Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Classroom Assessment Skills and Practices in the College of Education

[1]Ela N. Regondola, [2]Leah N. Barbado

[1]Ed. D., Professor III, Camarines Norte State College-College of Education Daet, Camarines Norte, Philippines
[2]M.A.Ed, Master in Applied Statistics, Associate Professor 1, Camarines Norte State College-College of Education Daet, Camarines Norte, Philippines

Abstract: **Assessment is an integral part of instruction, as it determines whether or not the goals of instruction are met. It is where decisions about grades, placement, advancement, instructional needs, curriculum and funding are based. It follows that teachers must possess assessment skills to assure that results of assessment are valid and reliable. This study explored the assessment skills and practices of the faculty members in the Camarines Norte State College, College of Education. It also determined the frequency of use of the traditional and alternative or authentic assessment techniques. Result of the study indicated that the respondents are skilled in following guidelines in writing test items, using of traditional assessment, grading, communicating results, and using alternative assessment. They are however, somewhat skilled in using statistical analyses of classroom assessment data and using data. The respondents often followed assessment practices, wrote test items, used traditional assessment, used grading, communicated results, used alternative assessment and used data to improve teaching-learning process; they on the other hand used statistical analyses of classroom assessment data only occasionally. There is a significant difference in the respondents' frequency of use of traditional and alternative assessments as to age and years of teaching experience while no significant difference in the frequency of use of these types of assessments relative to sex, educational attainment and school level assignment. Results indicate that the frequency of use of the assessment types changes as the age and years of teaching experience of the teacher increase. The three groups of respondents significantly differed in their use of statistical analyses of classroom assessment data based on school level assignment and years of teaching experience. The respondents are a little skilled in using classroom assessments techniques. Results imply that there is a need for all groups to try using other assessment techniques to properly evaluate the performance of their students. An in-service training program on the preparation of assessment tools and how results could be used to improve instruction is proposed for implementation.**

Keywords: **Classroom assessment, assessment practices, assessment skills, performance, authentic/alternative assessment techniques, traditional assessment.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Assessment of student learning is a regular part of the school routine. A fairly large amount of classroom time is devoted to the assessment of student learning. Since teachers must give even more time to the preparation and scoring of tests and other assessments, a considerable portion of a teacher's day is devoted to issues surrounding student assessment. One could argue, then, that careful consideration of testing within formal teacher preparation programs is certainly warranted. If educators, particularly those in teacher preparation programs, are to help teachers use their student testing time efficiently and to be effective at it, more must be learned about how teachers perceive and use classroom tests and other forms of assessment (Gullickson, 1984).

According to Farr and Griffin (1973), there was for a time a perceived misalignment between what is taught to pre-service teachers, in terms of assessment skills and techniques, and what in-service teachers actually practice in the schools. Gullickson, 1986) opined that there were some who have argued that measurement courses tend to overemphasize large-scale, standardized testing as cited by Farr & Griffin (1973). It has been noted that teachers place much emphasis on non-test assessment and evaluation strategies (Gullickson, 1985). In his study, Gullickson (1984) reported that the average teacher did not perceive college measurement courses to be pertinent to his/her classroom testing needs and that most teachers learned how to test their students through their on-the-job experiences.

The foregoing findings suggest that there may be a need for a better understanding of the nature of assessment practices in classrooms. From the perspective of the classroom teacher, a need for the reorientation of college instruction with respect to measurement issues and concepts is implied.

This research study tried to find out whether the mentioned assumption of teachers' limited understanding of assessment applies to the faculty of the College of Education.

This study also attempted to examine the current assessment skills and practices of teachers in the CNSC-College of Education. The researchers also explored on how teachers assess their students' performance. The study tried to describe the overall assessment practices of teachers, examine differences in practices based on gender, school level (elementary, secondary, and tertiary levels), and years of experience, and how skilled the respondents are in the used of the assessment techniques.

Specifically this study had the following objectives: 1) determine assessment skills and practices of the teacher-respondents; 2) determine the extent of differences in the frequency of use of traditional and alternative assessment techniques in terms of age, gender, school level assignment, educational attainment, and years of teaching experience; 3) determine the extent of differences in the use of statistical analyses of classroom assessment data based on school level assignment and years of teaching experience; 4) determine how skilled the teachers are in using classroom assessments techniques; and 5) propose an in-service training program on the preparation of assessment tools and how results could be used to improve instruction.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Several literatures have been conducted abroad with direct and indirect relation with the present study. A brief review of related literature and studies are presented hereunder:

Maina (2014) investigated teacher's perspective on Classroom Assessment Practices in Kenyan Secondary Schools. The study resulted in a moderately thorough description of these teachers' assessment practices. Based on this, teachers demonstrated competence in assessing students learning but as regards assessment tasks as per the learning taxonomy, they showed lack of demand for application for those areas. The study suggests that there is need to train and create demand on all aspects of assessment in learning.

The study of Hao and Johnson (2013) investigated the relationship between teachers' uses of various types of classroom assessments and their fourth-graders' reading literacy achievement, reading self-concept, and attitudes toward reading. The results showed varied outcomes associated with teachers' uses of different types of assessments (multiple-choice items, short-answer and paragraph writing, and oral communication) across countries and across aspects of student reading achievement.

Lazaro (2013) examined classroom assessment practices of secondary school teachers in Tanzania. The major purpose was to establish the classroom assessment practices of teachers and the kind of support they receive from school authorities in conducting assessment. A total of 4,160 questionnaires were completed and returned. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data. Findings of the study revealed that the traditional methods of assessment are dominantly used in schools. The findings also indicate that teachers are burdened with a heavy teaching load making it difficult for them to effectively use assessment strategies that could provide a comprehensive picture of students' learning. The study recommended the need for enhancing teachers' competences in assessing students and giving them the necessary resources and support to undertake classroom assessment.

Lumadi's (2013) research aimed to investigate the challenges affecting teachers' classroom assessment practices and to explore how these challenges influence effective teaching and learning. The results revealed major challenges such as policy interpretation, assessment planning, implementation of assessment, the use of a variety of methods in assessment and time for assessment. Recommendations were formulated to strengthen classroom assessment practices.

Koloi-Keaikitse (2012) disclosed that they examined the discrepancies between teachers' perceived skill and use of classroom assessment practices. Findings of the study show that teachers were unsure about the adequacy of their assessment training, but indicated that they needed further training in assessment. The results also showed that primary teachers, particularly those with only a certificate needed more skill training in assessment applications, statistical applications, and criterion referenced testing. The more experienced teachers were, the more they agreed with mastery and performance orientations, and the more they had perceived skill and use of desirable classroom assessment practices. Factors were related to teacher's characteristics of educational level, subject taught, teaching level, years of teaching experience and assessment training. The results showed that including more courses in assessment during teacher training and sending teachers for in-service or workshops in assessment helped to improve their perceived beliefs, skills, and use of desirable classroom assessment practices.

