

# Reframing Remote Learning Assessment Practices Of Teachers': Input For School Based Testing Reforms

Prof. Resty C. Samosa<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Graceville National High School

<sup>2</sup> Colegio de San Gabriel Arcangel

[resty.samosa002@deped.gov.ph](mailto:resty.samosa002@deped.gov.ph)

**Abstract:** Due to the unprecedented COVID-19 incident, basic education institutions have faced different challenges in their teaching-learning activities. Particularly conducting assessments remotely during COVID-19 has posed extraordinary challenges for basic education institutions owing to lack of preparation superimposed with the inherent problems of remote assessment. Descriptive-evaluation research was employed since the present study attempts to examine the assessment practices and competences on remote learning assessment of teachers in Graceville National High School. For the study, questionnaires were prepared and data from nine (9) senior high school teachers and forty-two (42) junior high school teachers were collected and analyzed. The gathered data from this study were subjected to the descriptive and inferential statistics. The data revealed that the most frequent number of the teacher-respondents in the study was 36 – 40 years old at age, female, Technology Livelihood Education (TLE) major, 6 – 10 years in service in Department of Education, and bachelor's degree holders. More so, the teacher respondents' level of teacher competencies on remote learning assessment was observed high competent. In addition, level of assessment practices in terms of clarity of assessment, time and effort on task, quality of feedback, motivational belief and self-esteem to learners, self-assessment and reflection of learning of the learners, and assessment – content and process in adapting teaching to students needs was mostly practice. However, it was completely practicing the interaction and dialogue about learning progress. The results confirmed that there was a significant difference on the teacher respondents' level of competence on the remote learning assessment when grouped according to their age, gender, areas of specialization, and training attended. On the other hand, teacher year of teaching and educational attainment revealed it has no significant difference on their level of competence on the remote learning assessment. Looking forward, that age, gender, year of teaching, areas of specialization, educational attainment, and training attended significantly differs to the level of assessment practices of the teachers. It also observed that the teachers experiencing highly challenges encountered on the remote learning assessment. It is recommended to implement the proposed school-based testing reforms and should be monitored and evaluated for the optimum advantage of the school and community.

**Keywords—** assessment practices, competence, remote learning assessment

## 1. INTRODUCTION & RATIONALE

As schools around the world have closed due to coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic students, teachers, and parents are settling into the "new reality" for the foreseeable future. Many schools are implementing their distance learning contingency plans and connecting students and teachers through online platforms and tools. National and local governments are partnering with broadcasting service providers to deliver educational content via television and radio during dedicated hours. Under these unexpected circumstances, teachers and parents have had to quickly adapt to teaching in this new reality to ensure that students engage in learning.

In response to this crisis and to ensure the continuity of learning while assuring the health, safety, and well-being of all learners, teachers, and other employees, the Department of Education instituted DepEd Order no. 12 series of 2020 to establish new learning delivery modalities in all levels embodied in the Learning Continuity Plan (LCP) for the school year 2020-2021. The alternative modes of delivering learning were envisioned to reach all learners regardless of who and where they are. Among these implemented learning delivery modalities (LDMs) were Distance Learning, Blended Learning, and Homeschooling. The Department of

Education (DepEd) conducted Learning Enrollment and Survey Form (LESF) on school opening (Department of Education, 2020), it was found out that Modular learning, a form of distance learning that uses Self-Learning Modules (SLM) is one of the highly convenient for most of the typical Filipino students. It was also the most preferred learning system of the majority of parents/guardians for their children. The SLM is based on the most essential learning competencies (MELCS) provided by the Department of Education.

However, without the grasp of the teacher and authentic learning experiences as in face-to-face teaching-learning process, the learners will have a difficulty in understanding the topic and will be demotivated to learn ultimately leading to the submission of incomplete answers in the modules or totally non-submission of modules resulting to poor academic performance and a risk of failure of the students. On the survey conducted by the Graceville National High School's Research Unit. Out of 45 students in a section, an average of 13 learners passed an incomplete answer in module and 8 learners did not pass the module at all on a weekly submission of modules. This also indicates that those learners will have a failing grade if not treated with an intervention and remediation.

In line with the Global Education Monitoring Report (2020) expressed issues in educational aspects, one of which is on assessment practices. Classroom assessment has been a topic of interest for researchers in the new normal of education owing to lack of preparation superimposed with the inherent problems of remote assessment. The main challenges identified in remote assessment were academic dishonesty, infrastructure, coverage of learning outcomes, and commitment of learners to submit assessments (Laitusis, 2020). Focusing on assessment is important for the development of teaching and learning processes. Assessment enables teachers and students to draw inferences from the information obtained and act accordingly. Such actions may aid in making the necessary improvements to teaching and learning, or simply provide a picture in time of students' competence or achievement (Black and Wiliam, 2018).

In a way it is observed that the teachers develop new alternative and varied approaches to monitor learners' learning from assessing to remediating learning losses during the COVID-19 crisis, including both formative and summative methods. Different methods may be required per grade and subject area for both individual and collective feedback and support. Moreover, teachers may lack relevant resources at home, training and experience, particularly on distance learning platform. Some programmes may largely reduce the amount of time allocated to teacher-directed learning processes by focusing on learners' self-learning. Upon return to school, teachers may also struggle to assess learners' learning levels to identify whether learners are on track, and any learning gaps or losses resulting from the school closure and for remedial actions. Such assessments may be critical in informing learning process and/or students' promotion, certification and access to higher levels of education.

From this, learner cannot and should not be expected to learn and progress across the intended curriculum through self-learning methods with few interactions from teachers. Distance learning modalities should integrate a formative and summative assessment component, whereby students submit work to teachers and teachers provide individualized and/or collective feedback regarding learning content and student error patterns. This can be established through complementary communication elements between teachers and students (e.g. teachers checking in on students via mobile) or integrate a role for parents as facilitators. Expectations for formative and summative assessment need to be clearly communicated to schools, teachers, learners and parents. Teachers may use various channels to collect and assess learners' work regarding learning areas targets and priorities: online platforms can be used, homework can be dropped off at a given location on a given day, according to local regulations or teachers can contact learners' periodically. Protocols should be put in place when learners are identified as not learning or not accessing distance learning modality.

As regards how assessment practices are currently being reshaped in the Philippine Basic Education, the Department of Education (DepEd) issued DepEd Order

No. 31, s. 2020 or the Interim Guidelines for Assessment and Grading in Light of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan. This is to provide guidance on the assessment of student learning and on the grading scheme for school year 2020-2021, which are key to understanding and addressing gaps in education among students that pursues learning continuity for schools to take stock of assessment and grading practices that are more meaningfully support learner development and respond to varied contexts at this time. More so, the learners' assessment should be holistic and authentic in capturing the attainment of the most essential learning competencies.

With all this information, the researcher was prompted to conduct this study since it was observed that the learners at risk in achieving and mastering the most essential learning competencies in the remote learning. This research led to evaluate the present assessment practice on the remote learning as the basis to reform the school-based testing program based on the findings of the study.

## **2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

This study evaluates the assessment practice of teachers on the remote learning in Graceville National High, Schools Division of San Jose de Monte Bulacan in the in new normal situation which serves as the basis to reform the school-based testing program during the LAC and In-Service Training.

Specifically, this research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher-respondents be described in terms of?
  - 1.1 Age
  - 1.2 Gender
  - 1.3 Areas of Specialization
  - 1.4 Years of teaching,
  - 1.5 Highest Educational Attainment
  - 1.6 Training Attended?
2. What is the level of teacher's competence and practice on the remote learning assessment in terms of the following component:
  - 2.1 Competencies on remote learning assessment
    - 2.1.1 Assessment Occurring Prior to Instruction.
    - 2.1.2 Assessment Occurring During Instruction.
    - 2.1.3 Assessment Occurring After the Appropriate Instructional Segment
  - 2.2 Level of assessment practices
    - 2.2.1 clarity of assessment
    - 2.2.2 time and effort on task
    - 2.2.3 quality of feedback
    - 2.2.4 motivational belief and self-esteem to learners
    - 2.2.5 interaction and dialogue about learning progress
    - 2.2.6 self- assessment and reflection of learning of the learners
    - 2.2.7 assessment – content and process in adapting teaching to students needs

3. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the teacher- respondents on the level of competencies on the remote learning assessment when grouped according to profile?
4. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the teacher- respondents on the Level of assessment practices when grouped according to profile?
5. What are the challenges encountered by the teacher respondents on the remote learning assessment?

### 3. METHODS

#### Research Design

The descriptive research design was employed since the present study attempts to assessment practices on remote learning of teachers in Graceville National High School. In addition, the researcher used descriptive-evaluation research to accomplish the purpose of the study. Samosa (2020) pointed out that descriptive-evaluation research is typically designed to determine the causes or consequences of processes, policies, practices or programs. This investigation approach includes the collection of data to address questions related to the status of the study subject. It seeks to identify the essence of the situation as it occurs at the time of the analysis and to examine the causes of the situation.

#### Respondents of the study

The respondents of the study were nine (9) senior high school teachers and forty-two (42) junior high school teachers from Graceville National High School in the District VIII, Division of San Jose del Monte Bulacan City.

#### Sample and Sampling Technique

The researcher utilized the *Purposive sampling technique* and according to Samosa, et al, (2021), it is a form of non-probability sampling in which decisions concerning the individuals to be included in the sample are taken by the researcher, based upon a variety of criteria which may include specialist knowledge of the research issue, or capacity and willingness to participate in the research. The study involved the nine (9) senior high school teachers and forty-two (42) junior high school teachers from Graceville National High School in the District VIII, Division of San Jose del Monte Bulacan City.

#### Instruments

The questionnaire was the main tool used in this study in gathering data needed. This questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of series of items for the purpose of gathering information from the respondents. The researcher used the structured questionnaire which was a researcher- made- instrument with 4 Likert scale survey formulated based on literature and studies.

The indicators used in this study were carefully chosen and improved after several consultations and discussions with the adviser. Important points were chosen that could necessarily represent the essence, substance, and intention of the study. To determine the validity of the instrument used and administered to the teacher- respondents, the survey questionnaires was presented to three testing coordinators in the City Division of San Jose del Monte for necessary correction and other modification.

