

**An Evaluation of Master of Education in English Language Teaching (M.Ed. in ELT) of  
Kathmandu University, School of Education Using CIPP Model**

Narayan Shrestha

*Kathmandu University, School of Education*  
[narayan\\_mpele2023@kusoed.edu.np](mailto:narayan_mpele2023@kusoed.edu.np)

**Abstract**

*This paper evaluates the M.Ed. program in English Language Teaching offered by Kathmandu University, School of Education, using the program evaluation model of CIPP developed by Daniel Stufflebeam in the 1960s. The study was carried out using the qualitative research design. The information was collected via several interviews with four participants who were selected using the purposive sampling method at the researcher's and the participant's convenience. Out of four, two were faculty members teaching any courses in the program, and two were students who had already completed the program. The questions were asked on the context, input, process, and product, the four elements of the CIPP model. The study found that the program has successfully addressed the needs of the stakeholders, the curriculum and contents are directly connected to the predetermined objectives, and the emphasis on student-centered teaching and learning methodologies with an excessive amalgamation of ITCs are the major findings.*

**Keywords:** Program evaluation, M.Ed., ELT, CIPP model, KUSOED

---

\*Corresponding Editor

© The Editors, 2024

ISSN: 3059-9393 (Online)



Journal Webpage:

<https://journals.ku.edu.np/elepraxis>

---

*Published by Kathmandu University School of Education, Hattiban, Lalitpur, Nepal. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-SA 4.0) license.*

**Introduction**

Evaluation is one of the integral and inevitable components of any program to scrutinize the effectiveness, appropriateness, process of implementation, and future directions. Aziz et al. (2018) describe evaluation as the extent to which the preset goals are attained. Evaluation is a basis for the decision-making process. The American Evaluation Association (2014) defines evaluation as "the systematic process to determine merit, worth, value, or significance". Therefore, it is an organized process of discovering strengths, significance, and directions for the improvement of any program. However, evaluations can be of multiple types depending upon the purpose of the evaluation.

This study is a program evaluation of a two-year Master of Education in English Language Teaching (M.Ed. in ELT) program offered by Kathmandu University, School of Education. It primarily aimed to evaluate the program's significance, effectiveness, and success using the framework of the CIPP (Context-Input-Process-Product) model developed by Stufflebeam in the 1960s that projected to facilitate educational improvement via a proactive approach to evaluation (Stufflebeam, 1971). So, I tried to evaluate the program based on those key elements of CIPP.

## **Methodology**

The study was conducted employing the interpretive paradigm of qualitative research. The information was gathered through semi-structured interviews with four informants: two teachers teaching any courses of the program and two graduates who have already completed the program. The faculty members are indicated as T1 and T2, whereas the students are named S1 and S2. The participants were selected purposefully for the convenience and feasibility of the researcher as well as the participants. The physical and virtual interviews were conducted due to the unavailability of the physical presence of the participants. The participants were informed before the interview about the purpose of the study, and the interview was recorded with their consent.

The results and discussion are the outcomes of a rigorous interpretation of the information gathered from the participants and the literature that the researcher accessed.

### **Master of Education in English Language Teaching (M.Ed. in ELT)**

M.Ed. in ELT was launched in 2004, aiming to prepare proficient English language teachers, teacher educators, material developers, and researchers to contribute to the field of English Language Education in Nepal. The primary goal of the program is to graduate students who are proficient in modern teaching principles and methods, conduct targeted research in ELT and their own professional development, create and deliver teacher training courses and activities for ELT instructors, train both pre-service and in-service teachers to effectively teach English, and develop ELT materials to adapt to changing needs.

The program consists of four semesters, embedding 54 credits in total. The courses contain 42 credits, whereas three credits are allocated for internships and 9 for research work. One credit equals a minimum of 16 contact hours in a semester. The courses are categorized into five major categories: core courses, specialization courses, professional courses, electives, and practical courses. Furthermore, the university ensures the timely revisions of the curriculum, contents, and the process of delivery based on the experience gained.