Frey and Schmitt (2010) examined classroom assessment practices of 3rd- through 12th-grade teachers in a Midwestern state. In addition to determining the frequency with which specific assessment item formats were utilized, the level of use of selected "best practice" approaches to assessment was considered (performance-based assessment, teacher-made tests, and formative assessment). According to them, essays and written assignments were the most common assessment formats reported. There is substantial use of performance-based assessments across grade levels and subject, but traditional paper-and-pencil testing remains the predominant classroom assessment format. Female teachers choose performance-based assessment more often than male teachers. It appeared that performance-based assessment is used much more frequently by language arts teachers than by those who teach other subjects and is more common at higher levels than at the elementary level.

Khan (2008) attempted to investigate the formative assessment practices of two lower secondary mathematics teachers of two private English-medium secondary schools of Karachi, Pakistan. It explored the different ways of giving feedback to students and asking oral questions from them in the classroom. Results show that the dominant form of assessment in Pakistan is highly summative and is focused on promoting students to the next classes. However, teachers in this study were found to be using some aspects of formative assessment. The findings revealed the teachers' understanding of formative assessment, along with ways of feedback from the teacher to the students. Furthermore, the teachers' classroom observations exemplified that they give oral feedback to explain how to get to the appropriate solution of mathematical problems.

Alkharusi (2008), examined the effects of classroom assessment practices on students' achievement goals. The study included 1,636 ninth grade students and 83 science teachers from Muscat public schools in Oman. Results showed that class contextual features and teachers' teaching experiences and assessment practices interacted significantly with students' characteristics in influencing students' achievement goals. The classroom assessment environment as perceived by students is of increasing interest to the educational assessment community. The study addressed this issue by utilizing achievement goal theory and classroom assessment literature to examine the effects of certain student characteristics (e.g., self-efficacy) and classroom characteristics (e.g., assessment practices) on achievement goals for ninth-grade students in Muscat science classrooms in Oman.

Most of the researches cited were conducted in other countries and dealt on foreign assessment practices and grading system. None so far was conducted in the local scene particularly in the CNSC- College of Education.

3. METHODOLOGY

This research study covered all 59 College of Education faculty members on permanent, temporary and contract of service status for school year 2014 -2015 who are currently teaching in the tertiary, secondary and tertiary levels.

Research Locale. CNSC College of Education, Abaño Campus is the research locale of the study. It has a total of 30 College teachers, 14 high school teachers and 15 elementary school teachers. The figures include permanent, temporary and contract of service faculty members.

Research Design. The researchers used the descriptive survey approach and formulated a survey questionnaire which was a modification of the instrument used by Zhicheng Zhang and Judith A. Burry-Stock (1994) to aid them in their research. The survey instrument include questions regarding the respondents' family profile, e.g., age, gender, educational attainment, school level assignment and number of years in the teaching profession. It also made use of survey instrument to determine the assessment practices of the respondents.

Population Sampling or Respondents of the Study. The main sources of data were the faculty members of the College of Education in all academic levels. Students taking up subjects related to research were tapped to conduct the survey. Responses by both group of respondents for objective 1 and 2 were correlated to determine agreement.

Research Instrument. The data were gathered through a set of questionnaires with three parts: the first part for profile of the respondents; the second determined the assessment skills and the third, determined the frequency of use of the assessment practices of the respondents. The first part determined the educational background, school level assignment, teaching experience, age, sex, and training in classroom assessment. Parts two and three are composed of 70 items each which the respondents rated from a scale of 1 to 5 with five as the highest, defined as follows: for the frequency of use – 1= not at all used, 2= seldom used, 3= used occasionally, 4= used often, and 5= used very often; for the skill in using the assessment practice - 1= not at all skilled, 2= a little skilled, 3= somewhat skilled, 4= skilled, and 5= very skilled.

To validate the instruments, a dry run was administered to the teachers of other schools because they are not among the identified respondents.

The data gathered were interpreted by combining all items with similar characteristics or with similar purpose and boiling them down into seven categories, namely: following guidelines in writing test items; using traditional assessment; grading; communicating results; statistical analyses of classroom assessment data; use of alternative assessment; and, use of data to improve teaching-learning process.

Statistical Treatment of Data. Every item in the survey was analyzed. A frequency distribution was developed to determine the median for each identified variable inasmuch as Likert Scale was used to gather responses. Appropriate statistical tools such as Mann Whitney U Test was used to compare frequency of use of traditional and alternative assessment techniques by the respondents in terms of age, gender, school level assignment, educational attainment, and years of teaching experience and Kruskal-Wallis H Test to determine the extent of differences in the use of statistical analyses of classroom assessment data based on school level assignment and years of teaching experience.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Teachers give tests to determine not only students' mastery but also to improve instruction. But how skilled are they in formulating and conducting these tests and the frequency of the frequency of the use of these tests which could either be traditional or alternative are the focus of this study. Presented as follows are the findings:

Assessment Skills and Practices of the Teacher-Respondents:

The assessment skills and practices of the respondents were determined through the survey questionnaire formulated for the purpose. The 70-item questionnaire were analyzed and reduced to seven categories namely: following guidelines in writing test items; using traditional assessment; grading; communicating results; statistical analyses of classroom assessment data; use of alternative assessment; and, use of data to improve teaching-learning process.

Profile of Respondents. Table I reveals the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, educational background, school level assignment, and number of years teaching. As shown in the table age range from 56 – 60 has the highest frequency of 8 (30.77%) among respondents in the tertiary level; age range from 56 -60 for respondents in the secondary with a frequency of 3 (25%); and age range from 26 – 30 for respondents in the elementary group with a frequency of 4 (28.57%). For all the groups of respondents, age range from 56 – 60 has the highest frequency of 12 (23.08%).

The table also shows that out of the total number of respondents, there are more female 28 (53.85%) than male teachers 24 (46.15%). For the respondents in the tertiary level, male with a frequency of 15 (57.69%) exceeded the female 11 (42.31%). Among the respondents in the secondary level respondents, Female respondents totaling to 7 (58.33%) are

more than the male respondents with a frequency of 5 (41.67%). For the elementary group, the female respondents with a frequency of 10 (71.43%) exceeded the male 4 (28.57%).

As to educational attainment, all the three groups have the highest frequency of MA/MS holders with a frequency of 19 (73.08%), 9 (75%), 10 (71.43%) for the tertiary, secondary and elementary respondents, respectively. There are 4 (15.38%) PhDs for the tertiary, 1 (8.33%) for the secondary and none for the elementary.

As to school level assignment, 26 respondents are teaching in the tertiary, 12 in the secondary and 14 in the elementary.

The table further reflects the number of years of teaching experience of the respondents. Teaching experience ranging from 31 – 35 has the highest frequency of 9 (34.62%) for the tertiary, 31 – 35 with a frequency of 3 (25%) as the highest for the secondary while 4 (28.57%) each for years of experience ranging from 1 – 5 and 6 – 10 for the elementary group.

