CASE STUDY 1 : School A

School Profile

Type: Co-educational CBSE school
Location: Tier 2 city
Strength: 1,200 students: Grades I to XII

School A is a well-established CBSE school located in a Tier 2 city with largely stable leadership over the past five years. The campus is clean, safe, and well-organised. Statutory policies, committees, and required documentation are in place and reviewed annually. School routines—such as assemblies, timetables, academic calendars, and review meetings—run predictably and on schedule.

Teachers submit weekly lesson plans aligned to the annual academic plan. Classroom environments are calm and orderly, with clear routines and expectations. Teaching is largely teacher-directed with an emphasis on syllabus coverage and examination readiness. Students are attentive and complete assigned tasks. Assessments are conducted as per the academic calendar, and results are compiled and discussed during leadership meetings. While outcomes remain steady and above previous baselines, there has been little variation or growth over recent years.

Professional development sessions are organised regularly, and attendance is high. Most sessions focus on compliance-related themes such as documentation, assessment formats, and procedural updates. Teachers collaborate mainly for coordination and task completion rather than for instructional planning or reflection. Informal conversations suggest that while teachers feel supported by clear systems, many are cautious about experimenting with new approaches due to time pressures and performance expectations.

Students participate in house meetings. They occasionally complete feedback forms, but there is limited evidence of how student input informs classroom practices or academic

decisions. Parents generally express confidence in the school's discipline, safety, and academic stability.

CASE STUDY 2 : School B

School Profile

Type: Co-educational CBSE school
Location: Tier 2 city
Strength: 900 students: Grades I to X

School B is a Tier 2 city school serving families from a similar socio-economic background as School A. Over the past few years, the school has experienced multiple leadership transitions, resulting in changes to priorities and processes. Infrastructure is adequate, though maintenance and upkeep vary across spaces. Safety practices are followed in day-to-day routines, but records and documentation are not always consistently updated.

Teachers demonstrate strong rapport with students, and in several classrooms, learning is interactive and student-centred. However, these practices are not uniform across the school. Lesson plans are submitted, but their quality and depth vary significantly between teachers and departments. Assessment data is available, but it is primarily used for reporting results rather than guiding instructional decisions or targeted support.

Professional development is organised intermittently and often responds to immediate needs rather than a long-term plan. Teachers express a desire for clearer expectations and more consistent feedback. Appraisal processes exist, but criteria and follow-up are not always clearly understood, leading to varied perceptions of fairness and growth opportunities.

Student contribution to school matters is largely informal, with them approaching trusted teachers directly. Parents are engaged and invested in the school, but frequently raise concerns about communication gaps, inconsistent practices across sections, and follow-through on commitments.

Applying SQAAF Through Case Studies

1. **Based on the evidence available in the case studies, record your group's initial thoughts.**

School A – Overall Impression:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

School B – Overall Impression:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Domain-wise Evidence-Based Assessment (SQAAF Rubric)

(Use the rubric below to assess each school independently, based only on the evidence in the case studies.)

- **Inceptive -** *The system is at the initial stage. Practices are individual-based.*
- **Transient -** *System is in its early constructive years. Practices are generally corrective in nature.*
- **Stable -** *Evidence of the database improvement process. The system is defined and documented. People are aware of their roles in the institution and practicing it. Practices are preventive and corrective in nature.*
- **Dynamic–Evolving -** *Demonstrates strong benchmarked, defined, and documented processes. Governance and leadership exhibit accountability, responsibility, self-evaluation, and improvement planning.*

SQAAF Domain	Rubric for Assessment			
Leadership, Management & Governance	**School A**	☐ Inceptive	☐ Transient	☐ Stable ☐ Dynamic–Evolving
	School B	☐ Inceptive	☐ Transient	☐ Stable ☐ Dynamic–Evolving
Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Assessment	**School A**	☐ Inceptive	☐ Transient	☐ Stable ☐ Dynamic–Evolving
	School B	☐ Inceptive	☐ Transient	☐ Stable ☐ Dynamic–Evolving

Human Resources	**School A**	☐ Inceptive	☐ Transient	☐ Stable	☐ Dynamic–Evolving
	School B	☐ Inceptive	☐ Transient	☐ Stable	☐ Dynamic–Evolving
Beneficiary Satisfaction	**School A**	☐ Inceptive	☐ Transient	☐ Stable	☐ Dynamic–Evolving
	School B	☐ Inceptive	☐ Transient	☐ Stable	☐ Dynamic–Evolving

3. Share ONE aspect of evidence for any TWO of the above domains:

	School A	School B
Domain 1		
Evidence for Rating		
Domain 2		
Evidence for Rating		

4. Discuss and note brief responses.

1) Which domain was easiest to analyse? Why?

_____

_____

2) Which domain was hardest to analyse? Why?

_____

_____

3) One example where compliance may be mistaken for quality:

_____

_____