### **The Framework of the CIPP Model**

Daniel Stufflebeam developed the concept of the CIPP model in the 1960s. It stands for context, input, process, and product evaluation, which are the key constituents of the model. The CIPP framework is one of the pertinent approaches for evaluating any programs, products, or conducts, though widely used in the assessment of educational programs (Donald, 1971; Lippe & Carter, 2017; Mirzazadeh et al., 2016; Shi, 2018; Singh, 2004 as cited in Burke, 2020). Many program administrators and officials employ this model to evaluate their programs or projects. According to Stufflebeam (1971), this model's flexibility and adaptability help it become applicable in various kinds of programs or projects. This model of evaluation offers not merely the final decision of the success or failure of a program but also provides feedback for the improvement in the areas needed for the future. Mathison (2005, as cited in Sopha & Nanni, 2019) regards it as a comprehensive model of supervising formative and summative evaluations of programs, organizations, systems, or products.

The following sections discuss the four major elements of the CIPP model in detail and present the program analysis.

### **Context Evaluation of the Program**

Context evaluation bestows information about the contextual appropriateness of the program. It assists in assessing the needs and opportunities within a demarcated context or setting (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The primary goals of this evaluation are to outline and recognize the needs of the target population and define if the program addresses the

desired needs. Correspondingly, Warju (2016) also agrees that context evaluation provides the rationale of a program concerning its objectives and policies that support the mission and vision of the institution. Surveys, document reviews, data analysis, and interviews are some of the various methods of context evaluation (Stufflebeam, 2003). The evaluators look for the answers to the questions regarding the aims, beneficiaries, initial needs and expectations, and the significance of the evaluated program.

From an intensive analysis of the information collected from the participants, the study found that the program is very contextual in the contemporary context of Nepal. All the respondents agreed that the two-year M.Ed. program in ELT offered by KUSOED has been able to address the needs and expectations of the program attendees and the other concerned personalities. One of the participants, S1, responded to the questions regarding contextual adherence to the program as follows:

*I found it very contextual. The present-day teacher needs to be aware of various teaching and learning methods, techniques or strategies, curriculum design, material development, and training session design for teacher educators, and this program has involved us in all of these activities.*

Flexibility is one of the notable characteristics of the program that benefits the students. One faculty member, T1, emphasized that the nature of the program and its alternatives have helped it become felicitous in the present context. He indicated:

*The alternatives of going for a teaching practice or designing training sessions and conducting training as an internship provide students with opportunities to become acquainted with the problems, issues, and needs of the contextual teaching and learning environment, which helps them enrich their understanding of the field that they are likely to commence their career.*

Likewise, the intensive integration of ICT tools in teaching and learning activities has proved an advancement and necessity of the program. At present, educators and scholars globally and nationally emphasize the immersion of various technologies in education for effective and successful teaching and learning. KUSOED stands at the frontier in this aspect, as the integration of ICTs is inevitable in any program. The institution currently runs several programs online (blended mode); thus, it is impossible to run those programs without ICTs. Although the usage of ICTs has become an integral part of the teaching and learning process, particularly in language education, many teachers teaching in many public schools in Nepal may lack competence in using technologies in their everyday pedagogy. However, once they complete any programs from KUSOED, they develop themselves as a confident user of different technologies as the programs require them to use Moodle, email, online portals, and resources excessively, inspiring them to transfer those learned skills of using ICTs in the everyday classrooms of their workplaces (Gnawali, 2020).

In addition, the students enrolled in the program claimed that intensive research projects has supported it to become a leading alternative in their selection of several programs available. The graduates of this program can quickly discover solutions for the problems they face in their workplaces. They develop competence and confidence in conducting small classroom research to make their teaching and learning procedures effective and successful. Stufflebeam and Zhang (2007) state that context evaluation measures the needs, challenges, and relevant contextual conditions. As a result, the study found the program relevant in the present context, where many educators emphasize the need for change in our teaching and learning.

### **Input Evaluation of the Program**

Input evaluation aims to gather information to determine the resources used to attain the objectives of the program (Khawaja, 2001). The resources comprise not solely the human resources and the infrastructures but also the time allocated, the curriculum designed, and the content selected for the program. The design of the curriculum and instructional materials to meet the objectives, the selection of the contents, and the availability of the resources: human, physical, material, and the overall work plan are the chief concerns of this evaluation (Stufflebeam, 2000; Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam and Zhang, 2007).