Table I. Profile of Respondents

Attribute	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Total
	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Age							
21 – 25	1	3.85	2	16.67	2	14.29	5
26 – 30	1	3.85	0	0.00	4	28.57	5
31 – 35	3	11.54	1	8.33	2	14.29	6
36 – 40	1	3.85	1	8.33	1	7.14	3
41 – 45	3	11.54	0	0.00	1	7.14	4
46 – 50	2	7.69	1	8.33	2	14.29	5
51 – 55	3	11.54	2	16.67	0	0.00	5
56 – 60	8	30.77	3	25.00	1	7.14	12
61 – 65	4	15.38	2	16.67	1	7.14	7
Sex							
Male	15	57.69	5	41.67	4	28.57	24
Female	11	42.31	7	58.33	10	71.43	28
Educational Attainment							
BS	3	11.54	2	16.67	4	28.57	9
MA/MS	19	73.08	9	75.00	10	71.43	38
PhD/Ed. D.	4	15.38	1	8.33	0	0.00	5
School Level Assignment							
Elementary	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00	14
Secondary	0	0.00	12	100.00	0	0.00	14
Tertiary	26	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	29
Teaching Experience (in yrs)							
1 - 5	2	7.69	2	16.67	4	28.57	9
6 – 10	2	7.69	1	8.33	4	28.57	7
11 – 15	4	15.38	0	0.00	3	21.43	7
16 – 20	3	11.54	2	16.67	1	7.14	6
21 – 25	1	3.85	1	8.33	0	0.00	2
26 – 30	2	3.85	1	8.33	0	0.00	3
31 – 35	9	34.62	3	25.00	1	7.14	13
36 – 40	4	15.38	2	16.67	1	7.14	7
41 – 45	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0

Table II presents the training on classroom assessment received by the respondents. For all the groups, the respondents acquired training in assessment as part of the course and from in-service training conducted viz.: 18 and 10 for the tertiary; 9 and 4 for the secondary; and 10 and 4 for the elementary. There is a total of 37 respondents who claimed that

their training in assessment is part of the course that they have taken while 18 disclosed that their training were from the training they have attended. It is worthy to note that there are seven respondents who did not take any training in classroom assessment.

Table II. Training in Classroom Assessment Received by the Respondents

Training in Classroom Assessment	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		All Groups	
	f	Rank	f	Rank	f	Rank	Total	Rank
None	7	3	0	4.5	0	5	7	4
Part of the Course	18	1	9	1	10	1	37	1
Took an assessment course	3	4	2	3	3	3	8	3
Took more than one course	2	5	0	4.5	1	4	3	5
Attended in-service training in assessment	10	2	4	2	4	2	18	2

Assessment Skills of Teacher-Respondents. The data that follow show the assessment skills of the respondents from the three academic levels, elementary, secondary and tertiary.

Following guidelines in writing test items. Table III reflects the skill of the three groups of respondents in writing test items. It further shows that all three groups were skilled in seven out of ten indicators listed.

Table III Skill in Following Guidelines in Writing Test Items

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.
1. Choosing appropriate assessment methods for instructional decisions.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
2. Selecting textbook-provided test items for classroom assessment.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
3. Administering announced quizzes.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
4. Administering unannounced quizzes.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
5. Using a table of specifications to plan assessments.	3	SS	4	S	3	SS	3	SS
6. Developing assessments based on clearly defined course objectives.	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
7. Matching assessments with instruction.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
8. Ensuring adequate content sampling for a test.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
9. Preparing TOS to ensure content validity.	3	SS	4	S	2.5	SS	3	SS
10. Avoiding teaching to the test when preparing students for tests.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
Average	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)
4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

The tertiary and secondary teacher-respondents disclosed that there are skilled in developing assessments based on clearly defined course objectives but not the elementary group who said that they are somewhat skilled. In the use of table of specifications (TOS) to plan assessment and ensuring content validity, the tertiary and the elementary teacher-respondents have agreed that they are somewhat skilled, the secondary group however, claimed otherwise.

Use of traditional assessment. Table IV reveals that all three groups of respondents were skilled in all indicators in using traditional assessment particularly in writing paper and pencil tests which may be objective (multiple-choice, matching type, true/false type, fill-in-the-blank or short answer items) or subjective type (essay) and items which elicit higher cognitive level responses. This is expected of the respondents because even before most of the assessment tools are in the form of paper and pencil tests aside from the fact that they are exposed to it even during their elementary and high school years.

Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Table IV Skill in the Use of Traditional Assessment

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.		Int.
1. Writing paper-pencil tests.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
2. Writing multiple-choice type questions.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
3. Writing matching type questions.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
4. Writing true/false type questions.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
5. Writing fill-in-the-blank or short answer questions.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
6. Writing essay questions.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
7. Writing test items for higher cognitive levels.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
Average	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)
4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

Grading. Table V displays responses of teacher-respondents as regards their skill in grading. It could be observed that the tertiary and secondary groups were skilled in twelve out of fourteen indicators and only somewhat skilled in "informing students in advance how grades are calculated" and in "using criterion-referenced grading model" for the tertiary group and "informing students in advance how grades are calculated" and "using systematic procedures to determine borderline grades" for the secondary group.

Table V. Skill in Grading

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.		Int.
1. Using criterion-referenced grading model.	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
2. Developing systematic grading procedures.	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
3. Developing a grading philosophy.	4	S	4	S	2.5	SS	4	S
4. Informing students in advance how grades are calculated	3	SS	3	SS	2.5	SS	3	SS
5. Using systematic procedures to determine borderline grades.	3.5	S	3	SS	2.5	SS	3	SS
6. Establishing student expectations for determining grades for special education students.	4	S	4	S	2.5	SS	4	S
7. Incorporating extra credit activities in the calculation of grades.	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
8. Incorporating ability in the calculation of grades.	4	S	4	S	3.5	S	4	S
9. Using criterion-referenced grading model.	3	SS	4	S	4	S	4	S
10. Incorporating improvement in the calculation of grades.	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
11. Incorporating effort in the calculation of grades.	4	S	4	S	3.5	S	4	S
12. Incorporating attendance in the calculation of grades.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
13. Assigning grades.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
14. Weighing differently projects, exams, homework, etc. when assigning semester grades.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
Average	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)
4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

The elementary group on the other hand, disclosed that they are only skilled in six out of fourteen indicators, e.g., incorporating ability in the calculation of grades, using criterion-referenced grading model, incorporating effort in the

calculation of grades, incorporating attendance in the calculation of grades, assigning grades, and weighing differently projects, exams, homework, etc. when assigning semester grades; they said that they are only somewhat skilled in the rest of the indicators.

The foregoing findings imply a training on grading specially among elementary teachers of the college.

Communicating results. The table that follows discloses the skill of the respondents in communicating results. It could be noted that all three groups of respondents agree that they are skilled in five out of the ten indicators such as "communicating performance assessment criteria to students in advance", "providing oral feedback to students", "communicating classroom assessment results to students", "protecting students' confidentiality with regard to test scores", and "recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate uses of assessment information".

