



Centre for Educational and Social Studies

A Report of Round Table Discussion on

Draft National Credit Framework

This Report is an outcome of the Round Table Discussion with the experts and stakeholders of School Education, Higher Education and Vocational Education & Training

December 21, 2022

Centre for Educational and Social Studies

#6/6, 'Prajnanam', 10th Block, 2nd Stage, Naagarabhaavi, Bengaluru - 560072

080-23182947 | mail@cessedu.org | www.cessedu.org

About CESS

Centre for Educational and Social Studies (CESS), based in Bengaluru, is a not-for-profit society registered under the Karnataka Societies Registration Act 1960. We are driven by our vision to bring about “Social Transformation through and with Education.” In pursuance of the vision, CESS engages in Research, Capacity Building and Policy Advocacy in the domain of Education.

CESS continuously engages with the stakeholders across the realm of Education- policy makers, domain experts, regulators, higher education institutions, academicians, researchers, teachers, and students to solicit their feedback on Central and State policy initiatives. With respect to Research and Policy Advocacy, CESS has conducted several research studies, both in-house and in collaboration with premier institutions.

In its endeavour to facilitate the implementation of NEP 2020, CESS is now deeply engaged in the capacity building of stakeholders, especially Faculty and Institutions of Higher Education across India. It is our pride to mention that some of our CESS members are on the Central Regulatory Bodies and on Government of Karnataka Task Force, constituted to develop a roadmap for implementation of NEP 2020.

Context

A credit framework is considered to be instrumental in enabling seamless integration and coordination across institutions and all stages of education and skilling to fulfil the vision of the NEP 2020. A high-level committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Nirmaljeet Singh Kalsi was constituted by MSDE in November 2021, to develop a National Credit Accumulation and Transfer Framework for both General and Vocational Education and Training/ skilling. The Draft National Credit Framework was put on the public domain by University Grants Commission to solicit the feedback/suggestions from the stakeholders.

CESS, in its endeavour of Policy Advocacy, conducted a Round Table Discussion on “Draft National Framework” on December 21, 2022 at its Centre in Bengaluru, with invited experts and stakeholders of general education-both school and higher education, and of Vocational Education & Training to solicit their views and suggestions on the draft framework.

Feedback/Suggestions from the Experts and Stakeholders

The experts and stakeholders lauded the efforts of the Ministry of Education and other associated regulatory bodies in implementation of National Education Policy. In particular, the members appreciated the draft framework for integrating general education and vocational education and training. They also expressed deep concern over the challenges associated with the implementation at the grass root level.

Following are the viewpoints/suggestions derived from the discussions:

1. There are various guidelines/regulations like ABC, Multiple Entry and Multiple Exit (ME-ME) that have implications on/for National Credit Framework. The essence and the purpose of these guidelines/regulations will not be fully met when read separately. Therefore, these documents should be integrated because each of the documents have aspects which are common or linked with each other. Though, the draft framework makes reference to these regulations/guidelines, it lacks the spirit of interconnectedness. Hence, the National Credit Framework should be an inclusive

framework by adopt a comprehensive approach of integrating all the relevant guidelines;

2. The draft framework doesn't explicitly define the term 'Credit', except mentioning its equivalence interms of number of hours. Though there are various dictionary definitions of a 'credit' it should be defined appropriately in accordance with NEP vision. Defining credit and its implications/application is fundamental to ensure mobility and flexibility as well. Also, the credits assigned in the framework is based on the number of hours spent in the classroom and not on the learning outcomes. Therefore, from students' learning point of view, it would be appropriate to award credit against assessment of learning outcomes as has been identified at each stage/level;

3. While assigning the credits at various levels of school education, the competencies/learning outcomes of students are to be considered;

4. Credits include self-learning skills, nurtured skills, tutored and mentored skills. Hence, tools of assessment (measurable), types, mode (oral, written, presentation) are to be defined. The tools of assessment can be validity, reliability and objectivity;



5. In line with the NEP 2020, Liberal Arts Education will be introduced among technical/professional institutions in due course of time. The credit framework must establish a clear credit linkage between liberal arts education and technical education;

6. The variability of the courses in different institutions needs to be verified and there should be a normalisation of the credits for each of the course across institutions to avoid any discrepancies. The fundamental knowledge would be lost if there is no normalisation particularly for the online courses. There should be equivalence in the credits assigned for online and offline courses;