The final instrument used was the result of the modifications or corrections made according to the suggestions or corrections done by the evaluators. Upon consideration of suggestions and recommendations given on validation of the instrument, misleading questions were modified as well. The researcher then presented the final draft of the instrument to the three testing coordinators for finalization and approval. After which, the researcher conducted a dry run or trial among ten teachers for the validation using Cronbach. Alpha Test of Validity and Reliability. All noted discrepancies or vague statement on the instrument were integrated and incorporated in the finalization of the instrument. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal consistency that is calculated using sample variance, total scores, and number of items.

Cronbach's alpha is used to assess how consistently multiple items in a survey or test assess the same skill or characteristic. Higher values of Cronbach's alpha suggest higher internal consistency. More so, providing the following rules of thumb: greater than 0.9 is excellent, greater than 0.8 indicates good item, greater than 0.7 indicates acceptable, greater than 0.6 is Questionable, greater than 0.5 is poor, and less than 0.5 is unacceptable. A benchmark value of 0.7 is commonly used. Generally, if Cronbach's alpha is greater than 0.7, then you have evidence that the survey or test items measure the same skill or characteristic. If Cronbach's alpha is below 0.7, then the items may not reliably measure a single skill or characteristic to conclude that at least some of the items measure the same characteristic. However, the appropriate benchmark value to use also depends on the standards in your subject area and the number of items in the analysis (Samosa, 2021d).

The instruments composed of four (4) parts:

Part I: determine the profile of the teacher-respondents be described in terms age, gender, area of specialization, years of teaching, highest educational attainment, and training attended.

Part II: assessment on the level of teacher's competencies on the remote learning assessment in terms of assessment occurring prior to instruction, assessment occurring during instruction, and assessment occurring after the appropriate instructional segment. It consists of five item questionnaires to each indicator that can be answered through four-point Likert scale, 1 – not competent 2 – low competent, 3 – high competent and 4 – very high competent. More so, the computed internal consistency was 0.83 that indicates good items,

Part III: evaluation on the teachers' level of assessment practices on remote learning in terms of clarity of assessment, time and effort on task, quality of feedback, motivational belief and self-esteem to learners, interaction and dialogue about learning progress, self- assessment and reflection of learning of the learners, assessment – content and process in adapting teaching to student's needs. It consists of ten (10) items questionnaires to each indicator that can be answered through four-point Likert scale, 1 – Not at all practice t 2 – somewhat practice, 3 – mostly practice and 4 completely practice. More so, the computed internal consistency was 0.88 that indicates good items,

Part IV: measurement on the challenges encountered by the teacher on the remote learning assessment which consist of ten (10) item questionnaires that can be answered through four-point Likert scale, 1 – Not encountered, 2 – Encountered, 3 – Highly Encountered and 4– Very Highly Encountered. The computed internal consistency was 0.87 that indicates good items,

**Data Collection Procedure**

Three major phases will be observed in order to gather data needed in the study. First, an approval will be secured from the Schools Division Office of San Jose del Monte City to field the questionnaire to teacher- respondents from Graceville National High School.

Secondly, upon approval, the researcher will submit a letter to the school principal of the subject school to conduct a survey with attachment of the approval endorsement from the office of the SDS. The conduct of the study was hereby granted with the condition that no government funds shall be used during the conduct of the activity, classes will not be disrupted as indicated in DepED Order No. 9 s. 2005 re: “Instituting Measures to Increase Engaged Time-on-Task and Ensuring Compliance Therewith” and proper coordination with the school principal shall be arranged prior to the conduct of the said activity.

Upon the approval of the school head, the researcher sent the survey questionnaire to all teacher- respondents of the study via Google form (<https://forms.gle/yyXfrAjPqGK9YFXS9>). On some cases where there was face to face setup, proper health protocol was strictly followed like wearing of mask wearing and face shield, physical distancing, and hand sanitizing. After the collection of data, the researcher tallied, tabulated all the data and information acquired and were statistically analyzed and interpreted. The answered Google form will then be retrieved on the Google drive repository for the tallying of the rating and summarizing the answers of the respondents. And lastly, the comments and suggestions of the teacher will be valued to further improve the remote learning assessment practices.

**Data Analysis**

Data gathered from this study were subjected to the following statistical treatments: Percentage and Frequency. The percentage and frequency distribution were use to determine the frequency counts and percentage distribution of personal related variables of the respondents in Research Question 1.

Weighted Mean. The weighted mean was use to assess the level of teacher's competence and assessment practices on remote learning (Research Question 2) and challenges encountered by the teacher on the remote learning assessment (Research question 5) that were analyzed with verbal interpretation listed below.

Weighted Mean	VERBAL INTERPRETATION		
	Level of teacher's competence and practices on the remote learning assessment	Level of teacher's practices on the remote learning assessment	Challenges encountered in conducting action research
1.00 – 1.75	Not Competent	Not at all Practice	Not encountered
1.76 – 2.50	Low Competent	Somewhat Practice	Encountered
2.51 – 3.35	High Competent	Mostly Practice	Highly Encountered
3.26 – 4.00	Very High Competent	Completely Practice	Very Highly Encountered

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is a statistical technique that is use to check if the means of two or more groups are significantly different from each other specifically the significant difference in the assessment of the teacher-respondents on the level of competence on the remote learning assessment when grouped according to profile (Research Question 3) and significant difference in the assessment of the teacher- respondents' level of assessment practices when grouped according to profile (Research Question 4).

**4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

This section presents analyses and interprets the data collected in the study. For clarity of presentation and consistency in the discussion, the data were performed in accordance with the order and sequence of the action research questions of the study.

**1. TEACHER- RESPONDENTS PROFILE**

**Table 1.1 Age Profile of the teacher-respondents**

Age Profile	Frequency Distribution	Percentage Distribution
21 – 25 years old	2	4%
26 – 30 years old	10	20%
31 – 35-year-old	11	22%
36 – 40 years old	15	29%
41 – 45 years old	9	18%
46 – 50-year old	2	4%
51 – 60-year old	2	4%
TOTAL	51	100%

Table 1.1 showed the frequency and percentage distribution of the age profile of the teacher-respondents. The

data showed that 29% (15) of the teacher-respondents from the sample are 36 – 40 years old at age. Then, 22% (11) were 31 – 35-year-old, 20% (10) were 26 – 30 years old, 18% (9) were 41 – 45 years old and 4% (2) were the ages range 21 – 25 years old, 46 – 50-year old and 51 – 60-year old from the sample.

**Table 1.2 Gender Profile of the teacher-respondents**

Gender Profile	Frequency Distribution	Percentage Distribution
Female	33	65%
Male	16	31%
TOTAL	51	100%

Presented in Table 1.2 was the frequency and percentage distribution of the gender profile of the teacher-respondents. Based on the tabulated data revealed that 65% (33) are female teacher-respondents and 31% (16) were male teacher-respondents.

**Table 1.3 Area of Specialization Profile of the teacher-respondents**

Teachers' Specialization	Frequency Distribution	Percentage Distribution
English	7	14%
Mathematics	9	18%
Science	7	14%
Filipino	6	12%
Social Studies	5	10%
TLE	10	20%
Values Education	1	2%
MAPEH	6	12%
Total	51	100

As gleaned in the Table 1.3 was the frequency and percentage distribution of the area of specialization profile of the teacher-respondents. Looking on the data provided on the table, it indicates that Technology Livelihood Education (TLE) Teachers have the majority respondents in the study with 20% (10) as regards to area of specialization, whereas nine (9) respondents or 18 % was mathematics teachers. In addition, there was seven (7) or 14% of Science and English teachers, then, six (6) respondents or 12% are Filipino and MAPEH teachers, 5 respondents or 10% was Social Studies. Finally, in the analysis, Values teacher was just one (1) respondent or 2%.

**Table 1.4 Years of teaching Profile of the teacher-respondents**

Year of Teaching	Frequency Distribution	Percentage Distribution
1 – 5 yrs.	19	37%
6 – 10 yrs.	32	63%
Total	51	100

The Table 1.4 was the frequency and percentage distribution of the years of teaching profile of the teacher-respondents in public school. As presented on the table, the first bracket, 6 – 10 years, has the majority number of populations with thirty-two (32) respondents or 63%. More so, nineteen (19) respondents or 37% are 1 – 5 years.

**Table 1.5 Highest Educational Attainment Profile of the teacher-respondents**

Teachers' Specialization	Frequency Distribution	Percentage Distribution
Bachelor's degree	30	60
with Master units	13	24
with Master's degree	5	10
with Doctoral units	1	2
with Doctoral degree	2	4
Total	51	100

Shown on Table 1.5 was the frequency and percentage distribution of the highest educational attainment profile of the teacher-respondents. Presented on the table, it indicates that majority of populations was bachelor's degree holder with thirty (30) respondents or 60%, whereas thirteen (13) or 24% has master's degree units, five (5) respondents or 10 % has master's degree, one (1) respondent or 2% with Doctoral units. Lastly, one (1) respondent or 2% completed the doctoral degree

**Table 1.6 Training Attended Profile of the teacher-respondents**

Training Attended Profile	Frequency Distribution	Percentage Distribution
School Level	29	57%
Division Level	16	31%
Regional Level	2	4%
National Level	2	4%
International Level	2	4%
TOTAL	51	100%

It can be gleaned on the table 1.6 was the frequency and percentage distribution of the training attended profile of the teacher-respondents. Meanwhile, the data revealed that most of the teacher – respondents attended training in the school level with total of twenty – nine (29) or 57%, while sixteen (16) or 31% was attended in division level. Lastly, two (2) or 4% was attended in regional, national and international training.