Table VI. Skill in Communicating Results

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.		Int.
1. Communicating performance assessment criteria to students in advance.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
2. Calling for teacher-parent conference to communicate grades.	3.5	S	4	S	3	SS	3.5	S
3. Providing oral feedback to students.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
4. Providing written feedback to students.	4	S	3	SS	4	S	4	S
5. Communicating classroom assessment results to students.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
6. Communicating classroom assessment results to parents.	3	SS	4	S	4	S	4	S
7. Communicating classroom assessment results to other educators.	3	SS	4	S	4	S	4	S
8. Protecting students' confidentiality with regard to test scores.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
9. Recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate assessment methods.	4	S	3.5	S	2.5	SS	3.5	S
10. Recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate uses of assessment information.	4	S	4	S	3.5	S	4	S
Average	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)
4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

The respondents differ in their claim in terms of skill in "calling for teacher-parent conference to communicate grades" where the elementary group is only somewhat skilled; providing written feedback to students" where the secondary group admitted that they are only somewhat skilled; "Communicating classroom assessment results to parents" and "communicating classroom assessment results to other educators" where the tertiary group admitted that they are only somewhat skilled; and, "recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate assessment methods" where the elementary group admitted that they are only somewhat skilled.

Statistical Analyses of Classroom Assessment Data. Table VII shows that all groups of respondents are skilled in three indicators, e.g., "revising previously produced teacher-made tests to match current instructional emphasis", "following required procedures (time limit, no hints, no interpretation) when administering standardized tests", and "calculating and interpreting central tendency of teacher made tests".

It could be observed that all three respondents are somewhat skilled in "determining if a standardized achievement test is valid for classroom assessment", "interpreting Percentile Rank to students and parents", The groups of respondents vary in their skill for the rest of the indicators. It could be noted further, that the elementary group is only a little skilled in "calculating and interpreting variability of teacher made tests".

Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Table VII. Skill in Statistical Analyses of Classroom Assessment Data

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.		Int.
1. Revising previously produced teacher-made tests to match current instructional emphasis.	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
2. Determining if a standardized achievement test is valid for classroom assessment.	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS
3. Testing the reliability of the scores.	4	S	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS
4. Following required procedures (time limit, no hints, no interpretation) when adminis-tering standardized tests.	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
5. Interpreting standardized test scores (e.g., Stanine, Percentile Rank) to students and parents.	3	SS	3.5	S	2.5	SS	3	SS
6. Interpreting Percentile Rank to students and parents.	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS
7. Calculating and interpreting variability of teacher made tests.	3	SS	3	SS	2	LS	3	SS
8. Conducting item analysis (i.e., difficulty and discrimination indices) for teacher-made tests.	3	SS	4	S	2.5	SS	3	SS
9. Calculating and interpreting central tendency of teacher made tests.	3.5	S	3.5	S	2.5	SS	3.5	S
Average	3	SS	3.5	S	3	SS	3	SS

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)

4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

Use of Alternative Assessment. The table that follows reflects the respondents' skill in using alternative assessment.

The data show that they are skilled in 12 out of 13 indicators such as: evaluating oral questions from students; assessing students through observation; constructing a model answer for scoring essay questions; matching performance tasks to instruction and course objectives; defining a rating scale for performance criteria in advance; recording assessment result on the rating scale/checklist while observing a student's performance; recording assessment result on the rating scale/checklist while observing a student's performance; assessing individual class participation; assessing group class participation; assessing individual hands-on activities; assessing group hands-on activities; assessing individual class participation; and using rubrics in assessing performance.

Both tertiary and elementary groups admitted that they are only somewhat skilled in using other rating scales in evaluating performance. Secondary teacher-respondents claimed that they are skilled in this particular activity. The table further shows that aside from using other rating scales in evaluating performance the teachers in the tertiary admitted that they are somewhat skilled in constructing a model answer for scoring essay questions; The secondary teachers disclosed that they are somewhat skilled in defining a rating scale for performance criteria in advance. On the other hand, the elementary teachers stated that they are somewhat skilled in using other rating scales in evaluating performance and in using rubrics in assessing performance.

Table VIII. Skill in the Use of Alternative Assessment

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall	
	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.
1. Evaluating oral questions from students.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
2. Assessing students through observation.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
3. Constructing a model answer for scoring essay questions.	3	SS	4	S	4	S	4	S
4. Matching performance tasks to instruction and course objectives.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
5. Defining a rating scale for performance criteria in advance.	4	S	3	SS	4	S	4	S

Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

6. Recording assessment result on the rating scale/checklist while observing a student's performance.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
7. Assessing individual class participation.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
8. Assessing group class participation.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
9. Assessing individual hands-on activities.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
10. Assessing group hands-on activities.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
11. Assessing individual class participation.	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
12. Using other rating scales in evaluating performance	3	SS	4	S	3	SS	3	SS
13. Using rubrics in assessing performance.	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
Average	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)

4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

Use of data to improve teaching-learning process. Table IX indicates the skill of the respondents in using data to improve teaching-learning process. The data show that the respondents are skilled in only three assessment practices, e.g., using assessment results when planning teaching, using assessment results when evaluating class improvement, and using assessment results when evaluating school improvement.

Table IX. Skill in the Use of Data to Improve Teaching-Learning Process

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn.	Int.		Int.
1. Revising a test based on item analysis.	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS
2. Obtaining diagnostic information from standardized tests.	3	SS	3.5	S	3	SS	3	SS
3. Using assessment results when planning teaching.	3.5	S	4	S	2.5	SS	3.5	S
4. Using assessment results when developing curriculum.	3	SS	3.5	S	2.5	SS	3	SS
5. Using assessment results when making decisions (e.g., placement, promotion) about individual students.	3	SS	4	S	3	SS	3	SS
6. Using assessment results when evaluating class improvement	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
7. Using assessment results when evaluating school improvement.	4	S	3.5	S	3	SS	3.5	S
Average	3	SS	3.5	S	3	SS	3	SS

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)

4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

The data also reflects that the respondents are somewhat skilled in revising a test based on item analysis, obtaining diagnostic information from standardized tests, using assessment results when developing curriculum, and using assessment results when making decisions (e.g., placement, promotion) about individual students.

Summary of Classroom Assessment Skills of Teacher-Respondents. Table X reveals the classroom assessment practices of the teacher-respondents. The data show that the respondents are skilled in following guidelines in test item writing, in the use of traditional assessment, in grading, in communicating results, and in the use of alternative assessment. They are somewhat skilled in the use of statistical analysis of classroom assessment data and in the use of data to improve teaching-learning processes.

Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

The findings indicate that all three groups of respondents need more training in the classroom assessment processes. Though most of the respondents had in-service training on assessment aside from the learning they acquired during their college days, their overall rating of 4 (skilled) implies a retraining or mentoring on classroom assessment particularly on the statistical analyses of classroom assessment data and the use of data to improve teaching-learning process.

The data further reveal that the elementary teachers group needs more training on grading. This is perhaps due to the introduction of a new grading system under the K-12 program.