The study has found that the contents and the curriculum are appropriate, flexible, and straightly connected to the objectives of the program. The program designers and the teachers who select content as well as deliver it in the classrooms have maintained a great balance between theory and practice. Regarding the questions related to the input evaluation, T2 claimed:

*Contents are directly linked to the objectives. They are selected based on the program's purposes and the curriculum, and the teachers have the autonomy to choose the content they wish. For instance, if I make my students read an article for a specific purpose this year, I can choose any others next year.*

Furthermore, the teachers are ready to make changes in the content based on the needs and demands of the learners or from a discussion between the students and teacher, resulting in a notion of collaborative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 2019). All the facets of the program contribute significantly to establishing the program as a great success. Not only are the professors and faculty members highly qualified and compassionate, but the other human resources are also exceptionally dedicated and supportive. Every person is ready to help the students overcome problems they encounter. In this regard, S2 asserted, "*The professors, teachers, and non-teaching staff all were amiable and supportive. When we had any issues, they were always available for their assistance and guidance*". Stufflebeam and Zhang (2007) consider input evaluation as the assessment of a program's scheme or action plan, staff arrangement and other implications to meet the goals. M.Ed. in ELT is found appropriate in the input evaluation.

### **Process Evaluation of the Program**

Process evaluation concentrates on implementing the teaching and learning processes, as Sopha and Nanni (2019) consider it as the plan execution phase. It mentions how the program is run to achieve its objectives and identifies the problems or challenges faced by any sides during the course. It gauges the delivery process and tries to identify the issues in the implementation and the corrections needed in the work plan for the future (Stufflebeam, 2000).

The research found that the M.Ed. in ELT at KUSOED is running with ample inspiring methodologies. The teaching and learning pedagogies are extremely learner-centred and interactive. The faculties are aware of using different teaching methods to address contextual needs and create countless opportunities for students to take responsibility for their learning, making them autonomous learners, which is also one of the program's objectives. The teachers deliver their content using various technologies and methodologies, helping the learners develop skills and competencies to help them grow independently in their learning process. Moreover, the teachers also pay attention to inculcating the virtue of collaborating with the students. For this, the students are highly required to work in pairs and groups. Regarding this, the participants, S1 and S2, stated:

**S2:** *At first, we had to present, sometimes individually, in pairs, or groups. Then, there used to be comments from students and discussion sessions, and finally, the professor would wrap up.*

**S1:** *I wasn't very familiar with the technologies then. And you know, the use of Moodle, PPT, emails, I had to struggle a lot, but I now can handle them very well.*

The program has developed basic digital literacy among the students. They are motivated to increase their acquaintance with technology as the pedagogy is technology-based. However, one of the participants suggested that the university should focus on updating the faculty members' ICT competencies, as most teachers have basic ICT skills, but some still need updated skills. Concerning this, S2 shared his experience as:

*Yes, all the faculties have basic knowledge of ICTs. However, I think the university must conduct sessions to upgrade their skills. I remember a teacher saying, I do not know much about it when some issues appeared while we were having classes online. I used to help him solve those issues because I had a computer diploma course.*

### **Product Evaluation of the Program**

The final component of this framework is product evaluation, which evaluates the program's outcomes or products. According to Stufflebeam (2003), product evaluation identifies and assesses the consequences, intended and unintended, as well as short-term and long-term.

The products of the M.Ed. provide an explicit foundation for the claim of success. The students completing the program have become successful in bringing changes in the field of ELT in Nepal. They have been able to implement the competence and skills learned from the program in their workplaces as a teacher or a teacher educator (Gnawali, 2020). The program has become successful in producing dynamic, competent teachers, teacher educators, and researchers, which is the program's key objective. One of the participants, S2, expressed his thoughts after the completion of the program:

*I am an in-service government teacher. We have to submit action research in our evaluation of work assets, and I did not know the format of it. I had read action research in my bachelor's, though I never did it before. However, after completing my third semester, I can plan and conduct myself whenever I face any problems in my school.*

In addition, a participant from the faculty also highlighted that the program has been able to supply the teacher educators that the contemporary job market requires. He further said that the students might not be aware of various teaching and learning techniques and methodologies when they get enrolled in the program, but after their graduation, they will be very competent and confident about the methods. He answered the questions on product evaluation as:

*We aim to produce highly competent teachers and teacher educators, and our products have proven the success of the program. Our teacher students might not have adequate knowledge about different teaching methods and techniques even if they were practicing them in the classroom, but after they complete the program, I am happy that they can adapt various teaching strategies for one single classroom as per the need of the context.*