## 2.1 TEACHER COMPETENCE ON REMOTE LEARNING ASSESSMENT

**Table 2.1.1 Assessment Occurring Prior to Instruction**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Understand the students' cultural backgrounds, interests, skills, and abilities as they apply across a range of learning domains and/or subject areas;	3.29	.71	High Competent
2. Understand the learners' motivations and their interests in specific class content;	3.19	.74	High Competent
3. Clarify and articulate the performance outcomes expected of learners and;	3.36	.66	Very High Competent
4. Motivate the learners to learn; and	3.36	.82	Very High Competent
5. Planned instruction for individuals or groups of students remotely	3.19	.80	High Competent
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>.75</b>	<b>High Competent</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not Competent), 1.76 – 2.50 (Low Competent), 2.51 – 3.25 (High Competent), 3.26 – 4.00 (Very High Competent)

Shown on Table 2.1.1 was teacher competencies on remote learning assessment in terms of assessment occurring prior to instruction.

Considering the data presented on the table, it shows that teacher respondents posed an overall weighted mean of 3.28, and standard deviation of .75 and interpreted to be high competent in assessment occurring prior to instruction. Looking on the indicators, teacher respondents was very high competent in motivating the learners to learn ( $\bar{x} = 3.36$ ;  $SD = .82$ ) and clarify and articulate the performance outcomes expected of learners ( $\bar{x} = 3.36$ ;  $SD = .66$ ). More so, teacher respondents were high competent in understanding the learners' cultural backgrounds, interests, skills, and abilities as they apply across a range of learning domains and/or subject areas ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ;  $SD = .71$ ), planned instruction for individuals or groups of students remotely ( $\bar{x} = 3.19$ ;  $SD = .80$ ), and understand the learners' motivations and their interests in specific class content ( $\bar{x} = 3.19$ ;  $SD = .74$ ).

Teachers who meet this competence will understand and be able to give appropriate explanations of how the interpretation of student assessments must be moderated by the learner's socio-economic, cultural, language, and other background factors. Teachers will be able to explain that assessment results do not imply that such background factors limit a student's ultimate educational development. Teachers will be able to use the concepts of assessment error and validity when developing or selecting their approaches to classroom assessment of learners. They will understand how valid assessment data can support instructional activities such as providing appropriate feedback to students, diagnosing group and individual learning needs, planning for individualized educational programs, motivating students, and evaluating instructional procedures. They will understand how invalid information can affect instructional decisions about students. They will also be able to use and evaluate assessment options available to them, considering among other things, the cultural, social, economic, and language backgrounds of students. They will be aware that different assessment approaches can be incompatible with certain instructional goals and may impact quite differently on their teaching. Teachers will know, for each assessment approach they use, its appropriateness for making decisions about their learners. Moreover, teachers will know of where to find

information about and/or reviews of various assessment methods. Assessment options in remote learning are diverse and include text- and curriculum-embedded questions and tests, standardized criterion-referenced and norm-referenced tests, oral questioning, spontaneous and structured performance assessments, portfolios, exhibitions, demonstrations, rating scales, writing samples, paper-and-pencil tests, seatwork and homework, peer- and self-assessments, student records, observations, questionnaires, interviews, projects, products, and others' opinions.

The study supported by the finding of Defianty et al (2021), that teachers formative assessment strategies are pivotal to be implemented in the emergency remote teaching context. Moreover, offers several benefits such as motivating students, informing them about learning progress and enhancing their achievement on external tests and provide information to be used as feedback to modify the teaching and learning activities in which they are engaged (Andersson & Palm, 2017).

**Table 2.1.2 Assessment Occurring During Instruction**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Monitored the learners progress toward instructional goals;	3.02	.78	High Competent
2. Identify the gains and difficulties learners are experiencing in learning and performing;	3.05	.82	High Competent
3. Adjust the instruction based on the learners' interest and modality;	3.05	.85	High Competent
4. Give contingent, specific, and credible praise and feedback;	3.19	.77	High Competent
5. Judge the extent of learners' attainment of instructional outcomes.	3.12	.83	High Competent
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>.81</b>	<b>High Competent</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not Competent), 1.76 – 2.50 (Low Competent), 2.51 – 3.25 (High Competent), 3.26 – 4.00 (Very High Competent)

Presented on Table 2.1.2 was teacher competencies on remote learning assessment in terms assessment occurring during instruction. In analyzing the data presented on the table, it shows that teacher respondents posed an overall weighted mean of 3.09, and standard deviation of .81 and interpreted to be high competent in assessment occurring during instruction.

In the foregoing results on the following indicators revealed that teacher respondents were high competent in giving contingent, specific, and credible praise and feedback ( $\bar{x} = 3.19$ ;  $SD = .77$ ), judging the extent of learners' attainment of instructional outcomes ( $\bar{x} = 3.12$ ;  $SD = .83$ ), Adjusting the instruction based on the learners' interest and modality ( $\bar{x} = 3.05$ ;  $SD = .85$ ), identifying the gains and difficulties learners are experiencing in learning and performing ( $\bar{x} = 3.05$ ;  $SD = .82$ ), and monitoring the learners progress toward instructional goals ( $\bar{x} = 3.02$ ;  $SD = .78$ ).

As surmised, teacher respondents allow to determine whether learners are learning as the material is being taught. This deliberate process of assessing as learning is occurring allows teachers to adjust instruction as needed to meet the learning needs of their students. More specifically, the teachers can provide useful information about a student's progress toward certain learning objectives, her

understanding of the skills or content being taught, and any misconceptions she may have. Allows teachers to make informed decisions about when to review or reteach content or skills or to adapt instruction. Helps identify students who are consistently struggling.

It complemented to the findings of Klute, Apthorp, Harlacher, and Reale, (2017) indicates that students whose teachers use assessment occurring during instruction perform better on a variety of achievement indicators (including mathematics) than their peers whose teachers did not. Contaminant, Madison-Harris & Muoneke, (2012) it improved the learning outcomes of students with disabilities, struggling students, and English learners.

**Table 2.1.3 Assessment Occurring After the Appropriate Instructional Segment**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Describes the extent to which each learner has attained both short- and long-term instructional goals.	3.07	.71	High Competent
2. Communicate the strengths and weaknesses based on assessment results to learners, and parents or guardians.	3.17	.66	High Competent
3. Record and report assessment results for school-level analysis, evaluation, and decision-making.	3.29	.71	High Competent
4. Analyzed the assessment information gathered before and during instruction to understand each students' progress to date and to inform future instructional planning.	3.26	.70	High Competent
5. Evaluate the effectiveness of remote learning instruction; curriculum and materials in use.	3.24	.73	High Competent
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>.70</b>	<b>High Competent</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not Competent), 1.76 – 2.75 (Low Competent), 2.76 – 3.35 (High Competent), 3.36 – 4.00 (Very High Competent)

The Table 2.1.3 depicted the teacher competencies on remote learning assessment in terms assessment occurring after the appropriate instructional segment. Considerably, based on the data gathered, teacher respondents show high competent on assessment occurring after the appropriate instructional segment as posed an overall weighted mean of 3.20, and standard deviation of .70.

Examining the indicators, teacher respondents exhibited high competent in recording and reporting assessment results for school-level analysis, evaluation, and decision-making ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ;  $SD = .71$ ), analyzing the assessment information gathered before and during instruction to understand each students' progress to date and to inform future instructional planning ( $\bar{x} = 3.26$ ;  $SD = .70$ ); evaluating the effectiveness of remote learning instruction; curriculum and materials in use ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .73$ ); communicating the strengths and weaknesses based on assessment results to learners, and parents or guardians ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ;  $SD = .66$ ) and describing the extent to which each learner has attained both short- and long-term instructional goals ( $\bar{x} = 3.07$ ;  $SD = .71$ ).

Assessment results are used to make educational decisions at several levels: in the classroom about students, in the community about a school and a school district, and in society, generally, about the purposes and outcomes of the educational enterprise. Teachers play a vital role when participating in decision-making at each of these levels and must be able to use assessment results effectively. Teachers

who meet this competence will be able to use accumulated assessment information to organize a sound instructional plan for facilitating students' educational development. When using assessment results to plan and/or evaluate instruction and curriculum, teachers will interpret the results correctly and avoid common misinterpretations, such as basing decisions on scores that lack curriculum validity. They will be informed about the results of local, regional, state, and national assessments and about their appropriate use for pupil, classroom, school, district, state, and national educational improvement.

On the other hand, teachers must routinely report assessment results to students and to parents or guardians. In addition, they are frequently asked to report or to discuss assessment results with other educators and with diverse lay audiences. If the results are not communicated effectively, they may be misused or not used. To communicate effectively with others on matters of student assessment, teachers must be able to use assessment terminology appropriately and must be able to articulate the meaning, limitations, and implications of assessment results. Furthermore, teachers will sometimes be in a position that will require them to defend their own assessment procedures and their interpretations of them. At other times, teachers may need to help the public to interpret assessment results appropriately. Cognizant to teachers will be able to communicate to students and to their parents or guardians how they may assess the student's educational progress. Teachers will understand and be able to explain the importance of taking measurement errors into account when using assessments to make decisions about individual learners. Teachers will be able to explain the limitations of different informal and formal assessment methods. They will be able to explain printed reports of the results of learners' assessments at the classroom, school district, state, and national levels.

It is intertwined with the study of Dayagbil , Palompon, Garcia and Olvido (2021) that teachers can utilized a flexible curriculum design should be learner centered; take into account the demographic profile and circumstances of learners—such as access to technology, technological literacies, different learning styles and capabilities, different knowledge backgrounds and experiences - and ensure varied and flexible forms of assessment during the pandemic to create a balance between relevant basic competencies for the students to acquire and the teachers' desire to achieve the intended outcomes of the curriculum (Ryan and Tilbury, 2013; Gachago et al., 2018). Connectedly, teachers make decisions aimed at improving student achievement using the information that data provides allows to prioritizing instructional time, targeting struggling or high-performing students to provide individualized instruction, identifying individual students' strengths and needs to provide appropriate interventions, gauging the instructional effectiveness of classroom lessons, refining instructional strategies, examining school-wide data to determine patterns of learning and consider how to adapt curriculum and communicating student progress to students

and families (National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment Inc., 2021).