Table X. Summary of Classroom Assessment Skills of Teacher-Respondents

Skills	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int	Mdn	Int.		Int.
1. Following Guidelines in Writing Test Items	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
2. Use of Traditional Assessment	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
3. Grading	4	S	4	S	3	SS	4	S
4. Communicating Results	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
5. Statistical Analyses of Classroom Assessment Data	3	SS	3.5	S	3	SS	3	SS
6. Use of Alternative Assessment	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
7. Use of Data to Improve Teaching-Learning Process	3	SS	3.5	S	3	SS	3	SS
Average	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)
4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

Assessment Practices of Teacher-Respondents:

The data that follow reflect the assessment practices of the respondents from the three academic levels, elementary, secondary and tertiary.

Follows guidelines in writing test items. Table XI indicates the practices of the three groups of respondents in following guidelines in writing test items. It shows that all three groups are consistent in saying that they often select textbook-provided test items for classroom assessment, administer announced quizzes, develop assessments based on clearly defined course objectives, match assessments with instruction, and ensure adequate content sampling for a test. Their responses vary in choosing appropriate assessment methods for instructional decisions, administering unannounced quizzes, and avoiding teaching to the test when preparing students for tests though their overall response to the practices mentioned is used often (UO). Two of the practices were occasionally used (OU) such as using of table of specifications to plan assessments and preparing TOS to ensure content validity.

The data imply that an activity to enhance the skill of the teachers in the preparation and use of the table of specification (TOS) be held. The teacher respondents also need to be refreshed on the principles and rules of test formulation.

Table XI. Following Guidelines in Writing Test Items

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.		Int.
1. Chooses appropriate assessment methods for instructional decisions.	4	UO	4	UO	4.5	UVO	4	UO
2. Selects textbook-provided test items for classroom assessment.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
3. Administers announced quizzes.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
4. Administers unannounced quizzes.	4	UO	4	UO	3	OU	4	UO

5. Uses a table of specifications to plan assessments.	3.5	UO	4	UO	3	OU	3	OU
6. Develops assessments based on clearly defined course objectives.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
7. Matches assessments with instruction.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
8. Ensures adequate content sampling for a test.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
9. Prepares TOS to ensure content validity.	3	OU	3.5	UO	4.5	UVO	3	OU
10. Avoids teaching to the test when preparing students for tests.	4	UO	4	UO	2	SU	4	UO
Average	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO

Legend: 1 = not at all used (NT) 2 = seldom used (SU) 3 = occasionally used (OU)

4 = used often (UO) 5 = used very often (UVO)

Use of traditional assessment. Table XII reveals the respondents' frequency of use of traditional assessment. It shows that all three groups of respondents used often all indicators in the use of traditional assessment. It could be noted however, that secondary teacher-respondents claimed that they write paper-pencil tests very often (UVO) while the elementary teacher-respondents disclosed that they write fill-in-the-blank or short answer questions, essay questions, and test items for higher cognitive levels very often.

The findings imply that the teacher-respondents prefer most the use of traditional test as indicated by their frequency of use of the types of tests mentioned.

Table XII. Use of Traditional Assessment

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.		Int.
1. Writes paper-pencil tests.	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO	4	UO
2. Writes multiple-choice type questions.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
3. Writes matching type questions.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
4. Writes true/false type questions.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
5. Writes fill-in-the-blank or short answer questions.	4	UO	4	UO	4.5	UVO	4	UO
6. Writes essay questions.	4	UO	3.5	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
7. Writes test items for higher cognitive levels.	4	UO	3.5	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
Average	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO

Legend: 1 = not at all used (NT) 2 = seldom used (SU) 3 = occasionally used (OU)

4 = used often (UO) 5 = used very often (UVO)

Grading. Table XIII displays responses of teacher-respondents as regards their grading practices. It could be observed that all groups are one in saying that they often used nine out of fourteen indicators such as: developing systematic grading procedures; developing a grading philosophy; using systematic procedures to determine borderline grades; establishing student expectations for determining grades for special education students; incorporating extra credit activities in the calculation of grades; incorporating improvement in the calculation of grades; incorporating effort in the calculation of grades; incorporating attendance in the calculation of grades; and weighing differently projects, exams, homework, etc. when assigning semester grades. The respondents had varied responses in the rest of the indicators. Unlike the secondary and tertiary groups, the elementary teacher-respondents claimed that the often used criterion-referenced grading model and inform students in advance how grades are calculated. While the tertiary and elementary groups admitted that they occasionally incorporated ability in the calculation of grades, the secondary teacher-respondents claimed using them often. The data also show that both tertiary and elementary groups disclosed that they occasionally use criterion – referenced grading model while the secondary use it often. Both tertiary and elementary groups opine that they often assign grades while the elementary teachers very often used it.

Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Table XIII. Grading Practices

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.		Int.
1. Uses criterion-referenced grading model.	3.5	UO	4	UO	2.5	OU	3.5	UO
2. Develops systematic grading procedures.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
3. Develops a grading philosophy.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
4. Informs students in advance how grades are calculated	4	UO	4	UO	2.5	OU	4	UO
5. Uses systematic procedures to determine borderline grades.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
6. Establishes student expectations for determining grades for special education students.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
7. Incorporates extra credit activities in the calculation of grades.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
8. Incorporates ability in the calculation of grades.	4	UO	3	OU	4	UO	4	UO
9. Uses criterion-referenced grading model.	3	OU	4	UO	3	OU	3	OU
10. Incorporates improvement in the calculation of grades.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
11. Incorporates effort in the calculation of grades.	4	UO	4	UO	3.5	UO	4	UO
12. Incorporates attendance in the calculation of grades.	4	UO	4	UO	3.5	UO	4	UO
13. Assigns grades.	4	UO	3.5	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
14. Weighs differently projects, exams, homework, etc. when assigning semester grades.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
Average	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO

Legend: 1 = not at all used (NT) 2 = seldom used (SU) 3 = occasionally used (OU)
4 = used often (UO) 5 = used very often (UVO)

Communicating results. The table that follows discloses the respondents' frequency of use of communicating results. It could be noted that all three groups of respondents agree that they used often five of the ten indicators such as: communicating performance assessment criteria to students in advance; calling for teacher-parent conference to communicate grades; communicating classroom assessment results to other educators; recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate assessment methods; and recognizing unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate uses of assessment information. The difference in the frequency of use of the practices lies among the elementary teachers. It could be observed that they used very often the activities like providing oral feedback to students, provides written feedback to students, communicating classroom assessment results to students, communicating classroom assessment results to parents, and protecting students' confidentiality with regard to test scores. For the foregoing practices, the tertiary and the secondary groups agreed that they used them often.

