a member of several committees that work on different school's plans. Bilal holds an MS in Mathematics from the American University of Beirut. He has taught Math for many years and is currently the Head of the Math Department. In addition to coordinating Math in BOS, he participates in tasks related to the school's general projects.

The AUB team has organized several workshops and meetings that aimed at training us on conducting an action research. Based on this training, our first task was to write a research proposal. This task, which seemed to be very easy, turned out to be a lengthy process that involved continuous brainstorming, reflection and discussions. This took place through several meetings we had together as a team in addition to other meetings with Father George Dimas. The input of Father George was quite supportive for he has the vision for the schools in addition to the focal points and the goals of the action research.

The initial research proposal submitted to the AUB team two years ago focused on Assessment. In fact, there was a consensus among the principal and the academic staff on choosing assessment as a focus in the action research to be conducted. This was due to the new approach of rating rather than grading adopted at the school. So there was a need to study this approach further and reflect on its vision, processes and results in order to develop it further, apply some modifications or even changes. At SMOC, we do not view assessment which is one component of our holistic academic approach, as an end-phase, but rather as a phase of reflection and transformation. This suggests developing assessment tools and techniques that (1) align assessment to objectives and teaching, (2) provide an assessment continuum on students' performance and (3) allow evidence-based post assessment decisions. This perspective allows the transformation of learning into capacity building.

The initial proposal was too general and tackled many global aspects of assessment which could not be simultaneously researched and at the same time no explicit relations among these aspects were defined. Accordingly and upon several meetings with the AUB team, we narrowed down our research proposal into specific research questions that focused on one aspect of assessment which is "rating". SMOC's continuous concern to assure the learners' acquisition of basic and pre-requisite skills, led to the construction of an assessment system, adopted in Grades 1 and 2, that is based on the rating on specific skills rather than the grading on tests. SMOC views rating as an assessment scheme that assesses the acquisition of particular skills or abilities of individual learners. This scheme aids teachers in identifying the students' strengths and weaknesses which not only allows teachers to conduct appropriate interventions, but also gives parents the opportunity to carry out meaningful follow up.

Accordingly, the purpose of the action research study was to determine whether the rating of skills gives more accurate data about the acquisition of these skills allowing individualized post –assessment decisions and achieving mastery learning. At this level, it was necessary to identify the target population of this study. Consequently this led to defining the purpose of this study from two perspectives; the parents' and the teachers' perspectives. We therefore limited our study to these two complementary aspects that ought to ultimately converge to the whole school community interest. Although parents, as our personal experiences have revealed, seem to be interested in their kids' learning processes, they show an exceptional concern towards the end product expressed by the grades on their kids' exams. On the other hand, teachers usually express more interest in the learning process where they spend a lot of time and effort than in the end result. To

them, although the end result is of great value, teachers are typically concerned with the process, which is qualitatively expressed through comments or opinions.

Therefore, the purpose of our study was further developed into two specific goals that cater for the interests of the school's community. Thus, we developed two research questions:

1. Does the rating of skills give more accurate data about the acquisition of these skills than grading does from the teachers' and parents' perspectives?
2. Does the rating of skills help teachers and parents in making post assessment decisions regarding the acquisition of un-acquired skills?

Therefore, studying the above questions allows us to examine an aspect related to efficiency of this assessment system and consequently the extent to which this system is achieving its intended goals. In addition, the study provides further insight that will lead to modification of the rating system in order to improve the quality of learning.

## 2. METHOD

### *Sample and sampling procedures*

The participants of this study consisted of two categories. The first category is a random sample of 7 teachers in Grades 1 and 2, where rating is being applied. Some of these teachers are homeroom teachers of Math, English and Science, and the others are language teachers of Arabic and French. The second category consisted of 191 parents of the students in Grades 1 and 2 (where rating is applied).

