

Classroom Assessment Profile of Teachers in Cauayan City, Philippines

Genalyn L. Capelo, Ph.D.
Isabela State University, Cauayan City, Isabela
genalyn.l.capelo@isu.edu.ph

Article Info**Volume 82****Page Number: 4044 - 4048****Publication Issue:****January-February 2020****Article History****Article Received: 18 May 2019****Revised: 14 July 2019****Accepted: 22 December 2019****Publication: 21 January 2020****Abstract:**

Using descriptive-comparative research design, the teachers' profile particularly their knowledge and understanding on the new classroom assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program (BEP) was analyzed. The respondents were the eighteen (18) Grade IV, Grade V and Grade VI teachers of a public school in Cauayan City, Isabela, Philippines. The results showed that the teacher-respondents have a moderate extent of knowledge in the concept of the new assessment; however, they exhibit lesser understanding in the said assessment. Furthermore, regardless of their position, number of years in teaching and age, the respondents have the same extent of knowledge and understanding on the new assessment.

Keywords: classroom assessment, Descriptive-Comparative, Isabela, Philippines.

I. INTRODUCTION

Classroom assessment is an integral part of curriculum implementation (DepEd Order NO. 8, s. 2015). Teachers must undergo different trainings and seminars in order to advance their knowledge and understanding about assessment. Research shows that in the implementation of a new grading system, inconsistencies in policy documents as well as teachers' lack of shared understanding and lack of resources are roadblocks to the achievement of the goals of the K to 12 Curriculum (Urich, 2012; Plata, 2011, 2007).

In the Philippines, due to the implementation of Republic Act No. 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, an assessment and rating of the learning outcomes has been devised to ensure that teachers and learners will attain content and performance standards (DepEd Order No.73 s. 2012). This previous system used the four levels of assessment namely knowledge, process, understanding, and product/performance (KPUP). However, the Department of Education (DepEd) released Order No.8 series of 2015 or the Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program, which uses a standard-and competency-based grading system. This new grading system is more precise than the previous one (KPUP) especially those concerning the promotion and retention of students.

The primary assessors in the classroom are the teachers. They design and provide appropriate assessment to measure learner's progress. With this new implementation, teacher's knowledge and understanding on the assessment guidelines play a critical part that may affect the assessment of student's learning. Thus, teacher's perception about this topic should be taken into consideration in order for the students to reach the content and performance standards of the curriculum.

Hence, as to what extent the teacher's knowledge and understanding on the classroom assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program is used and effected by the teachers in the classroom is the foremost objective of this study.

II. OBJECTIVES

This study sought to analyze the teachers' classroom assessment profile particularly their knowledge and understanding on the procedure implemented for the K to 12 Basic Education Program (BEP) under the DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015. Specifically, it sought to:

1. Determine the profile of the respondents with regards to:
 - a. Position
 - b. Length of teaching experience
 - c. Age
2. Determine the extent of the respondent's knowledge and understanding towards the classroom assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program.
3. Establish if a significant difference exists in the respondent's knowledge and understanding in the new K-12 assessment procedure when grouped according to their profile variables.

III. METHODS

This research used the descriptive-comparative design. This is used to determine the significant difference of the respondents' extent of knowledge and understanding on the new assessment when grouped according to their profile variables. The study was conducted at a prime public elementary school in Cauayan City, Philippines, utilizing its 18 teachers of Grades IV, V and VI.

Simple frequency and percentage counts was used to analyze the respondents' profile as well as the extent of their knowledge and understanding on the new classroom

assessment procedure. The table below shows the scale used to describe the overall knowledge and understanding of the respondents.

Range	Descriptive Interpretation
0-2	Very Little
3-5	Little
6-8	Moderate
9-11	Great

Kruskal – Wallis H Test was used to analyze the data whether there is a significant difference on the extent of knowledge and understanding of the respondents on the new assessment when grouped according to their profile.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table I. Respondents' Profile

Profile	Frequency	Percent
Position		
Teacher 1-3	16	88.89
Master Teacher 1-4	2	11.11
Length of Teaching Experience		
Less than 3	1	5.56
3-25	13	72.22
More than 25	4	22.22
Age		
Young Adult (18-40)	6	33.33
Adulthood	12	66.67

Table I shows the profile of the respondents. As to their academic position, 16 (88.89%) are holders of Teacher 1, Teacher II and Teacher III positions and 2 only (11.11%) are Master Teacher holders. This reveals that there are more

teachers in Grade IV, Grade V and Grade VI who holds the position of Teacher I, II and III than Master Teacher. This is so because based on the DepEd Order No.1 s. 1985, the number of master teachers in a district must compose of only 0.10 % of the total number of teachers in the district.