## 2.2 LEVEL OF ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

**Table 2.2. 1: Clarity of Assessment**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Provide clear definitions of academic requirements before each learning task	3.29	.81	Mostly Practice
2. Provide explicit marking criteria and performance level definitions.	3.24	.82	Mostly Practice
3. Provide opportunities for discussion and reflection about criteria and standards before learners engage in a learning task	3.26	.80	Mostly Practice
4. Ask learners to reformulate in their own words the documented criteria before they begin the task. This could be submitted with the assessment	3.21	.81	Mostly Practice
5. Model in class how you would think through and solve exemplar problems	3.31	.81	Mostly Practice
6. Provide learners with model answers for assessment tasks and opportunities to make comparisons against their own work	3.29	.83	Mostly Practice
7. Explain to learners the rationale of assessment and feedback techniques.	3.40	.80	Completely Practice
8. Before an assessment, let learners examine selected examples of completed assessments to identify which are superior and why (individually or in groups)	3.29	.83	Mostly Practice
9. Organize a workshop remotely where learners devise, in collaboration with you, some of their own assessment criteria for a piece of work	3.19	.74	Mostly Practice
10. Ask learners to add their own specific criteria to the general criteria provided by you	3.29	.74	Mostly Practice
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>.80</b>	<b>Mostly Practice</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not at all Practice), 1.76 – 2.50 (Somewhat Practice), 2.51 – 3.25 (Mostly Practice), 3.26 – 4.00 (Completely Practice)

Depicted on Table 2.2. 1 was teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of clarity of assessment.

As revealed, teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of clarity of assessment was mostly practice based on overall computed weighted mean of 3.28, and standard deviation of .80.

Looking forward on the following indicators, teacher respondents executed mostly practice on modeling in class how you would think through and solve exemplar problems ( $\bar{x} = 3.31$ ,  $SD = .81$ ), before an assessment, let learners examine selected examples of completed assessments to identify which are superior and why ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ;  $SD = .83$ ) providing the learners with model answers for assessment tasks and opportunities to make comparisons against their own work ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ,  $SD = .83$ ), clear definitions of academic requirements before each learning task ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ,  $SD = .81$ ), asking learners to add their own specific criteria to the general criteria provided by you ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ;  $SD = .74$ ), providing opportunities for discussion and reflection about criteria and standards before learners engage in a learning task ( $\bar{x} = 3.26$ ,  $SD = .80$ ), providing explicit marking criteria and performance level definitions ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .82$ ), asking the learners to reformulate in their own words the documented criteria before they begin the task. This could be submitted with the assessment ( $\bar{x} = 3.21$ ;  $SD = .81$ ), organizing a workshop remotely where learners devise, in collaboration with you, some of their own assessment criteria for a piece of work ( $\bar{x} = 3.19$ ;  $SD = .74$ ).

On the other hands, teacher respondents exhibiting completely practice in explaining to learners the rationale of assessment and feedback techniques ( $\bar{x} = 3.40$ ;  $SD = .80$ ).

It is pipelined with the Corwin (2017) enable to achieve what they want in the classroom, teachers need clarity — a deep understanding about what to teach and why, how to teach it and what success looks like. This goes way beyond simply knowing the day's lesson. It describes a process that enables teachers to communicate those same aspects to their students in simple and plain language. Teacher clarity is a powerful tool for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning. Along the way, teacher clarity reinforces the gradual release of responsibility of learning from the teacher to the students so that students feel ownership of their work.

As combined with the stand of Stubbs (2021) it is only when teachers know and can articulate why students are learning what they are learning that they are in a position to design learning experiences that are authentic, relevant, and capable of cultivating the curiosity of the learners.

To reach the deepest level of learning of the learners, teachers and students need a clear, shared understanding of the ultimate learning goal behind each lesson.

**Table 2.2. 2: Time and Effort on Task**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Reduce the size (e.g. by limiting the word count) and increase the number of learning tasks (or assessments). Distribute these across the module.	3.10	.76	Mostly Practice
2. Make such tasks compulsory and/or carry minimal marks (5/10%) to ensure learners engage but staff workload doesn't become excessive.	3.12	.89	Mostly Practice
3. Break up a large assessment into smaller parts. Monitor performance and provide feedback in a staged way over the timeline of your module	3.29	.77	Mostly Practice
4. Empower learners by asking them to draw up their own work plan for a complex learning task. Let them define their own milestones and deliverables before they begin. Assign some marks if they deliver as planned and on time.	3.31	.75	Mostly Practice
5. Provide homework activities that build on/link in-class activities to out-of-class activities.	3.17	.88	Mostly Practice
6. Ask learners to present and work through their solutions in class supported by peer comments remotely.	3.36	.69	Completely Practice
7. Align learning tasks so that students have opportunities to practice the skills required before the work is marked	3.33	.79	Mostly Practice
8. Give learners online/ offline multiple-choice tests to do before a class and then focus the class teaching on areas of identified weakness based on the results of these tests.	3.21	.90	Mostly Practice
9. Use a 'patchwork text' – a series of small, distributed, written assignments of different types. Each of these are complete in themselves but can also be stitched together through a final integrative commentary	3.17	.82	Mostly Practice
10. Provide learners with mock exams so they have opportunities to experience what is required for summative assessment in a safe remote environment	3.26	.73	Mostly Practice
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>.80</b>	<b>Mostly Practice</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not at all Practice), 1.76 – 2.50 (Somewhat Practice), 2.51 – 3.25 (Mostly Practice), 3.26 – 4.00 (Completely Practice)

Delineated on Table 2.2. 2 was teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of time and effort on task.

As revealed, teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of time and effort on task was mostly practice based on overall computed weighted mean of 3.23, and standard deviation of .80.

Importantly, on the following indicators, teacher respondents executed mostly practice on aligning learning tasks so that students have opportunities to practice the skills required before the work is marked ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ;  $SD = .79$ ), empowering learners by asking them to draw up their own work plan for a complex learning task. Let them define their own milestones and deliverables before they begin. Assign some marks if they deliver as planned and on time ( $\bar{x} = 3.31$ ;  $SD = .75$ ), breaking up a large assessment into smaller parts. Monitor performance and provide feedback in a staged way over the timeline of your module ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ;  $SD = .77$ ), providing learners with mock exams so they have opportunities to experience what is required for summative assessment in a safe remote environment ( $\bar{x} = 3.26$ ;  $SD = .73$ ), giving learners online/ offline multiple-choice tests to do before a class and then focus the class teaching on areas of identified weakness based on the results of these tests ( $\bar{x} = 3.21$ ;  $SD = .90$ ), providing homework activities that build on/link in-class activities to out-of-class activities ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ;  $SD = .88$ ), using a 'patchwork text' – a series of small, distributed, written assignments of different types. Each of these are complete in themselves but can also be stitched together through a final integrative commentary ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ;  $SD = .82$ ), making such tasks compulsory and/or carry minimal marks (5/10%) to ensure learners engage but staff workload doesn't become excessive ( $\bar{x} = 3.12$ ;  $SD = .89$ ), and reducing the size (e.g. by limiting the word count) and increase the number of learning tasks (or assessments). Distribute these across the module ( $\bar{x} = 3.10$ ;  $SD = .76$ ).

On the other hands, teacher respondents exhibiting completely practice in asking learners to present and work through their solutions in class supported by peer comments remotely ( $\bar{x} = 3.36$ ;  $SD = .69$ ).

A teacher who is prepared is well on his/her way to a successful instructional experience. The development of interesting lessons and assessment tasks takes a great deal of time and effort. Teacher must be committed to spending the necessary time in this endeavor. It is also important to realize that the best planned lesson and assessment is worthless if interesting delivery procedures, along with good classroom management techniques, are not in evidence.

It is parallel to the findings of Zafarullah, et al., (2016) that Impact of teacher time management is directly proportioned with the performance of students, teachers do plan actively and intelligently then they may be able in future to produce more intelligent minds for the future development of the nation. The significant relationship between teachers' time management and students' academic performance was found.

Table 2.2. 3: Quality of Feedback

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Provide opportunities for learners to work through problem sets in tutorials, where feedback from you is available. This ensures that the feedback is timely and is received when learners get 'stuck'	3.26	.73	Mostly Practice
2. Ensure feedback turnaround time is prompt, ideally within 2 weeks.	3.14	.78	Mostly Practice
3. Give plenty of documented feedback in advance of learners attempting an assessment, e.g. a 'frequently occurring problems' list.	3.14	.78	Mostly Practice
4. Give plenty of feedback to learners at the point at which they submit their work for assessment. This feedback might include a handout outlining suggestions in relation to known difficulties shown by previous learner cohorts supplemented by in-class explanations. Learners are most receptive to feedback when they have just worked through their assessment.	3.17	.76	Mostly Practice
5. Ensure that feedback is provided in relation to previously stated criteria, as this helps to link the feedback to the expected learning outcomes.	3.29	.67	Mostly Practice
6. Limit the number of criteria for complex tasks, especially extended writing tasks, where good performance is not just ticking off each criterion but is more about producing a holistic response.	3.24	.79	Mostly Practice
7. Instead of providing the correct answer, point learners to where they can find the correct answer.	3.33	.79	Mostly Practice
8. Ask learners to attach three questions that they would like to know about an assessment, or what aspects they would like to improve.	3.21	.72	Mostly Practice
9. Ask learners to self-assess their own work before submission and provide feedback on this self-assessment as well as on the assessment itself.	3.40	.73	Completely Practice
10. Have learners undertake regular small tasks that carry minimal marks, with regular feedback.	3.19	.74	Mostly Practice
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>.75</b>	<b>Mostly Practice</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not at all Practice), 1.76 – 2.25 (Emerging Practice), 2.26 – 3.11 (Mostly Practice), 3.12 – 4.00 (Completely Practice)

Displayed on table 2.2.4 was teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of quality of feedback.