### *Data collection techniques*

We were introduced to different data collection techniques during a workshop we attended with the AUB TAMAM team. Following this workshop, and during several meetings we had together, as a team, we agreed to use focus groups and questionnaires as the data collection tools. We sent the prepared questionnaire in addition to the focus group questions to the AUB team for feedback. Accordingly, the modified data collection tools were adopted. The focus group addressed the first category (teachers). The teachers were asked 9 questions on the shift grading to rating, the value and the efficiency of rating vs. grading and 4 questions on the degree of efficiency in the rating system in relation to post assessment decisions (Appendix 1). The questionnaires addressed the second category (parents). They were asked 8 closed 4-scaled questions, 1 semi-closed question and 1 open-ended question regarding the two assessment systems (Appendix 2). The two methods were used concurrently during the data collection process.

### *Procedure*

Two focus groups were conducted; one for Grade 1 teachers, and the other for Grade 2 teachers. In each focus group, teachers were asked to come to a designated room

in the school. Manal, Chantal and Bilal were present. Manal and Bilal wrote detailed field notes of the participants' answers and attitudes, whilst Chantal led the focus group discussion. Chantal explained the purpose of the study and answered teachers' queries. Teachers were informed that the school is currently working on an action research on the rating system in grades 1 and 2. Since the teachers are actively involved in the process, the schools find that their feedback is crucial at that point. The focus group lasted for approximately 95 minutes. At the end of the focus group, it was remarkable that teachers portrayed a positive feeling as a result of implicitly appreciating their professional experience through engaging them in a study that aims at school improvement. This is an important lesson that we have learned from the process.

The parents' questionnaire was distributed to 191 parents of Grade 1 and 2 of which 157 replied. This questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and consequently the study. Parents were given time duration of 5 working days to complete and return the questionnaire with their children. Some of these questionnaires were returned incomplete.

### *Data analysis methods*

#### *(1) Teachers' Focus Groups*

Qualitative data analysis techniques were used in analyzing the data from the focus groups. The process of examining and re-examining the data (data reduction) was done through several team meetings. This was a transitional phase in time, where Manal had to leave the team; consequently, this process involved the input of the four team members. This was done as follows:

1. We read the field notes and compared them in an attempt to identify common areas and investigate patterns in teachers' responses. This was done as follows: Rania read out loudly the written field notes while Bilal, Manal and Chantal classified the teachers' responses into patterns and common ideas. This was done across several meetings where intensive discussions took place.
2. We categorized the common areas and patterns into sub groups under which teachers' perceptions and views were assembled.
3. These areas are the following:
  - Advantages and disadvantages of grading/rating
  - Identification of learners' capabilities and academic needs
  - Teachers' attitudes towards the shift in the mode of assessment
  - Post assessment decisions
  - Efficiency of the remedial program
4. Once we agreed on these areas, we compiled and tabulated the different teachers' views.

#### *(2) Parents' Questionnaire*

We designed the parents' questionnaire through developing questions that target the following areas:

- Understanding of the rating system
- Post assessment follow-up
- Parents' preference (grading vs. rating)
- Suggested areas of improvement

We used qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques in analyzing the data collected from the questionnaire: The quantitative analysis involved the use of elementary mathematics (including percentages). In the first 9 closed questions of the questionnaire, we calculated the number of responses then we tabulated the percent of parents in each scale. In the qualitative analysis, we examined the parents' responses on the open-ended questions during several team meetings. The process of examining and re-examining the responses of Question 9 was done in steps and as follows:

1. We compiled all parents' responses in a comprehensive list.
2. We examined the data until we could identify meaningful patterns
3. We classified these patterns into 3 general categories as follows:
  - Personal and Psychological effects
  - Detection and Identification of Acquired and Un acquired skills
  - Parents' Involvement
4. Once we agreed on these areas, we compiled and tabulated the data.

As for the parents' responses on the open-ended question 10, we first wrote down a list of all the responses. Then we eliminated the repeated answers and we tried to find the common points that were mentioned. We finally narrowed down the responses to the above specific areas.