Many graduates of this program are not merely engaged in the teaching profession but also in helping teachers develop professionally designed teacher training. The program makes students engage and participate in several national or international conferences, fostering



their exploration and involvement in global practices, expanding their horizons of knowledge, and creating a broader network in their community. In regards to this statement, S1 contended:

*KU helps create a broader horizon for teachers and educators, providing ample expositors. I have participated in several trainings run by national and international figures. I am a NELTA life member, and I have participated in different conferences and presented a paper. It has connected me to a more incredible network of our ELT community.*

As Stoffelebeam (2000) argues, product evaluation is finding out the outcomes of a program, either positive or negative. This study found the M.Ed. in ELT successful in achieving the preset goals of producing conscious and updated educators and teacher educators. The program supports the notion of learner autonomy and critical thinking. The graduates are capable of taking the lead for their further learning and professional development. They imply the knowledge and skills learned from the program in their workplaces explore the issues they face and possible solutions.

### **Conclusion**

To conclude, concerning the findings and discussion, it can be concluded that the two-year M.Ed. in ELT of KUSOED is an indisputably successful program. The changes that the graduates brought in the teaching pedagogy in their workplaces and the value added to the existing knowledge by the scholars with their various studies and research advocate the pertinence and contextual relevance of the program. The provision of judicious and regular revision of the curriculum ensures the contextual adaptation to address the needs of the program trailers, the integration of innovative technologies and the upgraded methodologies, and the humility of the human resources aid the program becoming one of the most demanding and successful programs in Nepal in the field of English Language Education.

### **Reference**

- Aziz, S., Mahmood, M., & Rehman, Z. (2018). Implementation of CIPP model for quality evaluation at school level: A case study. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(1), pp. 189-206. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1180614.pdf>
- Burke, S. G. (2020). Using the CIPP evaluation model to examine a bachelor of science in health systems management program. *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. University of South Florida. <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=9715&context=etd>
- Gnawali, L. (2020). Embedding digital literacy in the classroom. In C. Tweedale, & J. Staufenberg (Eds.), *Developing effective learning in Nepal: Insight into school leadership, teaching methods and curriculum* (pp. 90-93). British Council. [https://www.britishcouncil.org.np/sites/default/files/developing\\_effective\\_learning\\_in\\_nepal\\_0.pdf](https://www.britishcouncil.org.np/sites/default/files/developing_effective_learning_in_nepal_0.pdf)
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2019). Cooperative learning: The foundation for active learning. In S. M. Brito (Ed.), *Active learning: Beyond the future* (59-70). IntechOpen.
- Kathmandu University, School of Education. (2019). *Master of education in English language teaching* (Brochure). KUSOED.
- Khawaja, S. (2001). *Education evaluation and monitoring concepts and techniques*. University of Missouri.

- Sopha, S. and Nanni, A. (2019). The CIPP model: Applications in language program evaluation. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(4), 1660-1667.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338426159\\_The\\_CIPP\\_Model\\_Applications\\_in\\_Language\\_Program\\_Evaluation#fullTextFileContent](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338426159_The_CIPP_Model_Applications_in_Language_Program_Evaluation#fullTextFileContent)
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971, February 24). The relevance of the CIPP evaluation model for educational accountability. [Paper Presentation]. *Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators Atlantic City*. New Jersey.  
<http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED062385>
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000). The CIPP model for evaluation. In D. L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus, & T. Kellaghan (Eds.), *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation* (2nd ed., pp. 280-317). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In D. L. Stufflebeam & T. Kellaghan (Eds.), *The international handbook of educational evaluation*, (pp. 31-62). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2007). *CIPP evaluation model checklist* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). National Science Foundation.  
[https://wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u350/2014/cippchecklist\\_mar07.pdf](https://wmich.edu/sites/default/files/attachments/u350/2014/cippchecklist_mar07.pdf)
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, & applications*. Jossey-Bass.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Zhang, G. (2007). *The CIPP evaluation model: How to evaluate for improvement and accountability*. The Guilford Press.
- Warju, W. (2016). Educational program evaluation using the CIPP model. *Innovation of Vocational Technology Education*, 12(1), 36-42

### **The Author**

**Narayan Shrestha** is a Research Assistant at the Research and Innovation Center and an MPhil scholar at the Department of Language Education, School of Education, Kathmandu University. He is a visiting faculty at Kitini College Lalitpur is interested in curriculum design, multilingualism, and teacher professional development.