Moreover, holders of Teacher I, Teacher II and Teacher III (Proficient Teachers) are expected to be proficient and professionally independent in the practice and application of skills vital to the teaching and learning process. Generally, teachers at this level are expected to display competence in planning, implementing, managing and evaluating learning programs. Whereas, Master Teacher I to Master Teacher IV are expected to be at the highly proficient career stage, which means that they consistently exhibit a high level of proficiency in their teaching practice. Generally, they are expected to manifest an in-depth and erudite understanding of the teaching and learning process (RPMS Manual, Department of Education- Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development, pages 4-5).

As to length of teaching experience, 13 (72.22%) of the respondents are between 3 to 25 years in the teaching profession, 4 (22.22%) of the respondents are teaching more than 25 years and only 1 (5.56%) is teaching in less than 3 years. The result indicates that most of the respondents are in the teaching service for more than 3 years. Hence, they are expected to manifest the proficiency and competencies expected from them as indicated in the RPMS Manual.

As to age, 12 (66.67%) of the respondents are in adulthood, whereas, 6 (33.33%) are at a young adult stage. It vividly shows that majority of the respondents are at age 41 and above. The findings affirm the report cited in the first regular session of the seventeen congress of the Philippines introduced by Senator Joel Villanueva (S.B. NO. 1222, page 3).

Table II. Distribution of Respondents' Extent of Knowledge

Knowledge	Frequency	Percentage
1. Classroom assessment is a continuing process of identifying, gathering, organizing, and interpreting information about what the learners know and can do.	18	100.00
2. Classroom assessment offers information relative to students' performance on the learning competencies and standards of the curriculum.	18	100.00
3. Assessment should recognize homogeneity of learners.	6	33.33
4. The formative assessment should scaffold the learners in summative assessment.	15	83.33
5. Assessment should have clear standards and should be aligned to the curriculum.	18	100.00
6. Assessment involves only learners.	14	77.78
7. Formative assessment helps prepare learners for summative assessments.	16	88.89
8. Formative assessment conducted after the lesson assesses whether learning objectives were achieved.	16	88.89
9. Summative assessment measures the different ways learners use and apply all relevant knowledge and skills.	18	100.00
10. Based on the DepEd Order No. 8. s 2015, learners from Grades I to XII are graded on the knowledge, process, understanding and product/performance.	1	5.56
11. The grading system used in the K to 12 basic education program is based on the learner's weighted score on summative assessments.	11	61.11

Table II shows that 4 out of 11 items has a frequency of 18 and a percentage of 100 which means that all of the respondents got the correct answer in those items, whereas, 1 out of 11 items has a frequency of 1 and a percentage of 5.56, an indication that only one of the respondents got the item correct.

Moreover, the table confirms that the teachers are knowledgeable about the concept of classroom assessment. This can be seen on items number 1, number 2, number 5 and

number 9 in which all the teachers were able to get the correct answers. These items deal with the definition of classroom assessment. However, findings also reveal that the respondents are confused about the difference between the guidelines in DepEd Order No. 8 s. 2015 and DepEd Order No. 73 s. 2012 or the KPUP assessment which can be seen in item number 10 wherein only 1 of the respondents was able to get the keyed response.

Table III. Distribution of Respondents' Extent of Understanding

Understanding	Frequency	Percent
1. Formative assessment conducted before the lesson informs teachers on the progress of the students in relation to the development of the learning competencies.	4	22.22
2. Formative assessment conducted during the lesson proper tells the teachers about the student's understanding of a lesson /topic before direct instruction.	0	0.00
3. Individual formative assessment enables the learner to demonstrate independently what has been learned or mastered through a range of activities.	18	100.00
4. Collaborative formative assessment allows students to support each other's learning.	17	94.44
5. Performance task component measures student learning at the end of the quarter.	6	33.33
6. Written work component ensures that students can express skills and concepts in written form.	18	100.00
7. Quarterly assessment allows learners to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in diverse ways.	1	5.56
8. Remembering cognitive process happens when the learner can recall information and retrieve relevant knowledge from long-term memory.	16	88.89
9. Applying cognitive process occurs when the learners can use information to perform a procedure in familiar situations or in a new way.	16	88.89
10. Creating cognitive process is achieved when the learner can put elements together to form a functional whole and create a new product or point of view.	15	83.33
11. When the learner can make judgments and justify decisions, evaluating cognitive process is attained.	15	83.33

Table III indicates the respondents' extent of understanding on classroom assessment. It is clearly seen that 2 out of 11 items has a frequency of 18 and a percentage of 100 which means that all the respondents got the answers correctly. However, no one got the keyed answer in number 2. In addition, item numbers 3 and 6, which deals with the types of classroom assessment, has the highest frequency and percentage. This reveals that all of the respondents fully understand those concepts of assessment. However, all of the respondents failed to understand when to conduct formative assessment as seen in item numbers 1 and 2.