### 3. RESULTS

#### *Teachers' Focus Groups*

The analysis of the data collected from the teachers' focus groups is as follows:

#### The Advantages and Disadvantages of Grading

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
Provides an average that allows comparison	A grade is global and does not provide specific data about the acquisition of skills

#### The Advantages and Disadvantages of Rating

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
- It is more specific - It helps detect the strengths and	- Validity of the criteria of rating - Time constraints (for re-teaching)

weaknesses - Precise diagnosis for post assessment purposes such as re teaching and remediation	- Number of Assessments administered - Preparation of tests was time consuming - Filling of Optical reader sheets was time consuming
--	--

An answer was included in the above table if it were provided by at least one teacher.

### *Parents' Questionnaires*

The Questionnaire (refer to Appendix 1) included 8 closed questions, 1 semi closed question and 1 open ended question. In Grade 1, out of 99 parents, 79 parents replied while in Grade 2, 78 replied out of 92.

The quantitative analysis of the parents' responses on the 9 closed questions (scaled as Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (DA), and Strongly Disagree (SA) is reported as follows:

Table 1: Grade 1 Parents' Responses (in percent) to Closed Questions

<b>Grade 1 Parents' Responses</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
1) I understand the rating system as a whole.	38	61	1	0
2) I understand the purpose of adopting the rating system.	27	59	13	1
3) I find the rating system suitable for my child's age level.	32	52	14	2
4) I face no difficulties in reading and understanding the evaluation report.	46	48	6	0
5) I understand the meaning of the ratings (1, 2, 3, 4) found in the evaluation report.	51	49	0	0
6) I find the promotion criteria of learners (from grade to grade) in the rating system meaningful.	26	58	15	1
7) The school is using the rating system to detect the un-acquired skills and to reinforce learning them through the remedial program	47	49	2	2
8) As a parent, I am using the rating system to help my child learn the un-acquired skills at home	37	44	17	2
9) I prefer the rating system to the grading system	28	50	17	5

Table 2: Grade 2 Parents' Responses (in percent) to Closed Questions

<b>Grade 2 Parents' Responses</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>SD</b>
1) I understand the rating system as a whole.	57	43	0	0
2) I understand the purpose of adopting the rating system.	45	48	7	0
3) I find the rating system suitable for my child's age level.	42	47	10	1
4) I face no difficulties in reading and understanding the evaluation report.	51	41	8	0
5) I understand the meaning of the ratings (1, 2, 3, 4) found in the evaluation report.	64	32	4	0
6) I find the promotion criteria of learners (from grade to grade) in the rating system meaningful.	33	54	13	0
7) The school is using the rating system to detect the un-acquired skills and to reinforce learning them through the remedial program	40	53	2	5
8) As a parent, I am using the rating system to help my child learn the un-acquired skills at home	28	51	8	13
9) I prefer the rating system to the grading system	28	34	32	6

The design of the parents' questionnaire immediately yields parents' responses to be in 3 categories: (1) Understanding the rating system which can be detected in questions 1, 2, 4 and 5; (2) Identifying the usefulness of the rating system in questions 3, 6, 7 and 8; (3) Preferring the rating system over the grading system in question 9. Accordingly, table 1 was re-formulated by the table below:

Table 3: Parents' Responses: Grade 1

	Understand the Rating system	Usefulness of the Rating System	Prefer the Rating System
Average percent	94.75	86.25	78

A similar reformulation that took place in table 2 results in the table below:

Table 4: Parents' Responses: Grade 2

	Understand the Rating system	Usefulness of the Rating System	Prefer the Rating System
Average percent	95.25	87	62

Tables 3 and 4 were combined in the table below:

Grades 1 and 2 Parents' Views on the Rating System

	Understand the Rating system	Usefulness of the Rating System	Prefer the Rating System
<b>Grade 1</b>	94.75	86.25	78
<b>Grade 2</b>	95.25	87	62