As revealed, teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of quality of feedback was mostly practice based on overall computed weighted mean of 3.24, and standard deviation of .75. In analysis of the following indicators showed as mostly practice such as instead of providing the correct answer, point learners to where they can find the correct answer ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ;  $SD = .79$ ), ensuring that feedback is provided in relation to previously stated criteria, as this helps to link the feedback to the expected learning outcomes ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ;  $SD = .67$ ), providing opportunities for learners to work through problem sets in tutorials, where feedback from you is available. This ensures that the feedback is timely and is received when learners get 'stuck' ( $\bar{x} = 3.26$ ;  $SD = .73$ ), limiting the number of criteria for complex tasks; especially extended writing tasks, where good performance is not just ticking off each criterion but is more about producing a holistic response ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .79$ ), asking learners to attach three questions that they would like to know about an assessment, or what aspects they would like to improve ( $\bar{x} = 3.21$ ;  $SD = .72$ ), having the learners undertake regular small tasks that carry minimal marks, with regular feedback ( $\bar{x} = 3.19$ ;  $SD = .74$ ), giving plenty of feedback to learners at the point at which they submit their work for assessment. This feedback might include a handout outlining suggestions in relation to known difficulties shown by previous learner cohorts supplemented by in-class explanations. Learners are most receptive to feedback when they have just worked through their assessment ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ;  $SD = .76$ ), ensuring feedback turnaround time is prompt, ideally within 2 weeks and give plenty of documented feedback in advance of learners attempting an assessment, e.g. a 'frequently

occurring problems’ list ( $\bar{x} = 3.14$ ;  $SD = .76$ ). However, teacher respondents exhibited completely practice in asking the learners to self-assess their own work before submission and provide feedback on this self-assessment as well as on the assessment itself ( $\bar{x} = 3.40$ ;  $SD = .73$ ).

Feedback is a key element of the incremental process of ongoing learning and assessment. Providing frequent and ongoing feedback is a significant means of improving achievement in learning. It involves the provision of information about aspects of understanding and performance and can be given by practitioners, peers, oneself and from learners to practitioners. Effective feedback assists the learner to reflect on their learning and their learning strategies so they can adjust make better progress in their learning. Reporting to parents and families commonly occurs at least twice per year in a formal written statement from the school. Involving parents and families in the learning process by providing them with more frequent feedback about their child’s learning progress and strategies they may use to assist their child improve has been shown to be effective in improving student achievement. Effective feedback practices of teachers provide the bridge between assessment and learning. High quality feedback can improve student learning. There’s a strong evidence base behind the impact of feedback. It is a cost-effective approach to enhancing student outcomes and it can be implemented in any education context.

The finding of the study was related to Ahea (2016), that there is a great importance of feedback in improving learning experience for the students. This has also significant effect in professionalizing teaching. More so, improving feedback practices can significantly improve student learning and the quality of teaching in classrooms (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2021).

**Table 2.2.4: Motivational Belief and Self-esteem to Learners**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Structure learning tasks so that they have a progressive level of difficulty	3.24	.73	Mostly Practice
2. Align learning tasks so that learners have opportunities to practice skills before work is marked	3.31	.72	Mostly Practice
3. Provide objective tests where learners individually assess their understanding and make comparisons against their own learning goals, rather than against the performance of other learners.	3.24	.73	Mostly Practice
4. Use real-life scenarios and dynamic feedback	3.43	.70	Completely Practice
5. Avoid releasing marks on written work until after learners have responded to feedback comments.	3.17	.88	Mostly Practice
6. Redesign and align formative and summative assessments to enhance learner skills and independence.	3.24	.76	Mostly Practice
7. Adjust assessment to develop learners’ responsibility for their learning	3.43	.67	Completely Practice
8. Provide learners with some choice in timing with regard to when they hand in assessments	3.29	.71	Mostly Practice
9. Involve learners in decision-making about assessment policy and practice	3.33	.72	Mostly Practice
10. Structure learning tasks so that they have a progressive level of difficulty	3.33	.85	Mostly Practice
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>.75</b>	<b>Mostly Practice</b>

Legend: 3.00 – 3.75 (Not at all Practice), 1.76 – 2.30 (Minimal Practice), 2.31 – 3.30 (Mostly Practice), 3.31 – 4.00 (Completely Practice)

Portrayed in the Table 2.2.4 was teacher respondents’ level of assessment practices in terms of motivational belief and self-esteem to learners.

Substantially, data revealed that the teacher respondents’ level of assessment practices in terms of motivational belief and self-esteem to learners was mostly practice based on overall computed weighted mean of 3.30, and standard deviation of .75.

Looking forward, the following indicators illustrates mostly practice in structuring learning tasks so that they have a progressive level of difficulty ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ;  $SD = .85$ ), involving learners in decision-making about assessment policy and practice ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ;  $SD = .72$ ), aligning learning tasks so that learners have opportunities to practice skills before work is marked ( $\bar{x} = 3.31$ ,  $SD = .72$ ), providing learners with some choice in timing with regard to when they hand in assessments ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ,  $SD = .71$ ), redesigning and aligning formative and summative assessments to enhance learner skills and independence ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .76$ ), structuring learning tasks so that they have a progressive level of difficulty and providing objective tests where learners individually assess their understanding and make comparisons against their own learning goals, rather than against the performance of other learners ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .73$ ), and avoiding releasing marks on written work until after learners have responded to feedback comments ( $\bar{x} = 3.17$ ;  $SD = .88$ ).

However, teacher respondents appeared completely practice in using real-life scenarios and dynamic feedback ( $\bar{x} = 3.43$ ;  $SD = .70$ ), and adjusting the assessment to develop learners’ responsibility for their learning ( $\bar{x} = 3.43$ ;  $SD = .67$ ).

The teacher’s role in motivation includes, but is not limited to, creating an environment conducive to learning. The teacher’s role in encouraging support of students’ autonomy, relevance, and relatedness of the material increases motivation to learn. Additionally, the teacher’s ability to develop students’ competence, interest in subject taught, and perception of self-efficacy are all important factors that influence students’ motivation to learn. Teachers motivate their students to learn by providing them with positive feedback, in order to develop competence. Providing feedback enables students to gain control over their own learning and a sense of belief about their abilities. Teachers who provide feedback to students about their efforts give them the idea that through hard work, they can achieve tasks and do well.

Teachers connect learning to the personal world of their students by making learning tasks more relevant through relating instructions to students’ experiences and build positive relationships with their students are more likely to influence their drive to learn (Ferland, 2015).

**Table 2.2.5: Interaction and Dialogue about Learning**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Review feedback in tutorials. Ask learners to read the written feedback comments on an assessment and discuss this with peers	3.33	.75	Mostly Practice
2. Encourage learners to give each other feedback in an assessment in relation to published criteria before submission.	3.38	.76	Completely Practice
3. Create natural peer dialogue by group projects. Structure tasks so that the learners are encouraged to discuss the criteria and standards expected beforehand, and return to discuss progress in relation to the criteria during the project.	3.38	.76	Completely Practice
4. Use learner response systems to make lectures more interactive.	3.38	.70	Completely Practice
5. Facilitate teacher-learner feedback in class through the use of in-class feedback techniques.	3.45	.71	Completely Practice
6. Ask learners to answer short questions on paper at the end of class. Use the results to provide feedback and stimulate discussion at the next class.	3.21	.84	Mostly Practice
7. Construct group work to help learners to make connections	3.45	.74	Completely Practice
8. Encourage the formation of peer study or create opportunities for learners from later years to support or mentor learners in early years	3.40	.70	Completely Practice
9. Link modules together as a pathway so that the same learners work in the same groups across a number of modules.	3.40	.73	Completely Practice
10. Require learners in groups to generate the criteria used to assess their projects	3.40	.77	Completely Practice
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>.75</b>	<b>Completely Practice</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not at all Practice), 1.76 – 2.50 (Somewhat Practice), 2.51 – 3.25 (Mostly Practice), 3.26 – 4.00 (Completely Practice)

**Progress**

Manifested in the Table 2.2.5 was teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of interaction and dialogue about learning progress.

Noticeably, data revealed that the teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of interaction and dialogue about learning progress was completely practice based on overall computed weighted mean of 3.38, and standard deviation of .75.

Foreseeing in the data gathered, revealed that the teacher respondents evident completely practice in constructing group work to help learners to make connections ( $\bar{x} = 3.45$ ;  $SD = .74$ ), facilitating teacher-learner feedback in class through the use of in-class feedback techniques ( $\bar{x} = 3.45$ ;  $SD = .71$ ), requiring learners in groups to generate the criteria used to assess their projects ( $\bar{x} = 3.40$ ;  $SD = .77$ ), linking modules together as a pathway so that the same learners work in the same groups across a number of modules ( $\bar{x} = 3.40$ ;  $SD = .73$ ), encouraging the formation of peer study or create opportunities for learners from later years to support or mentor learners in early years ( $\bar{x} = 3.40$ ;  $SD = .70$ ), and give each other feedback in an assessment in relation to published criteria before submission ( $\bar{x} = 3.38$ ;  $SD = .76$ ), creating natural peer dialogue by group projects. Structure tasks so that the learners are encouraged to discuss the criteria and standards expected beforehand, and return to discuss progress in relation to the criteria during the project ( $\bar{x} = 3.38$ ;  $SD = .76$ ), and using learner response systems to make lectures more interactive ( $\bar{x} = 3.38$ ;  $SD = .70$ ).

Even so, teacher respondents apparent mostly practice reviewing feedback in tutorials. ask learners to read the written feedback comments on an assessment and discuss this with peers ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ;  $SD = .75$ ), and asking the learners to answer short questions on paper at the end of class. Use the

results to provide feedback and stimulate discussion at the next class ( $\bar{x} = 3.21$ ;  $SD = .84$ ).

Teachers make different interventions to support their students in learning through social interaction. As such, interactions lie at the heart of understanding potentials and impediments to student learning.

Ramli (2018), classroom talk both in small groups and involving the whole class altered to pedagogical dynamics from a teacher centered approach to student centered one. The study also reveals that classroom talks did not only encourage students to develop their zone proximal development but also help them to learn the values of democracy. Real-time interactions are fundamental to the formation of teacher-student relationships (Hafen et al., 2015; Pennings et al., 2014).