Table XIV. Communicating Results

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.		Int.
1. Communicates performance assessment criteria to students in advance.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
2. Calls for teacher-parent conference to communicate grades.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
3. Provides oral feedback to students.	4	UO	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
4. Provides written feedback to students.	4	UO	3.5	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
5. Communicates classroom assessment results to students.	4	UO	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO

Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

6. Communicates classroom assessment results to parents.	3	OU	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
7. Communicates classroom assessment results to other educators.	3	OU	3.5	UO	4	UO	4	UO
8. Protects students' confidentiality with regard to test scores.	4	UO	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
9. Recognizes unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate assessment methods.	4	UO	4	UO	3.5	UO	4	UO
10. Recognizes unethical, illegal, or otherwise inappropriate uses of assessment information.	4	UO	4	UO	2.5	OU	4	UO
Average	4	UO	4	UO	4.5	UVO	4	UO

Legend: 1 = not at all used (NT) 2 = seldom used (SU) 3 = occasionally used (OU)
4 = used often (UO) 5 = used very often (UVO)

Statistical Analyses of Classroom Assessment Data. Table XV shows that all groups of respondents often follow required procedures (time limit, no hints, no interpretation) when administering standardized tests. They however, differ in their claim or other indicators which range from seldom to often used. It could be noted that the standardized tests e.g., Stanine, Percentile Rank to interpret scores to students and parents were occasionally used. Interpreting Percentile Rank to students and parents, calculating and interpreting variability of teacher-made tests and conducting item analysis (i.e., difficulty and discrimination indices) for teacher-made tests were seldom used.

Table XV. Use of Statistical Analyses of Classroom Assessment Data

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall	
	Mdn.	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.
1. Revises previously produced teacher-made tests to match current instructional emphasis.	4	UO	3	OU	4	UO	4	UO
2. Determines if a standardized achievement test is valid for classroom assessment.	3	OU	4	UO	2	SU	3	OU
3. Tests the reliability of the scores.	4	UO	2	SU	3	OU	3	OU
4. Follows required procedures (time limit, no hints, no interpretation) when administering standardized tests.	3	OU	3	OU	4	UO	3	OU
5. Interprets standardized test scores (e.g., Stanine, Percentile Rank) to students and parents.	4	UO	2	SU	3	OU	3	OU
6. Interprets Percentile Rank to students and parents.	4	UO	2	SU	2	SU	2	SU
7. Calculates and interpreting variability of teacher made tests.	3	OU	2	SU	2	SU	2	SU
8. Conducts item analysis (i.e., difficulty and discrimination indices) for teacher-made tests.	3	OU	2	SU	2	SU	2	SU
9. Calculates and interprets central tendency of teacher made tests.	3	OU	3	OU	2	SU	3	OU
Average	3	OU	2	SU	2	SU	2	SU

Legend: 1 = not at all used (NT) 2 = seldom used (SU) 3 = occasionally used (OU)

4 = used often (UO) 5 = used very often (UVO)

The data indicate that respondents are not well-versed with simple statistics that help determine whether learning is enhanced.

Use of Alternative Assessment. The table that follows reflects the respondents' frequency of using alternative assessment. The data show that the three groups of respondents agree that they often practiced assessing students through observation, matching performance tasks to instruction and course objectives, assessing individual class participation, and using rubrics in assessing performance. Constructing a model answer for scoring essay questions received a rating of 3 (OU) from both tertiary and secondary teacher-respondents and 4 (UO) from the elementary group. Using other rating scales in evaluating performance received a rating of 3 (OU) from tertiary and secondary groups and a rating of 4 (UO) from the secondary group.

Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

It could also be noted that while the tertiary and the secondary groups disclosed that they often evaluate oral questions from students, assess group class participation, assess individual hands-on activities, assess group hands-on activities, and assess individual class participation, the elementary group claimed that they practiced them very often.

Table XVI. Use of Alternative Assessment

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.		Int.
1. Evaluates oral questions from students.	4	UO	4	UO	4.5	UVO	4	UO
2. Assesses students through observation.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
3. Constructs a model answer for scoring essay questions.	3	OU	3	OU	4	UO	3	OU
4. Matches performance tasks to instruction and course objectives.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
5. Defines a rating scale for performance criteria in advance.	4	UO	3	OU	4	OU	4	UO
6. Records assessment result on the rating scale/checklist while observing a student's performance.	4	UO	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
7. Assesses individual class participation.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
8. Assesses group class participation.	4	UO	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
9. Assesses individual hands-on activities.	4	UO	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
10. Assesses group hands-on activities.	4	UO	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
11. Assesses individual class participation.	4	UO	4	UO	5	UVO	4	UO
12. Uses other rating scales in evaluating performance	3	OU	4	UO	3	OU	3	OU
13. Uses rubrics in assessing performance.	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
Average	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO

Legend: 1 = not at all used (NT) 2 = seldom used (SU) 3 = occasionally used (OU)
4 = used often (UO) 5 = used very often (UVO)

Use of data to improve teaching-learning process. Table XVII indicates the respondents' use of data to improve teaching-learning process. It could be noted that all groups of respondents often used assessment results when evaluating class improvement and when evaluating school improvement. They however, vary in using assessment results when planning teaching, when making decisions and when developing curriculum.

In these three indicators, the tertiary and elementary groups disclosed using the often while the secondary, admitted that they occasionally and seldom used them. Meanwhile the tertiary and secondary groups opined acknowledged that they occasionally revise a test based on item analysis, obtain diagnostic information from standardized tests, when the elementary used them often.

Table XVII. Use of Data to Improve Teaching-Learning Process

Indicators	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall	
	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.
1. Revises a test based on item analysis.	3	OU	2.5	OU	4	UO	3	OU
2. Obtains diagnostic information from standardized tests.	3	OU	3	OU	4	UO	3	OU
3. Uses assessment results when planning teaching.	4	UO	3	OU	4	UO	4	UO
4. Uses assessment results when developing curriculum.	4	UO	2	SU	4	UO	4	UO
5. Uses assessment results when making decisions (e.g., placement, promotion) about individual students.	4	UO	3	OU	4	UO	4	UO
6. Uses assessment results when evaluating class improvement	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
7. Uses assessment results when evaluating school improvement.	4	UO	4	UO	3.5	UO	4	UO
Average	4	UO	3	OU	4	UO	4	UO

Legend: 1 = not at all used (NT) 2 = seldom used (SU) 3 = occasionally used (OU)
4 = used often (UO) 5 = used very often (UVO)

Summary of Assessment Practices of Teacher-Respondents. Table XVIII reflects the overall frequency of use of the assessment practices of teacher-respondents. The data show that the following assessment practices were used often, viz., follow guidelines in writing test items; use of traditional assessment; use of grading; communicating results; use of alternative assessment; and use of data to improve teaching-learning process. They however, occasionally used statistical analyses of classroom assessment data. This is expected because this particular indicator needs skill in computation and not all teachers are adept in mathematics. Some excel in Math but others are not.

Inasmuch as analyzing classroom assessments is one of the responsibilities of the teacher, it is imperative that they use assessment data to improve teacher's instruction and assessment as well as student learning.