In question 9, parents were asked to list reasons that support their preference of the rating system. The qualitative analysis of these results led to classifying the parents' responses into 3 main categories summarized in the 3 tables below:

Influence on the Personal and Psychological level

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Encourages and motivates learners</li> <li>- Does not put pressure on the learners</li> <li>- Suitable for the child's age level</li> <li>- The system encourages competencies rather than competition</li> <li>- Improves the self-confidence and self-esteem of the child</li> <li>- Puts the learners in equal lines and narrows the differences amongst them</li> </ul> |
|--|

### Detection and identification of acquired/un-acquired skills

- Helps to detect the un-acquired skills
- It is specific and gives significant details of the learners' understanding/performance
- Puts more emphasis on mastery of the skill
- Helps identify strengths of the child
- Provides details of which skills are required for mastery
- Reflects the true capacity of the learner
- It is more individualized

### Parents' Involvement

- Enhances the parents' involvement in the child's education
- It provides parents with additional details of the material covered in class
- Helps parents know the un-acquired skills
- Helps parents reinforce the skills
- Helps the child acquire the skills in a better way
- Allows for faster improvement
- Helps identify learners' strengths and weaknesses

In question 10, parents were asked to suggest ways to improve the rating system. Their answers were collected in the table below:

### How Can the Rating System Be Improved

- Having intervals (1+, 2+...)
- Finding a way to have a total average
- Specifying the rank of students in class (highest achiever per class)
- Changing the criteria of the rates (if a learner gets one mistake it's not fair to take a rate of 2)
- Giving the rate a translation: for example:  $A=90 \rightarrow 100=1$

The answers which appear in the above table are the answers which were provided by at least one teacher. Encourage

#### 4. DISCUSSION

Although parents and teachers have different backgrounds, in terms of education, views and interests, they both, almost, expressed a consensus on accepting the rating system and preferring it over the grading system. The uniqueness of such an outcome represents a very encouraging reason to continue adopting the rating system as a philosophy of assessment. On the other hand, the concerns that teachers expressed regarding the technical aspect of the rating process trigger the school modify the rating procedure in a way that best serves the rationale of the rating system. These outcomes can be expressed in three clear assertions:

The first assertion that can be made is that most parents of Grades 1 and 2 students have a positive attitude towards the comprehension and the acceptance of the rating system adopted and its rationale. Moreover, this comprehension that parents revealed was clearly reflected in the degree of preference they showed for the rating system versus the grading system. It is noteworthy that the parents' preference of the rating system in Grade 2 has decreased by 20% from that of Grade 1 parents. Even though we do not have enough evidence of the reason for this difference, we thought of the following factors that might have caused this decrease in percentage from grade 1 to grade 2 parents. These factors are (1) parents' affinity towards ranking of students especially when they go into higher grade levels (2) parents' expectations of their children in Grade 2 in relation to their age level and (3) complexity of the academic competencies which does not align with the specificity of skills. That is, the skills in grade 1 are simple enough for parents to comprehend and "accept" rating them whereas the skills in grade 2 are more complex for parents would prefer a grade that may seem more meaningful. In addition, the use of the rating system in the preschool division has developed familiarity and an acceptance of this same system in Grade 1. On the other hand, Grade 2 parents' expectations seem to rapidly evolve as they expect their children to engage in more competitive and challenging learning experiences whereby the rating of skills may seem to them as an

insufficient tool to evaluate these students' intellectual capabilities. Parents view that these intellectual capabilities ought to induce differentiation and distinction among their children, which the rating system does not provide (ranking and average).