7. Holistic development of students is at the heart of the NEP; therefore, utmost importance should be given to develop assessment rubrics that reflects the holistic development;
8. The members felt the intense need for capacity enhancement training/programmes for teachers, faculty and education practitioners on the implications and implementation-process and procedure of credit award;
9. There should be a robust system for assessment, which would otherwise demean the very purpose of the credit framework;
10. The National Education Policy looks at the different stages of learning in school education, the flexibility within the stage with respect to assigning the credits should not be too prescriptive. The draft looks at class-wise credits which ceases the flexibility of assigning the credits at each stage;



11. The components of outcome, competence and assessment are not very clear in the document. Explicit definition will help in proper implementation;

The practicality of the number of hours suggested in the draft framework should be reconsidered. For example – 1200 hours has been assigned for class 6, 7 & 8 which sums up to 200 days of school work every year may not be practical because this may not include every activity that is happening at school. This will also lead to difficulty in assigning credits and also if the number of hours is equated with the competence which has long lasting impact on the learning of the children. Also, while talking about equity and inclusion, there are some districts where schools are closed because of natural calamities and the classes may not happen accordingly with the number of hours mentioned in the draft framework. Hence, number of hours alone should not be a criteria for credit award;

12. There is a scope for exit after 10th standard but it is not clear how the re-entry into the system happens after some years of gap. Therefore, implications of multiple entry and exit at the school level should be clearly defined;
13. Multidisciplinarity will require certain kinds of pedagogies especially when it is thematic approach like field visit, project, taking up a social problem and solving etc., the assignment of credits is very unclear in such cases. Several such possibilities should be considered and illustrations should be provided in order to assign the credits. A guideline/handbook (for teachers, faculty and education practitioners) for assigning the credits with illustrations can be thought off;
14. The social outcome of the learning should also be considered for credit award;
15. The credits, assessment and outcomes should be connected with each other and there should be a conscious effort in integrating these things;
16. Relationship between workload and credit is very important. Curriculum design and assessment are not considered as a part of work load, and also it should be noted that assessment is 'for learning' and it is 'not of learning';
17. Besides glossary, adding a section for/on 'definitions' of key/important terminologies used in the framework would help in better understanding and standardisation. It would be even better if the final framework is presented through infographic.

Feedback from Centre for Educational and Social Studies

1. The draft framework states that the responsibility of implementing the credit framework shall lie with the concerned regulator/and or autonomous organisations,

as applicable. This may lead to multiple entities trying to regulate the credit system. Therefore, best way forward would be to establish the regulatory system as recommended by the NEP, so that there shall be one apex body which is mandated with all the issues pertaining to the credit system;

2. UGC, under ABC, stipulates 7 years window period for credit accumulation, whereas NCrF proposes for lifelong learning. Clarity is needed in this direction;
3. Credit award is determined by/subject to assessment. The draft framework, has enlisted the areas for/of assessment. The focus is on the process. It doesn't define the learning outcome. Clarity is needed with regard to components of assessment. Secondly, the draft framework recommends stagewise assessment. Whereas in school education assessment for early learning/stage is not preferred;
4. Experiential learning mentioned in the draft needs more clarity. It must clearly bring forth the both the dimensions- one student experience secondly as experiential learning as pedagogical process.

The first section of the suggestions/comments/feedback are given by the invited experts and stakeholders. The above suggestions are by the CESS Team. The report is consolidated by CESS and is being submitted herein on behalf of all the experts and stakeholders present at the Round Table with a request to consider reviewing the draft National Credit Framework.

Experts, Stakeholders and CESS Members Present at the Round Table Discussion

1. Dr. Gopalakrishna Joshi, Executive Director, Karnataka State Higher Education Council (KSHEC), Government of Karnataka
2. Smt. Suparna Diwakar, Member, Technical Secretariate, NCF
3. Prof. T N Raju, Member, NEP Task Force on School Education, GoK
4. Dr. K N Subramnya, Principal & Professor, R V College of Engineering
5. Dr. Rajendra Kumar Joshi, Senior Consultant, CESS
6. Dr. Sandeep Nair, Associate Professor & Registrar (Evaluation), Chanakya University
7. Dr. Muralidhar S, Professor, Government First Grade College, Kolar, Karnataka
8. Dr. Gowrisha, Professor & Director, CESS
9. Dr. Padmavathi B S, Professor and Head, Education Unit, CESS
10. Ms. Dharani S, Research Associate, CESS