**Table 2.2.6: Self- assessment and Reflection of Learning of the Learners**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Create a series of online objective tests and quizzes that learners can use to assess their own understanding of a topic or area of study	3.24	.79	Mostly Practice
2. Ask learners to request the kind of feedback that they would like when they hand in their work - example worksheet	3.24	.79	Mostly Practice
3. Structure opportunities for peers to assess and provide feedback on each other's work using set criteria	3.29	.81	Mostly Practice
4. Use confidence-based marking (CBM). Learners must rate their confidence that their answer is correct. The higher the confidence the higher the penalty if the answer is wrong.	3.05	.85	Mostly Practice
5. Use an assessment cover sheet with questions to encourage reflection and self-assessment. Ask learners to make a judgement about whether they have met the stated criteria and estimate the mark they expect	3.24	.82	Mostly Practice
6. Directly involve learners in monitoring and reflecting on their own learning, through portfolios	3.33	.79	Mostly Practice
7. Ask learners to write a reflective essay or keep a reflective journal in relation to their learning	3.21	.75	Mostly Practice
8. Help learners to understand and record their own learning achievements through portfolios. Encourage learners to link these achievements to the knowledge, skills and attitudes required in future employment.	3.36	.76	Completely Practice
9. Ask learners, in pairs, to produce multiple-choice tests over the duration of the module, with feedback for the correct and incorrect answers.	3.21	.78	Mostly Practice
10. Require learners in groups to generate the criteria used to assess their projects as self - assessments.	3.40	.77	Completely Practice
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>.79</b>	<b>Mostly Practice</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not at all Practice), 1.76 – 2.50 (Somewhat Practice), 2.51 – 3.25 (Mostly Practice), 3.26 – 4.00 (Completely Practice)

Represent in Table 2.2.5 was teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of self- assessment and reflection of learning of the learners.

Markedly, data revealed that the teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of self- assessment and reflection of learning of the learners was mostly practice based on overall computed weighted mean of 3.26, and standard deviation of .79.

Anticipating, in the data gathered, revealed that the teacher respondents evident that mostly practice the directly involve learners in monitoring and reflecting on their own learning, through portfolios ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ;  $SD = .79$ ); structuring opportunities for peers to assess and provide feedback on each other's work using set criteria ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ;  $SD = .81$ ), using an assessment cover sheet with questions to encourage reflection and self-assessment. Ask learners to make a judgement about

whether they have met the stated criteria and estimate the mark they expect ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .82$ ), creating a series of online objective tests and quizzes that learners can use to assess their own understanding of a topic or area of study and asking learners to request the kind of feedback that they would like when they hand in their work - example worksheet ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .79$ ), asking learners, in pairs, to produce multiple-choice tests over the duration of the module, with feedback for the correct and incorrect answers ( $\bar{x} = 3.21$ ;  $SD = .78$ ), and write a reflective essay or keep a reflective journal in relation to their learning ( $\bar{x} = 3.21$ ;  $SD = .75$ ), and using confidence-based marking (CBM). Learners must rate their confidence that their answer is correct. The higher the confidence the higher the penalty if the answer is wrong ( $\bar{x} = 3.05$ ;  $SD = .85$ ).

However, teacher respondents appeared completely practice in requiring learners in groups to generate the criteria used to assess their projects as self - assessments ( $\bar{x} = 3.40$ ;  $SD = .77$ ), and help learners to understand and record their own learning achievements through portfolios. Encourage learners to link these achievements to the knowledge, skills and attitudes required in future employment ( $\bar{x} = 3.36$ ;  $SD = .76$ ).

An effective teacher continually reflects on and improves the way they do things, but reflection is not a natural process for all teachers, it facilitates, guides, supports, fosters, and nurtures a positive learning environment to the learners. As the teachers utilized self-assessment and reflection in the classroom contexts, learners learn to assess their own learning for the purpose of improving it. To become capable assessors of their learning, learners must have clear goals, the opportunity to help create a definition of quality work, ongoing feedback, and the opportunity to correct or self-adjust their work before they turn it in. After finishing the project, learners need to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of their work, make plans for improvement, and integrate the assignment with previous learning. Teachers exposing the learners in self-assessment become more responsible for their own educational growth; more reflective, autonomous, motivated, and effective.

It was incorporated with McMillan and Hearn (2015) that classroom teachers, student self-assessment and reflections develop an awareness of which metacognitive strategies to use and when to use them. Teachers and students learn these skills when they establish clear learning goals and articulate evaluative criteria that enable students to assess their own work. Those practices engage students as they actively participate in the learning process and become more connected and committed to the learning outcomes. It mandates that teachers learn to pass the evaluative responsibilities to their students by scaffolding and modeling goal setting, evaluation, strategy adjustment, and reflection. Likewise, the idea of being a self-reflective practitioner to continually examine practice in an endeavor to adjust, improve or adapt to the present circumstances as well as continually draw from and add to past learning (Brookfield, 2015).

**Table 2.2.7: Assessment – content and process in Adapting Teaching to Students needs**

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Give learners opportunities to select the topics for extended essays or project work, encouraging ownership and increasing motivation	3.36	0.76	Completely Practice
2. Give learners choice in timing with regard to when they hand in assessments – managing learner and teacher workloads. Particularly appropriate where students have many assignments and the timings and submissions can be negotiated	3.40	0.80	Completely Practice
3. Require learner groups to generate criteria that could be used to assess their projects	3.21	0.75	Mostly Practice
4. Ask learners to add their own specific criteria to the general criteria provided by the teacher. Take these into account in the final assessment	3.24	0.76	Mostly Practice
5. Ask learners, in pairs, to produce multiple-choice tests with feedback for correct and incorrect answers, which reference the learning objectives. Let the rest of the class take these tests and evaluate them. These could be used in final assessment	3.31	0.72	Mostly Practice
6. Have students request the feedback they would like when they make an assignment submission	3.26	0.73	Mostly Practice
7. Provide opportunities for frequent low-stakes assessment tasks with regular outputs to help you gauge progress	3.33	0.75	Mostly Practice
8. Use online tools with built-in functionality for individual recording and reporting – providing information about levels of learner engagement with resources, online tests and discussions	3.43	0.80	Completely Practice
9. Use learner response system to provide dynamic feedback in class. The stored data provides information about responses, which can be analyzed	3.40	0.73	Completely Practice
10. Require learners in groups to generate the criteria used to assess their projects as self – assessments	3.50	0.71	Completely Practice
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>Mostly Practice</b>

Legend: 1.00 – 1.75 (Not at all Practice), 1.76 – 2.50 (Somewhat Practice), 2.51 – 3.25 (Mostly Practice), 3.26 – 4.00 (Completely Practice)

Manifested in the Table 2.2.7 was teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of assessment – content and process in adapting teaching to student's needs.

A great deal, data revealed that the teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of assessment – content and process in adapting teaching to students needs was mostly practice based on overall computed weighted mean of 3.35, and standard deviation of 0.75.

Looking forward, the following indicators teacher respondents shows mostly practice in providing opportunities for frequent low-stakes assessment tasks with regular outputs to help you gauge progress ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ;  $SD = .75$ ), asking learners, in pairs, to produce multiple-choice tests with feedback for correct and incorrect answers, which reference the learning objectives. Let the rest of the class take these tests and evaluate them. These could be used in final assessment ( $\bar{x} = 3.31$ ;  $SD = .72$ ), having learners request the feedback they would like when they make an assignment submission ( $\bar{x} = 3.26$ ;  $SD = .73$ ), asking learners to add their own specific criteria to the general criteria provided by the teacher and taking these into account in the final assessment ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .76$ ), requiring learner groups to generate criteria that could be used to assess their projects ( $\bar{x} = 3.21$ ;  $SD = .75$ ).

However, teacher respondents appeared completely practice in requiring learners in groups to generate the criteria used to assess their projects as self – assessments ( $\bar{x} = 3.43$ ;  $SD = .80$ ), giving learners choice in timing with regard to when they hand in assessments – managing learner and teacher workloads. Particularly appropriate where students have many assignments and the timings and submissions can be negotiated ( $\bar{x} = 3.40$ ;  $SD = .80$ ), using online tools with

built-in functionality for individual recording and reporting – providing information about levels of learner engagement with resources, online tests and discussions ( $\bar{x} = 3.21$ ;  $SD = .75$ ), use learner response system to provide dynamic feedback in class. The stored data provides information about responses, which can be analyzed, and giving learners opportunities to select the topics for extended essays or project work, encouraging ownership and increasing motivation ( $\bar{x} = 3.36$ ;  $SD = .76$ ).

Teachers are needed modify instruction and assessment to accommodate special needs students in the remote learning. In fact, all students will benefit from the following good teaching and assessment practices. More so, it is essential that teachers know the particular strengths and needs of their students in order to select appropriate accommodations. It should be noted as well that each student will respond differently to the accommodations offered to them. Similarly, each assessment is different, so a technique that is effective for one evaluation may not be the best for another.

The results of study were complemented to the study of Kleinert & Kearns, (2017), teachers can change the format in which a task is presented without changing the actual task. Such a change might be needed for a variety of reasons: (1) an assignment is too long; (2) the spacing on the page is too close to allow the student to focus on individual items; (3) the directions for the task are insufficient or confusing; or (4) the models or examples for the task are either absent, misleading, or insufficient. The critical concept here is that while task and response remain the same, the teacher makes adaptations in the way the material is presented.

3. Test of difference in the assessment of the teacher-respondents on the level of competence on the remote learning assessment when grouped according to profile.

Variables	F-value	F critical value	P-value	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
Age	39.41	2.19	6.24	Ho is rejected	Significant
Gender	9.78	4.20	0.00	Ho is rejected	Significant
Year of Teaching	3.06	4.20	0.09	Ho is accepted	Not Significant
Areas of Specialization	20.25	2.53	6.76	Ho is rejected	Significant
Educational Attainment	0.96	2.50	0.43	Ho is accepted	Not Significant
Training Attended	27.21	2.53	6.76	Ho is rejected	Significant

As denoted on Table 3, there is a significant difference in the assessment of the teacher-respondents on the level of competence on the remote learning assessment when grouped according to profile. To determine the significant assessment of the teacher-respondents on the level of competence on the remote learning assessment when grouped according to profile, the researcher employed Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the extent difference between the means of two or more groups on the variables under study.