The second assertion that can be made is that teachers of Grades 1 and 2 showed acceptance and preference of the rating system vs. the grading system. Teachers consider the rating system as a powerful tool in identifying students' weaknesses and catering for them. This might make the planning/teaching/evaluating/re-planning and re-teaching process structured and compact enough to support students' learning. In addition, this might allow for making post-assessment decisions that are aligned with the students' needs. This can be inferred from the teachers' focus group when the teachers were asked about rating and the post assessment decisions. However, teachers raised concerns regarding the practical and technical implementation of the assessment process. These were (1) duration of preparing a test due to large number of skills to be assessed (2) duration of filling out the optical readers (3) the difference between teaching skills to be reported or skills that are not reported (4) number of situations for assessing each skill and its relation to the number of assessments. These technical aspects serve as an impediment towards the proper implementation of the rating system.

Therefore, the third assertion that can be made is that the technical aspects of the rating system affected the alignment between the implementation and the rationale of the system. In other words, the process of rating skills in grades 1 and 2, that is the process that starts with preparing an assessment and ends in reporting the rates of the assessed skills to parents, involves several procedural stages that is making this process a complex one. This complexity, in turn, is serving as an obstacle in the path of the rating system's attaining its underlying principle. That was clear in teachers' feedback as part of the disadvantages of the rating system. We assume that there was a need for better communication with teachers of Grades 1 and 2 on the rating system and their engagement in planning for it which will lead to (1) teachers' understanding of the system (2) teachers' adaptation of the system and (3) teachers' proper implementation.

## 5. STEPS TOWARDS ACTION

At this level, we presented the initial results of this study to the school principal and thoroughly discussed the possible reasons and implications of these results on the school in several meetings. During discussion, we raised several points that ought to resolve technical issues immediately on one hand and to reflect on other related school practices. Accordingly, any strategic or technical actions need to serve teachers' acquaintance and understanding of the rating system's rationale and procedures. In addition, these actions should comply with (1) the action research's assertions (2) the school's mission statement and (3) ultimately improve the students' learning outcomes, which are all hypotheses that require further investigations. We suggested that training sessions be held for teachers. These sessions will involve several training techniques and will be followed up by concerned departments. The aim of the training is to (1) reach a common understanding of the rating system and its elements (2) ensure the teachers' familiarity with the elements of assessment (3) provide support and assistance to teachers at the practical level. On the other hand, a consensus was reached during these meetings on the fact that any proposed

action needs not only to cater for the technical processes of the implementation of the rating system, but also, for the strategic concerns of the school and the teachers. This is due to our conviction of the necessity in aligning the school mission with the practices in order to maintain the credibility of the school on one hand, and to cater for teachers' needs. These ideas were extensively discussed in the executive board meeting which viewed the issue in its holistic manner and accordingly decided to review the mode of work in other school programs and the extent to which the schools' policies and procedures are efficient in light of the insights the action research technique can provide. This decision was inspired by the impact of the evidence based strategies earlier used. This encouraged the academic board to tackle the problematic issue of remedial using the action research approach. Here it worth noting that this was, or at least partially, the result of the evidence-based strategies that we, the team members, used in our discussions with the principal or the academic board. This allowed us to acquire and develop an informal leadership authority that resembles the formal leadership authority of the principal in mainly one route, which is access to data.

Consequently, the principal and the school administration had now, at the strategic level, a clear conviction of the need to enhance communication among all school's community. An efficient dialogue between teachers and administrators was thus encouraged in order to cater for teachers' personal and professional needs and thus, strengthen the visionary partnership between decision makers and practitioners. This dialogue ought to be continuous through division and department meetings and general assemblies. The aim of this dialogue is to (1) enhance communication between teachers and administrators, (2) encourage and promote teachers' involvement in the school's project and (3) empower teachers as thinkers rather than doers.