Table XVIII. Summary of Assessment Practices of Teacher-Respondents

Practices	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Overall Median	
	Mdn	Int	Mdn	Int.	Mdn	Int.		Int.
1. Follow Guidelines in Writing Test Items	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
2. Use of Traditional Assessment	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
3. Grading	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
4. Communicate Results	4	UO	4	UO	4.5	UVO	4	UO
5. Statistical Analyses of Classroom Assessment Data	3	OU	3.5	UO	3	OU	3	OU
6. Use of Alternative Assessment	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO
7. Use of Data to Improve Teaching-Learning Process	4	UO	4	UO	3	OU	4	UO
Average	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO	4	UO

Legend: 1 = not at all used (NU) 2 = seldom used (SU) 3 = occasionally used (OU)
4 = used often (UO) 5 = used very often (UVO)

Extent of Differences in the Frequency of Use of Traditional and Alternative Assessment Techniques:

An examination of the data in the Table XIX reveals that the results of Mann Whitney U test, applied to compare the frequency of use of traditional and alternative assessment of the respondents, showed statistical difference at (Z=2.34, p=.0192<.05) as to age and at (Z=2.00, p=.0456<.05) as to years of teaching experience. Since their p-values are less than 0.05 alpha, it can be concluded that the respondents' frequency of use of the traditional and alternative assessments differed significantly. Results as to sex (Z=0.00, p=1.000>.05); as to educational attainment (Z=0.65, p=.5156>.05); and as to school level assignment (Z=0.00, p=1.000>.05) did not really differ. Since all p-values are more than 0.05 alpha it can be concluded that the respondents' frequency of use of the traditional and alternative assessments did not vary.

The findings indicate that age and years of teaching experience have some effect on the frequency of use of the traditional and alternative assessments. There is however a balance in the use of these assessment methods among teachers from all levels in the college as to sex, educational attainment, and school level assignment. Though there are assessment skills which need further enhancement, the teachers know the importance of using the appropriate assessment tool and technique.

Table XIX. Results of the Mann Whitney U Test to Compare the Frequency of Use of Traditional and Alternative Assessment Techniques

Profile	U	z-value	P-value	Decision	Conclusion
Age	14.00	2.34	0.0192	Reject Ho	Significant
Sex	2.00	0.00	1.0000	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Educational Attainment	3.00	0.65	0.5156	Accept Ho	Not Significant
School Level Assignment	4.50	0.00	1.0000	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Teaching Experience	13.00	2.00	0.0456	Reject Ho	Significant

Novelty Journals

ISSN 2394-9686

International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning
Vol. 4, Issue 6, pp: (8-27), Month: November-December 2017, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Extent of differences in the use of statistical analyses of classroom assessment data based on school level assignment and years of teaching experience:

The table that follows reflects the results of Kruskal-Wallis Test, used to compare the differences in the use of statistical analyses of classroom assessment data. Results show that there is statistical difference between the variables compared since the computed values (6.84 and 6.55) are more than the critical value of the test (5.99). The results further indicate that the frequency of use of statistical analysis data as to school level assignment and years of teaching experience vary among the respondents.

Table XX. Results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test to Compare the Frequency of Use of Statistical Analysis Data Based on School Level Assignment and Years of Teaching Experience

Variables	Computed Value	Critical Value	Decision	Conclusion
School Level Assignment	6.84	5.99	Reject Ho	Significant
Years of Teaching Experience	6.55	5.99	Reject Ho	Significant

Teachers' Skill in Using Classroom Assessments Techniques (CATs):

Table XXI shows the respondents' skill in using classroom assessment techniques. It further discloses that all three groups of respondents are skilled in the use of performance assessment and scoring rubrics with an overall rating of 4 (S); somewhat skilled in the use of directed paraphrasing, one-sentence summary, student- generated test questions, concept mapping, portfolios, classroom opinion poll, and human tableau or class modeling, all with overall rating of 3 (SS). All three groups also disclosed that they are a little skilled with an overall rating of 2 (LS) in using the following classroom assessment techniques: minute paper, chain notes, memory matrix, exam evaluations, application cards, attitude surveys, muddiest point, paper or project prospectus, pro and con grid, group work evaluations, and goal ranking and matching. The teacher respondents in the elementary level however, admitted that they are not skilled in using Chain notes, memory matrix, attitude surveys, and muddiest point. They also disclosed that they are not using these techniques in assessing the performance of their students.

Table XXI. Classroom Assessment Techniques

Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs)	Respondents' Skill in the Using CATs							
	Tertiary		Secondary		Elementary		Median	
1. Minute paper	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS
2. Chain Notes	2	LS	3	SS	1	NS	2	LS
3. Memory Matrix	2	LS	2	LS	1	NS	2	LS
4. Directed Paraphrasing	3	SS	3	SS	2	LS	3	SS
5. One-sentence summary	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS
6. Exam Evaluations	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS
7. Application cards	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS
8. Student- generated test questions	3	SS	3	SS	2	LS	3	SS
9. Attitude Surveys	2	LS	2	LS	1	NS	2	LS
10. Concept Mapping	3	SS	3	SS	2	LS	3	SS
11. Performance Assessment	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
12. Muddiest Point	2	LS	2	LS	1	NS	2	LS
13. Portfolios	3	SS	4	S	3	SS	3	SS
14. Scoring Rubrics	4	S	4	S	4	S	4	S
15. Paper or Project Prospectus	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS
16. Pro and Con Grid	3	SS	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS
17. Classroom Opinion Poll	3	SS	3	SS	2	LS	3	SS
18. Group Work Evaluations	3	SS	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS
19. Goal Ranking and Matching	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS	2	LS
20. Human Tableau or Class Modeling	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS	3	SS
Median	3	SS	2.5	SS	2	LS	2	LS

Legend: 1 = not at all skilled (NS) 2 = a little skilled (LS) 3 = somewhat skilled (SS)
4 = skilled (S) 5 = very skilled (VS)

The data imply that the respondents seldom use the majority of the assessment techniques because if they do use them always, they could have mastered these skills.

The foregoing findings necessitate a review of the classroom assessment strategies and techniques learned since the respondents' college days and as part of the in-service training conducted years back. The data further imply that there is a need to refresh the respondents in writing effective objective types of test items, improving test items, conducting performance tests, creating rubrics and using test scores for making educational decisions, hence this training program proposal.

Proposed In-Service Training Program on the Preparation of Assessment Tools and Use Results to Improve Instruction:

One of the teacher's primary tasks in the classroom is to evaluate what students know and can do as a result of instruction. For many teachers, however, classroom assessment methods, strategies and techniques may be limited to a few options, such as exams and research papers. The strategies and techniques employed may not connect well to the course or program outcomes. The focus of this training is to review the variety of assessment methods, strategies and techniques like exams. It will also address overall classroom assessment through the use of rubrics, outcomes, and taxonomies. Participants will learn how to use assessment to measure student learning for outcomes such as teamwork, communication, and team-based projects.