The results of the ANOVA test of differences on the extent difference of teacher-respondents on the level of competence on the remote learning assessment when grouped

according to age, gender, areas of specialization, and training attended have significant difference as can be gleaned on F-value 39.41, 9.78, 20.25, and 27.21, respectively. Further discussion showed that the comparison of the F-value exceeds on the given F-critical value, giving the researcher reason to reject the null hypothesis. This may be implying that when the teacher respondents' group according to their age, gender, areas of specialization, and training attended have significantly differed on their level of competence on the remote learning assessment.

In quest for the extent difference, when the teacher respondents group according to year of teaching and educational attainment revealed it has no significant difference on their level of competence on the remote learning assessment as can be gleaned on F-value 3.06 and 0.96, respectively. More so, comparison of the F-value not exceeds on the given critical value, giving the researcher reason to accept the null hypothesis which is not favorable of researcher hypothesis. Hence, the results implying that when the teacher respondents' group according to their year of teaching and educational attainment have not significantly differed on their level of competence on the remote learning assessment.

Koloi-Keaikitse (2017) surveyed 691 primary and secondary school teachers in Botswana about their classroom assessment practices. Results indicated factors related to teachers' educational level, teaching experience, and assessment training contributed positively to beliefs, skills, and uses of desirable classroom assessment practices.

In line with the finding of Alkharusi (2015c) examined self-perceived assessment skills of 213 Omani teachers. He found that female teachers perceived themselves more skillful than male teachers in writing test items and communicating assessment results. Also, science teachers perceived themselves more skillful than English language teachers and fine arts teachers in developing performance assessment and analyzing assessment results. Further, sixth grade teachers indicated higher levels of self-perceived skills in developing performance assessment than eighth and tenth grade teachers. Furthermore, teaching experience correlated positively with self-perceived assessment skills, and that teachers with in-service assessment training showed a higher level of assessment skills than those without in-service assessment training. Moreover, in an investigation of 516 in-service teachers, Alkharusi (2015a) found that in-service assessment training and teaching experience correlated positively with educational assessment knowledge. Similarly, when examining educational assessment knowledge of 259 pre-service teachers who completed an educational assessment course, Alkharusi (2015b) found that male teachers tended to have on average a higher level of educational assessment knowledge than female teachers

#### 4. Test of difference in the assessment of the teacher-respondents on the Level of assessment practices when grouped according to profile

Variables	F-value	F critical value	P-value	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
Age	206.83	2.12	1.09	Ho is rejected	Significant
Gender	31.59	3.92	1.14	Ho is rejected	Significant
Year of Teaching	110.93	4.59	3.92	Ho is rejected	Significant
Areas of Specialization	53.24	2.40	3.45	Ho is rejected	Significant
Educational Attainment	139.78	2.40	2.44	Ho is rejected	Significant
Training Attended	67.98	2.40	9.29	Ho is rejected	Significant

To determine the significant assessment of the teacher-respondents on the on the level of assessment practices when grouped according to profile, the researcher employed Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the extent difference between the means of two or more groups on the variables under study.

Looking forward, teacher respondents' age, gender, year of teaching, areas of specialization, educational attainment, and training attended revealed that have significant difference on their level of assessment practices as can be gleaned on F-value 206.83, 31.59, 110.93, 53.24, 139.78 and 67.98, respectively. More so, comparison of the F- value exceeds on the given critical value, giving the researcher reason to reject the null hypothesis in favor of researcher hypothesis. Hence, that age, gender, year of teaching, areas of specialization, educational attainment, and training attended significantly differs to the level of assessment practices.

Furthermore, the study was aligned with Uganda, Matovu and Zubairi (2014) discovered that academic qualifications and training in assessment significantly predicted teachers' assessment practices. They remarked that teachers with more experience in teaching and higher academic qualifications possess desirable assessment practices due to their constant dealings with learners' assessment activities. Suah and Ong (2012) discovered that years of teaching experience influenced the assessment practices of teachers, as beginner teachers have a higher inclination of utilizing questions developed by other teachers. This signifies a lower perception of assessment competency.

However, Gonzales and Aliponga (2012) found that academic qualifications do not influence academic staff's assessment practices and revealed that assessment practices of teachers depended principally on the purpose they had set for the class, rather than their educational qualifications.

According to Al-Nouh, Taqi and Abdul-Kareem (2014), teacher professional development programmes play a crucial role in enhancing practising teachers' knowledge and skills of assessing learners, especially in this era of a paradigm change from summative to formative assessment practices.

#### 5. Challenges Encountered by the Teacher respondents on the remote learning assessment

INDICATORS	WM	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Matching reliable, valid, and appropriate learning assessment methods and tools to all course learning objectives	3.29	0.71	Highly Encountered
2. Creating or adapting learning assessment tools that are appropriate, fair, and easily understood by both faculty and learners	3.33	0.79	Highly Encountered
3. Creating or adapting learning assessment methods that support deeper conceptual understanding and application	3.43	0.80	Highly Encountered
4. Creating or adapting learning assessment methods that support active and experiential learning, and are suited to students' different learning styles	3.38	0.82	Highly Encountered
5. Committing time and resources to implement new learning assessment methods	3.26	0.80	Highly Encountered
6. There is a lack of training for new strategies and the use of technology for the assessment	2.90	1.10	Highly Encountered
7. The face-to-face classroom assessment strategies don't necessarily translate to online or blended learning contexts, requiring a shift in our assessment approaches, tools, and mindsets	2.93	0.95	Highly Encountered
8. Tracking and triangulate learners' observations, conversations, and products to evaluate learning over time, threatening the validity of assessment	2.98	0.95	Highly Encountered
9. learners don't always have the adequate technical infrastructure needed for online learning and meaningful formative assessment, posing equity issues	3.02	0.98	Highly Encountered
10. authentic assessments and demonstrations of learning are more challenging in an online context (e.g. group projects and hands-on tasks), putting us at risk of slipping back to a reliance on traditional summative assessments like tests, exams, and essays	3.24	0.79	Highly Encountered
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>Highly Encountered</b>

Legend: 3.00 – 4.00 (Not encountered), 1.75 – 2.50 (Encountered), 2.51 – 3.25 (Highly Encountered), 3.26 – 4.00 (Very Highly Encountered)

Table 5 shows the challenges encountered by the teacher respondents on the remote learning assessment. Based on the gathered data revealed that teachers experiencing highly challenges encountered based on overall computed weighted mean of 3.18, and standard deviation of 0.87.

Considerably, the following indicators exhibited highly challenges encountered in creating or adapting learning assessment methods that support deeper conceptual understanding and application ( $\bar{x} = 3.43$ ;  $SD = .80$ ), adapting learning assessment methods that support active and experiential learning, and are suited to students' different learning styles ( $\bar{x} = 3.38$ ;  $SD = .82$ ), creating or adapting learning assessment tools that are appropriate, fair, and easily understood by both faculty and learners ( $\bar{x} = 3.33$ ;  $SD = .79$ ), matching reliable, valid, and appropriate learning assessment methods and tools to all course learning objectives ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ;  $SD = .71$ ), committing time and resources to implement new learning assessment methods ( $\bar{x} = 3.26$ ;  $SD = .80$ ), authentic assessments and demonstrations of learning are more challenging in an online context (e.g. group projects and hands-on tasks), putting us at risk of slipping back to a reliance on traditional summative assessments like tests, exams, and essays ( $\bar{x} = 3.24$ ;  $SD = .79$ ), learners don't always have the adequate technical infrastructure needed for online learning and meaningful formative assessment, posing equity issues ( $\bar{x} = 3.02$ ;  $SD = .98$ ), tracking and triangulate learners' observations, conversations, and products to evaluate learning over time, threatening the validity of assessment ( $\bar{x} = 2.98$ ;  $SD = .95$ ), the face-to-face classroom assessment strategies don't necessarily translate to online or blended learning contexts, requiring a shift in our assessment approaches, tools,

and mindsets ( $\bar{x} = 2.93$ ;  $SD = .95$ ), there is a lack of training for new strategies and the use of technology for the assessment ( $\bar{x} = 2.90$ ;  $SD = 1.10$ ).

The idea of Rutgers (2020) complemented to the present study that remote proctored exams are often more stressful for students than in-person proctored exams which would affect the student performance adversely. It requires well-established infrastructure setup, software, and hardware, both on the instructor and student side. In addition, the application software such as proctortrack could create “false positive” flags that mislead the instructor. It has a failure of software, hardware, or internet connection could be experienced. Hence, contingency plan should be designed before the exam is started. More so, due to personal or cultural reasons students may not be willing to stay under the camera supervision. In addition, if a student faces technical difficulties on the system during exam time, supporting the student and fixing the problem remotely will not be easy.

Likewise, Almeida and Monteiro (2021) stressed teachers' has high concern about adopting fraud-free models and an excessive focus on the summative assessment component that in the distance learning model has less preponderance when compared to the gradual monitoring and assessment processes of the students. Relatively, students' problems arise regarding equipment to follow the teaching sessions and concerns about their privacy, particularly when intrusive IT solutions request the access to their cameras, audio, and desktop.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

In line with the mentioned findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Based on the results, the most frequent number of the teacher- respondents in the study was 36 – 40 years old at age, female, Technology Livelihood Education (TLE) major, 6 – 10 years in service in Department of Education, and bachelor's degree holders,
2. As to the results, it can be concluded that the teacher respondents' level of teacher competencies on remote learning assessment in terms of assessment occurring prior to, during and after the appropriate instructional segment was observed high competent.
3. Based on the results, teacher respondents' level of assessment practices in terms of clarity of assessment, time and effort on task, quality of feedback, motivational belief and self-esteem to learners, self-assessment and reflection of learning of the learners, and assessment – content and process in adapting teaching to students needs was mostly practice. However, it was completely practice the interaction and dialogue about learning progress.
4. The results confirmed that there was a significant difference on the teacher respondents' level of competence on the remote learning assessment when group according to their age, gender, areas of specialization, and training attended. On the other hands, teacher year of teaching and educational

attainment revealed it has no significant difference on their level of competence on the remote learning assessment. Looking forward, that age, gender, year of teaching, areas of specialization, educational attainment, and training attended significantly differs to the level of assessment practices of the teachers.