On the average, 38.89% or 7 out of 18 of the respondents understand the new assessment. The result is similar to the findings of Terdecillas (2014) that only 40% understand what assessment is, as they deal and fulfill their duties.

Table IV. Summary of the Respondents' Extent of Knowledge and Understanding

Extent of Knowledge and Understanding	Knowledge Frequency	Knowledge Percent	Understanding Frequency	Understanding Percent
Very Little (0-2)	0	0.00	0	0.00
Little (3-5)	0	0.00	2	11.11
Moderate (6-8)	11	61.11	13	72.22
Great (9-11)	7	38.89	3	16.67
Total	18	100.00	18	100.00

The table above shows the summary of the extent of respondent's knowledge and understanding on the new classroom assessment. As can be vividly seen, 11 (61.11%) of the respondents have a moderate extent of knowledge and 7 (38.89%) of the respondents have a great extent of knowledge on the classroom assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program. This means, that they are knowledgeable in the concept of the new classroom assessment. On the other hand, 13 (61.11%) of the respondents have a moderate extent of understanding, only 3 (38.89%) of the respondent have great

extent of understanding and 2 (11.11%) of the respondents have little extent of understanding in the classroom assessment for K to 12 Basic Education Program. This indicates that the respondents have a lack in understanding the concept of the new assessment when compared on their knowledge about the concept of assessment. The findings are in consonance with Plake and Imparas (1999) findings, which revealed that teachers receive little or no formal assessment training in the preparatory programs and often they are ill-prepared to undertake assessment-related activities. This is further confirmed in the study conducted by Schafer and Lissitz (1987) that teachers are not well-prepared to conduct accurate classroom assessment that includes proper concepts.

Table V. Kruskal-Wallis H Test on the Extent of Respondents' Knowledge According to their Profile

Profile Variable	Mean Rank	H-value	p-value
Position			
Teacher I-III	9.38	.088	.766

Master Teacher I-IV	10.50		
Number of Years in Teaching			
Less than 3	17.00	2.336	3.11
3-25	9.08		
More than 25	9.00		
Age			
Young Adult (18-40)	11.33	1.186	.276
Adulthood	8.58		

It is shown in Table V the Kruskal-Wallis H test on the difference of the extent of respondents' knowledge when grouped according to their profile variables. As to their position, the p-value of 0.766 implies that no significant difference exists on the teachers' extent of knowledge on classroom assessment when grouped according to their position. This implies that teachers' position has no obvious bearing on their knowledge on assessment. Also, the p-value of 0.311 signifies that the respondents' knowledge on classroom assessment has no difference when grouped according to their number of years of teaching. This means that the length of teaching experience is not an indicator of the teachers' knowledge of assessment. Correspondingly, the 0.276 p-value indicates that there is no significant difference on the teacher's knowledge when grouped according to their age. Again, this suggests that age is not an indication of the teachers' knowledge of classroom assessment

Table VI. Kruskal-Wallis H Test on the Extent of Respondents' Understanding According to their Profile

Profile Variable	Mean Rank	H-value	p-value
Position			
Teacher I-III	9.91	.955	.328
Master Teacher I-IV	6.25		
Number of Years in Teaching			
Less than 3	14.50	2.087	.352
3-25	9.88		
More than 25	7.00		
Age			
Young Adult (18-40)	11.50	1.447	.229
Adulthood	8.50		

Table VI shows the Kruskal-Wallis H test on the extent of respondents' understanding corresponding to their profile. A p-value of 0.328 indicates no significant difference on the respondents' extent of understanding with respect to their position. Furthermore, a p-value of 0.352 suggests no significant difference on their extent of understanding with respect to their number of years in teaching. Also, the 0.299 p-value signifies no significant difference on the teacher's extent of understanding with regards to age.

Therefore, it can be deduced that no significant difference in the respondents' understanding on the new K-12 assessment procedure when grouped according to their profile variables. This implies that regardless of their position, number of years in teaching and age, the respondents have the

same extent of understanding in the new K-12 classroom assessment.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS

- For the stakeholders in the field of teaching, it is recommended that educational leaders like: the principals, deans, department chairs, and academic coordinators must monitor the teachers in the implementation of the new assessment.
- Teachers' extent of knowledge and understanding is not at its great extent. In-service-training is recommended to refresh their knowledge and understanding on the new K-12 assessment.
- The researcher's respondents in the research are the Grade 4, Grade 5 and Grade 6 teachers. Further research is recommended, utilizing the Grades 1 to Grade 6 teachers.