The matrix that follows is a training program proposed to enhance the skills of the teachers in assessing the academic performance of their students. It aims to: a) address assessment accuracy and effective use, for both summative and formative assessment; b) utilize feedback from students to make adjustments in their instructional methods; c) design accurate classroom assessments to assess those learning targets; and d) effectively use the results of those assessments for teachers to adjust instruction and students to adjust learning.

The proposed training program is composed of seven topics which the researchers identified as necessary for recalling. These are rationale of classroom assessment, traditional and alternative assessment, alignment in assessment development and interpretation, statistical analyses of classroom assessment data, classroom assessment techniques (CATs), and outcomes-based assessment.

Table XXII. Proposed Assessment Topics for Review/Retraining

Objectives	Activities	Strategies	Time Frame	Persons Involved
Part I. Classroom Assessment Rationale	• The need to assess learning skills. • Different assessment methods for the assessment of learning skills. • Assessment for and assessment of learning, principles, processes and strategies.	Lecture, brainstorming, grouping	One day	Dean, Area Chairperson CE Faculty
Part II. Traditional Assessment	• Objectives types of tests, advantages and limitations • Test item writing • Basic ideas of validity and reliability • Applications of these ideas to classroom assessments	Lecture, brainstorming, grouping, workshop		Dean, Area Chairperson CE Faculty
Part III. Alternative Assessment	• Rationale for alternative assessments • Key concepts in designing alternative assessments • Reliability and validity issues in alternative assessments • Fundamentals and purposes of using rubrics • Common flaws and making improvements of design of rubric • Good use of rubrics in classroom for peer/self-assessment	Lecture, brainstorming, grouping, workshop	One day	Dean, Area Chairperson CE Faculty

Part IV. Alignment in Assessment Development and Interpretation	• Alignment concept and connection to learning outcomes, syllabi, and tables of specifications • Tables of Specifications and test/item alignment • Alignment and its implications for assessments used in one's own context	Lecture, brainstorming, grouping, workshop	One day	Dean, Area Chairperson CE Faculty
Part V. Statistical Analyses of Classroom Assessment Data	• Test and item analysis • Analyses using facility indices (FIs) & discrimination indices (DIs) • Approaches to item banking and test interpretation using FI and DI • Simple statistical analyses and item analyses. • How to make the statistical functions available in Excel and perform simple analyses • How to determine standard scores in interpreting data.	Lecture, brainstorming, grouping, workshop	One day	Dean, Area Chairperson CE Faculty
Part VI. Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs)	• Identify various CATs • Provide reasons for using CATs • Select appropriate assessment techniques	Lecture, brainstorming, grouping, workshop	One day	Dean, Area Chairperson CE Faculty
Part VII. Outcome-based Assessment (OBA)	• Establish clear, measurable objectives (expected outcomes) of student learning • Principles, processes and methods • Writing outcomes	Lecture, brainstorming, grouping, workshop		Dean, Area Chairperson CE Faculty

5. CONCLUSIONS

The research showed that the respondents are skilled in following guidelines in writing test items, using of traditional assessment, grading, communicating results, and using alternative assessment. They are however, somewhat skilled in using statistical analyses of classroom assessment data and using data to improve teaching-learning process. The respondents often followed assessment practices, wrote test items, used traditional assessment, used grading, communicated results, used alternative assessment and used data to improve teaching-learning process; they on the other hand used statistical analyses of classroom assessment data only occasionally. It could further be concluded that using more often the assessment practices means being skilled in using them and using them occasionally boil down to being only somewhat skilled. The respondents significantly differ in their frequency of use of traditional and alternative assessments as to age and years of teaching experience while no significant difference were seen in the frequency of use of these types of assessments relative to sex, educational attainment and school level assignment. Results indicate that the frequency of use of the assessment types changes as the age and years of teaching experience of the teacher increase. Respondents' use of statistical analyses of classroom assessment data significantly differ among the groups based on school level assignment and years of teaching experience. Respondents are a little skilled in using classroom assessments techniques. Though the tertiary and secondary teachers are somewhat skilled as compared to the elementary teachers group who are not at all skilled in the use of some assessment techniques, there is a need for all groups to try using other techniques to properly evaluate the performance of their students. Respondents need to attend an in-service training program on the preparation of assessment tools and how results could be used to improve instruction.

It is further recommended that the College of Education faculty come together and discuss about classroom assessment methods, processes, and techniques to improve students' learning performance. Faculty needs more training on the use of classroom assessment techniques, use of assessment data to improve learning and data interpretation to make correct decisions regarding curriculum. While the faculty members have developed skillful approaches in using classroom assessment whether traditional or alternative, there is still room to enhance and expand that use, especially as a tool to improve students' learning processes. The training program on classroom assessment practices proposed as an output of this study may be adopted for implementation. Teachers should be sent for in-service training in assessment on a regular

basis to ensure that they maintain current classroom assessment skills. Finally, this research study may be used as baseline data for further studies.

REFERENCES

[1] Alkharusi, Hussain (2008). Effects of Classroom Assessment Practices on Students' Achievement Goals. Sultan Qaboos University, Oman. Retrieved on October 2014 at http://www.immagic.com/eLibrary/ARCHIVES/ GENERAL/ JOURNALS/E080013A.pdf

[2] Farr, R. & Griffin, M.. Measurement gaps in teacher education. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 7(1), 19-28, 1973.

[3] Frey, Bruce B. and Vicki L. Schmitt. Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices. Retrieved on October 2014 at http://www.uwsp.edu/conted/ConfWrkShp/ Documents/ ClassroomAssess.pdf, 2010.

[4] Gullickson, A.R.. Teacher perspectives of their instructional use of tests. Journal of Educational Research, 77(4), 244-248, 1984.

[5] Hao, Shiqi and Robert L. Johnson. Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices and Fourth-Graders' Reading Literacy Achievements: An International Study, 2013.

[6] Khan. A case study: Formative classroom assessment practices of two lower secondary teachers of mathematics in an English medium private school of Karachi. Aga Khan University, Institute for Educational Development, Karachi. Retrieved on October 2014 at http://ecommons.aku.edu/theses_dissertations/212/, 2008.

[7] Koloi-Keaikitse, Setlhomo. *Classroom Assessment Practices: A Survey of Botswana Primary and Secondary School Teachers*. A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate School in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy. Marchant Ball State University Muncie, Indiana, 2012.

[8] Lazaro, Joyce. Examining Classroom Assessment Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Tanzania. Ndalichako National Examinations Council of Tanzania, 2013.

[9] Lumadi, Walter. Challenges Besetting Teachers in Classroom Assessment: An Exploratory Perspective. Mutendwahothe Walter Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, University of South Africa, 2013.

[10] Maina, Gichuru Francis. Classroom Assessment Practices in Kenyan Secondary Schools: Teacher Perspective. University of Nairobi School of Education, Psychology Department, 2014.

[11] Stiggins. *Classroom Assessment for Student Success*. Washington: National Education Association, 1998.

[12] Zhicheng Zhang and Judith A. Burry-Stock. Classroom Assessment Practices and Teachers' Self-Perceived Assessment Skills. (1994)