The school has initiated a series of actions that aim at improving the technical aspects of the rating system which were reported by teachers. At the level of the curriculum, all academic departments have simultaneously reviewed the vertical progression (scope and sequence) of competencies, abilities and skills; this led to the redistribution of academic skills across grade levels. This re-distribution was related to the type and number of skills assessed and rated. This created, at the teacher's level, a sense of flexibility that was reflected in the assessment procedures that were re-discussed and modified. In addition, training and mentoring were done at the beginning of the academic year 2008-09 in order to assure better understanding of the assessment process as well as its proper implementation. This involved various training strategies that engaged teachers in the actual practice thus allowing them to communicate and understand the rationale in addition to the procedure.

Moreover, the school has launched the department of Assessment, Tests and Measurement (DATM) that works closely and interactively with teachers and other departments on several academic issues. This department's role is to ensure follow up based on research. This research involves collecting data from the concerned persons at school and work with departments on designing practical solutions on one hand and aligning these solutions and other practices to the school's strategic goals. Although the

school's administration had the intention of initiating this department, our experience has shown a real need to scientifically investigate school's projects and programs.

There is no doubt that our assertions pose questions on the nature of the rating system, the cognitive levels of the rated skills, the types of assessment situations used, and the impact of these aspects on students' learning. 1) Does the rating system better report students' performances than the grading system? 2) Is the difficulty of rating skills at the technical level affecting the choice of these skills at the cognitive level? 3) Does the rating system put restrictions on the number of assessment situations used and consequently does not yield authentic results? 4) Does the rating system improve student learning?

Furthermore, our experience led us to think of other school programs on one hand and the harmony/alignment among these structures and programs on the other hand. This harmony has a direct influence on the general school climate and the alignment between the school's structures, the school projects and the school's mission statement. These considerations if viewed holistically, pave the road for numerous and consecutive developments that lead to the growth of the school's vision and the accomplishment of its mission. This is a way to "Metanoia".

APPENDIX 1  
Teachers' Focus Groups

- 1) Does the rating of skills give more accurate data about the acquisition of these skills from the teachers' perspectives?
- 2) What are teachers' perspectives on the post assessment decisions regarding the acquisition of un-acquired skills?

Focus groups questions:

Rating vs. Grading:

- How did you know about the new system of rating?
- How did you receive the news of shifting from grading to rating?
- What was the impact of this shift on your perception of assessment?
- What do you think were the advantages and disadvantages of grading?
- What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of rating?
- Can you talk about the difficulties you faced when you shifted from grading to rating?
- Did the rating system help you identify better the learners' capabilities and academic needs?
- To what extent are the promotion criteria valid in comparison to the grading system?
- To what extent are the criteria for rating indicative of the learners' performance?

Rating and Post Assessment Decisions:

- How does the rating system help you in taking the appropriate decisions after the assessment (re-teaching, remedial, reinforcement)?
- How helpful was the rating system in re-teaching the un-acquired skills?
- Was the remedial that is based on rates more efficient than when it was based on grades?
- Do you think that the post assessment lead to better acquisition of the previously un-acquired skills (thus leading to mastery learning?)

APPENDIX 2  
Parents' Questionnaire

Name of learner: \_\_\_\_\_

Grade Level / Section: \_\_\_\_\_

**Kindly answer the questions according to the below scale by circling your choice:**

<b>SA</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Agree</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
<b>SD</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>

**I. I understand the rating system as a whole.**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**II. I understand the purpose of adopting the rating system.**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**III. I find the rating system suitable for my child's age level.**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**IV. I face no difficulties in reading and understanding the evaluation report.**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**V- I understand the meaning of the ratings (1,2,3,4) found in the evaluation report.**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**VI- I find the promotion criteria of learners (from grade to grade) in the rating system meaningful.**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**VII- The school is using the rating system to detect the un-acquired skills and to reinforce learning them through the remedial program**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**VIII- As a parent, I am using the rating system to help my child learn the un-acquired skills at home**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**IX. I prefer the rating system to the grading system**

SA                      A                      D                      SD

**Give three reasons that support your preference**

---

---

---

**X. In my opinion, the rating system can be improved by \_\_\_\_\_**

---

---

Thank you