REFERENCES

1. H. Alkharusi, "Teachers' classroom assessment skills: Influence of gender, subject area, grade level, teaching experience and in-service assessment training." *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 8(2), 39-48, 2011.
2. H. Alkharusi, S.Aldhafri, H. Alnabhani, & M. Alkalbani, "Educational assessment profile of teachers in the Sultanate of Oman. *International Education Studies*", 7(5), 116 – 13, 2014.
3. L. Batchman, "Statistical Analysis for Language Assessment", Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
4. E. Baylon, "Effects of classroom assessment on the critical thinking and academic performance of students". *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(1), 205-208, 2014.
5. DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2012, "Policy guidelines in the implementation of grades 1 to 10 of the K to 12 basic education curriculum (BEC) effective school year 2012-2013". Department of Education, Philippines, 2012.
6. DO 73, s. 2012 – Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes Under the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum retrieved from <http://www.deped.gov.ph/2012/09/05/do-73-s-2012-guidelines-on-the-assessment-and-rating-of-learning-outcomes-under-the-k-to-12-basic-education-curriculum/>
7. DO 8, S. 2015 – POLICY GUIDELINES ON CLASSROOM ASSESSMENT FOR THE K TO 12 BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM retrieved from <http://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/04/01/do-8-s-2015-policy-guidelines-on-classroom-assessment-for-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/>
8. H. Fives & N. Barnes, "Informed and uninformed naive assessment constructors' strategies for item selection". *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(1), 85-101, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116668019>
9. S. Katz, L. Earl, & D. Olson, "The paradox of classroom assessment: A challenge for the 21st century", *McGill Journal of Education*, 36(1), 13-26, 2001.
10. F. MacBeath & M. Galton. "A life in secondary teaching: Finding time for learning", 2004. Retrieved from

- <http://www.data.teachers.org.uk/resources/pdf/74262-MacBeath.pdf>, 23 March, 2009,
11. J. McMillan, "Formative classroom assessment: The key to improving students. In J. H. McMillan (Ed.), *Formative classroom assessment: Theory into practice*" (pp. 1-7). New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2007.
 12. C. A. Mertler, & C. Campbell, "Measuring teachers' knowledge and application of classroom assessment concepts: Development of the assessment literacy inventory. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 2005.
 13. M. T. Ohlsen, "Classroom assessment practices of secondary school members of NCTM". *American Secondary Education*, 36, 4-14, 2007.
 14. J. W. Pellegrino, "Assessment of science learning: Living in interesting times". *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 49, 831-841, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.21032>
 15. B.S. Plake, & J.C. Impara. *Teacher Assessment Literacy: What Do Teachers Know About Assessment?* In B. S. Plake & J.C. Impara (Eds.), *Handbook of Classroom Assessment*. San Diego Academic Press.
 16. S. Plata, "Exploring assessment reform policy and implementation in Philippine public secondary education", *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 97 (7), 52-56, 2007.
 17. S. Plata, "Implementation of curriculum reform: Roadblocks and potholes. In Dita (Ed). *Issues and Trends in Applied Linguistics*", 2011.
 18. J. W. Popham, "Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental? *Theory Into Practice*", 48, 4-11, 2009.
 19. W. J. Popham, "Classroom assessments what teachers need to know". (5th ed). Person Education, Inc., 2008.
 20. Republic Act 10533. "Enhanced Basic Education Implementing Rules and Regulations", Philippines, Retrieved from <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533/>
 21. W. D. Schafer and R. W. Lissitz. *Measurement Training for School Personnel: Recommendations and Reality*. *Journal of Teacher Education*.
 22. M. Scriven, "The methodology of evaluation (Vol. 1). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association", 1967.
 23. R. J. Stiggins, "The principals' leadership role in assessment". *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(13), 13-26, 2001.
 24. R. J. Stiggins, "The unfulfilled promise of classroom assessment. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*", 20(3), 5-15, 2001.
 25. J. Terdecillas. *Teacher's Perception of KPUP*. <https://jemterdecillas.blogspot.com>. 2014
 26. L. Urich, "Implementation of standards-based grading at the middle school grading", 2012.
 27. Retrieved from <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3499&context=etd>.
 28. Z. Zhang, & J. A. Burry-Stock, "Classroom assessment practices and teachers' self-perceived assessment skills. *Applied Measurement in Education*", 16(4), 323-342, 2003.