5. Based on the results, the teachers experiencing highly challenges encountered on the remote learning assessment.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations were forwarded:

1. To address the challenges, the school heads and testing coordinator has devised the teachers on various follow-up methods to encourage learners to attend blended classes and submit the assessments on time. More so, to lessen the burden of the learners on multiple assessment it is suggested to teachers to create an integrative assessment tasks to solve challenges related to infrastructure and commitment of students to attend blended classes and submit assessments. However, academic dishonesty problem is not a tentative and COVID-19-related problem and needs further investigation.
2. Hence, the assessment type used for unproctored assessment was taken as one prevention method and learners were asked to identify the appropriate assessment method. The other option appeared to be good for prevention of academic dishonesty was using interdisciplinary evaluation methods for an assessment could be more appropriate to address the learning outcomes of the module and at the same time minimize the risk of academic dishonesty.
3. The implementation of the proposed school-based testing reforms should be monitored and evaluated for the optimum advantage of the school and community.
4. Future research might consider using interviews and direct observations of teachers' competence and assessment practices to judge the validity of the teachers' responses to the questionnaire.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ahea, M. (2016). The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Students' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(16), 38-41.
- [2] Alkharusi, H. A. (2015a). An analysis of the internal and external structure of the teacher assessment literacy questionnaire. *International Journal of Learning*, 18, 515-528.
- [3] Alkharusi, H. (2015b). A logistic regression model predicting assessment literacy among in-service teachers. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 7, 280-291.

- [4] Alkharusi, H. (2015c). Teachers' classroom assessment skills: Influence of gender, subject area, grade level, teaching experience, and in-service assessment training. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 8, 39-48.
- [5] Almeida, F., & Monteiro, J. (2021). The challenges of assessing and evaluating the students at distance. *Journal of Online Higher Education*, 5(1). <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/2102/2102.04235.pdf>.
- [6] Alotaibi, K. A. (2019). Teachers' Perceptions on Factors Influence Adoption of Formative Assessment. *Journal of Education and Learning*; 8, (1). <https://doi:10.5539/jel.v8n1p74>.
- [7] Andersson, C., & Palm, T. (2017). Characteristics of improved formative assessment practice. *Education Inquiry*, 8(2), 104-122.
- [8] Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (2021). Reframing feedback to improve teaching and learning. [https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/research-evidence/spotlight/feedback.pdf?sfvrsn=cb2eec3c\\_14](https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/research-evidence/spotlight/feedback.pdf?sfvrsn=cb2eec3c_14).
- [9] Black, P., and Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assess. Educ. Principles, Policy Pract.* 5 (1), 7-74. <https://doi:10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>.
- [10] Brookfield, S. D. (2015). *The skillful teacher: On technique, trust and responsiveness in the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [11] Corwin. (2017). *How to Empower Student Learning with Teacher Clarity*. Sage Publishing Inc.
- [12] Dayagbil FT, Palompon DR, Garcia LL and Olvido MMJ (2021) Teaching and Learning Continuity Amid and Beyond the Pandemic. *Front. Educ.* 6:678692. <https://doi:10.3389/educ.2021.678692>.
- [13] Defianty, M., Hidayat, D. N., Kultsum, U., Sufyan, A., Subchi, I., & Sururin, S. (2021). Reframing Formative Assessment Practices in Emergency Remote Teaching Context of English Language Teaching in Higher Education institutions Indonesia. <https://eudl.eu/pdf/10.4108/eai.20-10-2020.2305143>.
- [14] DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2020. *The Interim Guidelines for Assessment and Grading in Light of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan*.
- [15] Ferlazzo, L. (2015). Strategies for helping students motivate themselves. <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/strategies-helping-studentsmotivate-themselves-larry-ferlazzo>.
- [16] Gachago, D., Jones, B., and Edwards, S. (2018). "Towards Flexible Learning through Distance Learning: ND Real Estate Learners' Experiences," in ICCEL 2018 13th International Conference on E-Learning (Capetown: Academic Conferences and publishing limited), 93.
- [17] Gonzales, R. D., & Aliponga, J. (2012). Classroom assessment preferences of Japanese language teachers in the Philippines and English language teachers in Japan. Gonzales, R. DLC, & Aliponga, J.(2012). *Classroom Assessment Preferences of Japanese Language Teachers in the Philippines and English Language Teachers in Japan*. MEXTESOL Journal, 36(1), 1-18.
- [18] Global Education Monitoring Report (2020). Could coronavirus shape the way assessments work forever? [Blog post]. <https://gemreportunesco.wordpress.com/2020/03/20/could-coronavirus-shape-the-way-assessments-work-forever/>.
- [19] Hafen, C. A., Hamre, B. K., Allen, J. P., Bell, C. A., Gitomer, D. H., & Pianta, R. C. (2015). Teaching Through Interactions in secondary school classrooms: Revisiting the factor structure and practical application of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System – Secondary. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 35(5–6), 651–680.
- [20] Kampfer, S. H., Horvath, L. S., Kleinert, H. L., & Kearns, J. F. (2017). Teachers Perceptions of One State's Alternate Assessment: Implications for Practice and Preparation. *Exceptional Children*, 67(3), 361-374.
- [21] Klute, M., Aphorp, H., Harlacher, J., & Reale, M. (2017). Formative Assessment and Elementary School Student Academic Achievement: A Review of the Evidence. REL 2017-259. Regional Educational Laboratory Central.
- [22] Koloï-Keaikitse, S. (2017). Classroom assessment practices: A survey of Botswana primary and secondary school teacher. Ball State University, Indiana.
- [23] Laitusis, V. (2020). *Assessment Challenges in a Remote Learning Environment*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- [24] Madison-Harris, R., Muoneke, A., & Times, C. (2012). Using Formative Assessment to Improve Student Achievement in the Core Content Areas. Briefing Paper. Southeast Comprehensive Center.
- [25] Matovu, M., & Zubairi, A. M. (2014). Factors influencing assessment practices among university academic staff: A multiple regression analysis.
- [26] McMillan, J. H., & Hearn, j. (2015). *Student Self-Assessment: The Key to Stronger Student Motivation and Higher Achievement*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ815370.pdf>.
- [27] National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. (2021). Using Baseline Data and Information to set SLO targets: A Part of the Assessment Toolkit. Rhode Island Department of Education.
- [28] Oluwatoyin, M. O., & Sitwala, N.I. (2019). The Impact of Assessment for Learning on Learner Performance in Life Science. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 15(11). <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/108689>.

- [29] Pennings, H. J. M., van Tartwijk, J., Wubbels, T., Claessens, L. C. A., van der Want, A. C., & Brekelmans, M. (2014). Real-time teacher–Student interactions: A dynamic systems approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 37, 183–193.
- [30] Ramli, M. (2018). Classroom Interaction: Teacher and Students Perception on Dialogue in Primary Science Classroom. *EDUSAINS*, 10(1), 127-134.
- [31] Ryan, A., and Tilbury, D. (2013). *Flexible Pedagogies: New Pedagogical Ideas*. London: Higher Education Academy.
- [32] Rutgers. (2020). Remote exams and assessments. Retrieved from <https://sasoue.rutgers.edu/teaching-learning/remote-exams-assessment#special-advice-for-open-book-assessment-in-quantitative-courses>.
- [33] Samosa, R.C. (2020a). Understanding the End- to – End Praxis of Quantitative Research: From Scratch to Paper Presentation *Book of Life Publication*.
- [34] Samosa, R.C., Magulod, G.C., Capulso, L.B., Delos Reyes, R.J., Luna, AR. F., Maglente, S.S., Orte, C.J.S., Olitres, B.J.D., Pentang, J.P. Vidal, C.J. E. (2021). *How to Write and Publish Your Thesis*. Beyond Books Publication.
- [35] Samosa, R.C. (2021). Equipping 21st Century Teachers' with the Research Based Instructions Across the Curriculum in the New Normal. [Webinar]. *Rethinking the Teaching Practices 4.0 Beyond Borders in the New Normal of Education*. University of Caloocan City, Graduate School.
- [36] Samosa, R.C. (2021d). From Test Validity to Construct Validity & Back: Theory and Application in the Experimental Design in Science Action Research (Webinar). *Philippine Association of Physics and Science Instructors*.
- [37] Stubbs, P. (2021). Teacher Clarity: Finding the 'Why'. EdTech Digest. <https://www.edtechdigest.com/2019/08/21/teacher-clarity-finding-the-why/>.
- [38] Suah, S. L., & Ong, S. L. (2012). Investigating Assessment Practices of In-service Teachers. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(1).
- [39] Zafarullah, S., Mumtaz, K., Murad, P. U., Abida, S., & Humera, S. (2016). Teachers' Time Management and the Performance of Students: A Comparison of Government and Private Schools of Hyderabad, Sindh, Pakistan. *World Journal of Education*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1157611.pdf>.

Dr. Merlina P. Cruz, CESO VI, OIC –Schools Division Superintendent, for her encouragement and supports to all teachers to conduct research in the Schools Division.

Dr. Erleo T. Villaros, OIC – Assistant Schools Division Superintendent, whose input and constructive feedback and insight helped in the finalization and completions of this manuscript.

Dr. Rolando T. Sotelo, Chief Education Supervisor, for having patiently guided the researcher from the conceptualization of this study until its completion. For his encouragement, generous considerations, wise guidance and direction, and untiring efforts in making this study a reality.

Esperanza Diaz – Cruz, Chief Education Supervisor, for sharing their expertise, thereby enriching the content of this study.

Dr. Donn Uriel D. Buenaventura, Senior Education Program Specialist (Research and Planning), for sharing his utmost support, time, expertise, understanding, and encouragement that motivated me intrinsically to complete this research.

Mam Chona C. Dulay, Principal I, for the encouragement and continuous guidance throughout the research process.

The researcher's family, my parents, sisters and brothers, nephews and nieces, for always giving their unreserved support, love, understanding and prayers; and Above all, to the Unmoved Mover, for giving His unending grace.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher is deeply indebted to the following, who in one way or another have helped in the completion of this research endeavor.

In particular, sincere heartfelt gratitude is hereby offered to: