

Faculty Perceptions, Skills and Problems on Assessment in Undergraduate Programs in a State University Extension Campus in the Philippines

Anania B. Aquino, Noraida P. Ramos, Celia J. Nolasco

College of Teacher Education, Batangas State University ARASOF, Nasugbu, Batangas, Philippines
anania1969@gmail.com

Date Received: June 23, 2015; Date Revised: July 22, 2015

Abstract - *The assessment of student learning is a continuous process geared towards understanding and improving student learning hence an assurance of providing quality education. It is a fundamental function of higher education and one of the primary roles of its faculty. This research investigated perceptions, practices and skills of faculty of a university extension campus on assessment of student learning. It relied on descriptive survey method to investigate responses of 77 teachers. The respondents regard assessment as useful, important and should be integrated with learning process. Faculty also place importance on purposes of evaluation in student learning and use varied assessment tools. In spite of various assessment tools used, majority of respondents are only somewhat skilled in performing tasks incident to assessment. University academic guidelines, applicable professional licensure examination, qualifying / classification test, university grading standard and their immediate academic supervisor affect faculty's assessment practices. The respondents specify some problems and concerns on assessment. The results serve as basis in coming up with proposed strategies for continuous enhancement of assessment are conceptualized for possible implementation.*

Keywords: *assessment, higher education, undergraduate programs, community extension, student learning*

INTRODUCTION

Quality education is vital to human and economic development. In Philippines, institutions of higher learning are given a mandate to provide quality education. They are to develop competent and high – level human resources needed for economic development. In line with this, it is expected that they will turn in graduates who are prepared for the world of work, life, and citizenship. To be able to accomplish these expectations, colleges and universities must make assessment an integral part of their academic system. Everyone in these institutions must collaborate to monitor student learning across entire organization (Paris, 2012).

The assessment of student learning is a fundamental function of higher education. It is a continuous process that is geared towards understanding and promoting student learning. It involves making expected learning outcomes known to varied stakeholders of educational process. It also entails establishing appropriate criteria and standards for education, and systematically collecting,

understanding, and interpreting evidence to ascertain if student's performance satisfies those expectations and criteria (Angelo, 1995). These resulting information would then be utilized to record, clarify, and enhance student performance (Angelo, 1995). When used in this manner, assessment serves as quality assurance of academic standards of higher education institution. Through assessment, higher education institutions can gather data about the quality of instruction. Moreover, they can also monitor instruction for improvement, and determine student learning against academic standards. This nature of assessment makes it to have a vital impact on student behavior (Newble & Jaeger, 2009) as well as learning approaches (Scouller, 1998). It also has bearing on faculty time, university reputations (William et al, 2004), and students' future lives.

In higher education, learners carry primary responsibility for learning, but faculty members play a central role as they are in direct contact with students in and out of learning environment. Faculty members then must facilitate student's learning and advance it

through the use of appropriate teaching methods and approaches, time-tested classroom management skills, employment of suitable instructional materials and timely and efficient assessment of learning. With their roles and responsibilities in academic setting, faculty members have primary responsibility for developing, implementing, and using effective educational assessment. Teachers, therefore, must be actively engaged in effective assessment of student learning and using assessment data to enrich student learning experience for improved learning (Hutchings, 2010).

Assessment is a vital component of a learning process (Bell & Cowie, 2001; Black & Wiliam, 1998) and a facilitator of learning (McDonald & Boud, 2003; Wiliam, 2011). Implementing an effective assessment of learning has become a major concern. This concern is one of the most significant challenges in higher education instruction. For faculty members to be involved in efficient and meaningful assessment, they should have a solid background, a well-defined purpose and a motivation for embarking on assessment of learning. They should also have clear learning objectives, and evaluation methods that will provide appropriate opportunities for students to demonstrate their knowledge both in cognitive and process levels. Moreover, they need to know a range of methods and tools for assessing these outcomes as well as a standard reference for making judgments.

Varied factors influence assessment practices of faculty. To a large extent, evaluation practices depend on a university's external structure, its policies (Myers, et al., 2014) and how achievements and qualifications are perceived. To some extent, faculty member's perceptions and knowledge of assessment seem to affect their practices. All of these have bearing on student learning. Viewed in this manner, an evaluation of educators' fundamental knowledge and insights about their teaching, as well as student learning, and education is, as a result, necessary. Relevant to this line of thought, this research explored perceptions, practices, and skills on assessment of faculty members in an extension campus of a state university. Specifically, it investigated teachers' self-perceived views on classroom assessment. In addition, it examined kinds of assessment methods and tools used by respondents to assess learning among their students. It hypothesized that teachers prefer to use a particular method of assessment. Further, it determined respondents' self-reported assessment skills and their problems in assessment. The findings serve as basis for designing strategies to improve

faculty members' classroom assessment perceptions, practices, and competencies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research design

The nature of objectives raised in this research necessitated the use of a descriptive design of research to collect data. It collected perceptions, practices, and skills of faculty members on assessment of student learning using a survey questionnaire. The findings served as baseline information for proposing strategies to improve faculty members' classroom assessment perceptions, practices, and competencies.

Participants

The present research utilized faculty members of an extension campus of a state university in CALABARZON area as participants of the study. The campus has a laboratory elementary and secondary schools. However, this research targeted college faculty members on permanent and contractual basis only taking into consideration that the institution's mandate is to offer university degree programs. In addition, it focused on assessment in the college department as the author is also a college faculty member, and teachers in this department might not have a background in teaching or pedagogy.

Following ethics in research, the researcher obtained first the campus executive director's approval for conducting this research. When permission was granted, she circulated survey questionnaires to the respondents consisting of 91 teachers. She also requested participants' cooperation and assured confidentiality of their responses through a letter attached to each instrument. In total, 77 of them returned accomplished survey questionnaire. Of these participants, 33 (43%) are male, and 44 (57%) are female. In terms of highest academic attainment, 18 (23%) has post-graduate degrees and 59 (77%) baccalaureate prepared. As to academic rank, majority (81%) are holders of academic rank of instructors with 15 (19%) of them as assistant professors.

Measure

The present research used survey questionnaire as the primary instrument for gathering data. The questionnaire surveyed perceptions and practices of faculty members teaching in a higher education institution. This instrument included items from Zhang and Burry-Stock (1994) Assessment Practices

Inventory (API). The development of the said API primarily considered theoretical construct of assessment of student learning. A table of specification used for preparing the questionnaire of 67 items ensured its content validity. The questionnaire was then pilot tested twice to in-service teachers, and it was revised based on teachers' feedback and result of item analysis.

The questionnaire consisted of seven parts with most of these elements in a form of multiple choice or Likert-type scales (with either 4 or 5 options). The first part surveyed the profile of respondents. The second part surveyed their views on assessment. The responses were interpreted accordingly as strongly agree for weighted mean ranging 3.51 – 4.00. For weighted mean of 2.51 – 3.50, it was interpreted as agree while it is disagree for 1.51 – 2.50. The interpretation strongly disagree was used for weighted mean that ranged from 1.00 – 1.50.

The third part asked respondents about assessment methods they used while fourth part survey respondents' skill in using different evaluation methods. The weighted mean was interpreted as very skilled if it ranged 4.51 – 5.00, and skilled for 3.51 – 4.50. Somewhat skilled was used for weighted mean of 2.51 – 3.50 while a little skilled was used for 1.51 – 2.50. Lastly, the interpretation of not at all skilled was applied for weighted mean of 1.00 – 1.50.

The questionnaire also included a survey on respondents' self – perceived importance of classroom assessment practices and classroom assessment purposes in teaching one's course. The weighted mean was interpreted as very important (3.51 – 4.00), important (2.52 – 3.50), somewhat important (1.51 – 2.50) and not important (1.00 – 1.50).

In addition, said instrument also surveyed extent by which different factors affected their learning assessment practices with five as highest and one as lowest. The interpretation of this part was to a very great extent for weighted mean of 4.51 – 5.00. The weighted mean of 3.51 – 4.50 was interpreted to a great extent while 2.51 – 3.50, to a moderate extent. The verbal interpretation of limited extent was applied for values of 1.51 – 2.50, and not at all if it is 1.00 – 1.50.

The last part asked about problems experienced by respondents relevant to the assessment of learning of their students. They were requested to check all that they experienced.

To gather data needed, the researcher prepared a letter of request to distribute questionnaires and

conduct interview addressed to executive director. Upon its approval, she distributed the questionnaires with a cover letter orienting them about the purpose. They were given enough time to answer the questionnaire. She also scheduled interview with them to corroborate findings.

Statistical procedure

The researcher was able to retrieve questionnaires from 77 teachers. Following retrieval, she tallied, analyzed and interpreted all data that were collected. She applied frequency count, ranking and weighted mean to treat data on faculty members' perceptions of classroom assessment. She also used these statistical measures to describe typicality of faculty responses on classroom assessment practices and skills. To substantiate findings, she used chi-square test of goodness of fit to find out if respondents have a preference for a particular method of assessment.

Based on findings, the researcher proposed different strategies to improve faculty members' self-perceived views, practices and skills on assessment of student learning.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Perceptions on Assessment of Learning

The degree of faculty's involvement in assessment may influence their perceptions of assessment (Trullen & Rodríguez, 2013). The present research asked respondents to indicate their perceptions regarding assessment of learning. Table 1 displays these responses.

The respondents *strongly agree* that assessment is useful to them as faculty members because through assessment they can identify student's difficulties (3.69) and monitor their learning (3.65). They also *strongly agree* that assessment is essential to a teaching-learning process (3.62) thus should be integrated throughout this process (3.57). These findings indicate faculty members' awareness of roles and functions of assessment in teaching – learning process and development of students.

The respondents also *strongly agree* that assessment is useful to their students (3.53). In an interview, they indicated that they are aware of the impact of evaluation in student's learning and in obtaining good grades. These responses show that faculty members, in general, have good perceptions of classroom assessment.

Table 1. Perceptions on Assessment

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Assessment is useful to me in monitor learning of students.	3.65	Strongly Agree	2
2. Assessment is useful to me in identifying student's difficulties.	3.69	Strongly Agree	1
3. Assessment is useful to me in monitoring students' achievement at the end of a semester.	3.52	Strongly Agree	6
4. Assessment is useful to me as a faculty in determining grades of students.	3.51	Strongly Agree	7
5. Assessment is useful to my students.	3.53	Strongly Agree	5
6. Assessment gives no benefit to my students	2.07	Disagree	10
7. Assessment is an additional work to instruction	2.58	Agree	9
8. Assessment is an essential part of a teaching-learning process	3.62	Strongly Agree	3
9. Assessment should be integrated throughout the instructional process	3.57	Strongly Agree	4
10. Assessment should be implemented at a conclusion of a particular lesson or unit of study only	3.19	Agree	8

With respect to other items, respondents *agree* that assessment should be implemented only at a conclusion of a particular lesson or unit (3.19). Teachers also perceive assessment as an additional work to instruction (2.58). Through interview, some faculty members exposed that they sometimes find assessment as a tedious task consuming a considerable amount of their work time. If number of teaching loads and teaching preparation is high, faculty members would find preparing assessments and administering them to be tiresome.

Table 1 also shows that some respondents believe assessment gives no benefit to students (2.07). This perception is probably a consequence of an isolated experience that expected student outcomes were not attained even if an assessment was done.

The investigation of perceptions of faculty on assessment reveals differences of faculty opinion on an assessment. In this extension campus, faculty members have personal and frequent interactions, and are deeply involved with undergraduate instruction. In spite of this situation, differences of opinion still persist. Of all of these perceptions, notion that assessment is an additional work to teaching is one that may be disadvantageous to satisfactory assessment of student learning. Although assessment programs are developed on a university level, faculty members implement them thus it is important to them to be clear about what assessment is. Understanding educational purposes of assessment would guide faculty's practices so that its benefits may be maximized (MacDonald, Williams, Lazowski, Horst, & Barron, 2014).

Faculty members' self – reported views on the importance of purposes of assessment

The findings on teachers' self – reported views on the importance of purposes of assessment show that many goals are perceived as very crucial. With highest weighted mean of 3.69, respondents recognize the purpose of diagnosing students' difficulties and weakness as very paramount. The response signifies that respondents use assessment as a basis to enhance learning. The identification of difficulties and weakness of students would give faculty information on topics that seem difficult so they can make adjustments in their teaching.

In second rank, respondents divulge purpose of assessing on – going learning progress as also very crucial. It could be that they judiciously monitor student learning, and they are deeply concerned with their students' development. In the third rank with a weighted mean of 3.52, respondents assess purpose of determining end of semester achievements of students as also very critical. This response indicates that respondents make it their function and take full responsibility to be aware of their students' development.

The participants also regard purpose of using assessment to assign grades as very paramount. This perception shows that respondents keep track of their student's development and performance and use assessment data in giving grades.

In last rank, respondents evaluated placement function of assessment as also important. Although respondents are aware of their roles in placement, they

might see this as a primary service of testing and placement office.

Of semblance to these findings is that of Serra, Gómez and Sáiz (2014). They find that faculty regard student learning as important and they are also confident of their skills to carry out an assessment for that purpose. However, faculty feel that student participation in such evaluation is not that needed. Further, they know that they need improvement in their abilities to promote student involvement in evaluation, and, as a result, they seldom used such tasks.

Assessment practices

As student's performance varies in different forms of assessment (James & Fleming, 2004) an evaluation process should be done using a mix of varied methods and tools. Many experts believe that evaluation approaches can be most efficient if combinations of different methods are used.

Table 2. Assessment Methods and Tools Used by Faculty Members per Semester

Assessment Tools Used	Total	%
1. Performance Assessment	69	89.61
2. Portfolio	63	81.81
3. Project	70	90.91
4. Oral Interviews	64	83.12
5. Written Tests	77	100
6. Presentations	68	88.31
7. Quizzes	77	100
8. Class Participation	76	98.70
9. Self – Assessment	67	87.01
10. Peer Assessment	65	84.42

Chi – square test of goodness of fit computed value - 10.41 (df - 9; alpha -0.5); Critical value - 16.919.

Table 2 presents assessment methods and tools used by participants which indicates that all respondents use written tests and quizzes. Instructors seemingly find pedagogical value in using written test and quizzes as evaluation methods. This finding is not surprising taking into consideration that written tests are part of the university grading system. For quizzes, instructors may find them very easy to prepare and effective in enhancing learning. Traditionally, students answer quizzes given to them individually. However, if quizzes are administered and answered by a group

of students, quizzes positively impact learning (Rao, Collins & Di Carlo, 2002).

The participants of this research also exhibit high inclination to utilize class participation (98.70%) as an assessment tool. It could be that they appreciate merit of class participation in evaluation thus one of the most commonly used methods. The table also shows that most instructors favor project as there 70 of them (90.91%) who engage in its use. The assessment of student performance (89.61%) follows closely. This could mean that faculty conduct myriad of activities in the classroom to allow frequent performance assessment.

Assessment using presentations comes next with 68 teachers (88.31%) taking advantage of this kind of evaluation strategy. In connection to this result, students may look at oral presentations as a way teachers assess their knowledge of lessons they are studying (Joughin, 2007).

Sixty-seven faculty respondents expose that they use self-assessment, which can be very relevant to discovering students' thoughts and personal interaction within a group (Bergh et al., 2006). This result means that respondents consider student self-assessment vital in promoting student learning. Bergh et al. (2006) found that students have high regard for this method. It encourages self – examination among students as well as instructors, and this is its advantage over traditional assessment methods. Students appreciate impact of self - assessment in their formative development.

Sixty-five respondents employ peer assessment. In connection with student learning, peer assessment involves evaluation of work of other students (O'Farrell, 2011). This method favorably affects formative learning among students (Topping, 1998). That it is employed by many faculty members stresses that respondents consider it important for students to assess their peers. The respondents might have utilized this tool as it can be used to validate their evaluation of undergraduates' performances or projects. Additionally, this method would promote student's level of confidence and decision-making skills as their teachers trust them to do the assessment.

The table also discloses that 64 faculty conduct oral interviews (83.12%), and 63 of them require portfolio for assessment (81.81%). The results connote that teachers find these two methods difficult to use hence they receive lowest percentage of respondents employing them among 12 items.

Assessment processes can be classified into traditional and alternative methods. Written test and quizzes fall under traditional methods while all other assessment tools and processes can be categorized into alternative forms of assessment (Mueller, 2014). The findings show that all respondents use these traditional methods with some of them reporting that they do not use authentic or alternative forms of assessment. Further, some can be classified as formative in nature (i.e. quizzes, self – assessment, oral interviews) while others are summative.

The responses of participants on assessment tools used show slight differences. These differences might indicate that respondents may have a preference for a specific method of assessment. However, when Chi-square test of goodness of fit was applied to these data, the researcher obtained a computed value of 10.41 (df - 9; alpha -0.5). This value is lower than the critical value of 16.919. Thus, this present research fails to accept null hypothesis that respondents prefer one assessment method over another.

These findings emphasize that faculty members employ diverse assessment methods and tools. They use a combination of both summative and formative assessments suggesting faculty engagement in both approaches to assessment of student learning. Further, they employ a mix of traditional and alternative methods in assessment.

This result is in contrast to findings of Toomey, Chapman, Gaff, Mcgilp, Walsh, Warren and Williams (2004). They found that Australian teacher educators' assessment, reporting, and evaluation practices can be classified as either summative or formative in nature. Their decisions to utilize a particular approach are influenced by philosophical and other various factors. These factors include students' prospects for learning outcomes and faculty working conditions. In addition,

effective communication between staff, faculty beliefs about teaching-learning process, and nature of courses offered also modify these teachers' decisions.

Table 3 reflects the frequency of use of these varied assessment methods. The previous findings on evaluation tools used expose that all respondents claim they use written tests. However, faculty members differ in the frequency of administering these written tests to students. Fortyrespondents admit using it5-6 times per semester, 21respondents for 7-8 times and 16 for more than eighttimes per semester. This findings suggest that majority of respondents consider written test very relevant in assessing student learning. Interview revealed that participants see it as easy to administer to many students and more straightforward to check and grade compared to alternative forms of assessment.

This situation is similar to findings of Flores, Simao, Pereira (2014) where respondents identified written tests as one of most frequently used evaluation methods in higher learning. All teachers admit using quizzes. One third of them administer it more than eight times, 20 give it 5-6 times, and 15 do it 7-8 times. These results suggest that respondents also find quizzes a valuable tool in the assessment of learning. As few faculty put it, short examsare easy to prepare and check and consume only a short period.

The respondents also frequently use project as assessment tool.Majority or 70 of them use it with 59 using it 1-2 times and 7 using it 3-4 times. Although a few faculty reveal that rating or evaluating projects is somewhat difficult, it is still very popular because they can observe and enhance students' creativity and innovativeness through projects.

Table 3. Frequency of Use of Assessment Methods per Semester

Assessment Tools Used	1-2 Times	3-4 Times	5-6 Times	7-8 Times	More Than 8 Times	Total
1. Performance Assessment	15	23	16	3	12	69
2. Portfolio	63	0	0	0	0	63
3. Project	59	7	4	0	0	70
4. Oral Interviews	25	20	15	1	3	64
5. Written Tests	0	0	40	21	16	77
6. Presentations	22	19	15	7	5	68
7. Quizzes	4	13	20	15	25	77
8. Class Participation	20	22	11	12	11	76
9. Self – Assessment	33	20	7	4	3	67
10. Peer Assessment	38	20	4	3	0	65

With reference to performance tasks, sixty-nine teachers employ it. Of this number, majority or 23 respondents employ it 3-4 times. Sixteen use it 5-6 times, and 15 use it 1-2 times. This survey outcome connotes that instructors find this kind of assessment very useful and applicable in different disciplines. Notable about this assessment is that there are 12 who use it more than eight times. These respondents might be teaching laboratory subjects hence they utilize performance tasks in most class sessions.

As for assessment tool of presentations, 22 out of 68 utilize it 1-2 times, 19 employ it 3-4 times and 15 for 5-6 times. Many faculty members may prefer presentations especially power point presentations, for they are attractive. In addition, students are given an opportunity to demonstrate their creativity, practice cooperation, teamwork, and resourcefulness. Further, since many students may not have been exposed to power point presentations, these become very interesting and challenging to them.

The participants also use oral interview, which requires training in interviewing skills and rating scales. Sixty-four respondents claim that they employ it. Of these respondents, majority or 25 use it 1-2 times followed by those 20 who use it 3-4 times. Interview encourages oral fluency and spontaneity among learners. Moreover, faculty have a chance to observe students' attitude and behavior giving them a clue to student's personality. The researcher assumes that this nature of interview makes respondents use them frequently in assessment.

As for portfolio, sixty-two respondents use it. Of this number, 27 employ it 1-2 times and 24 apply it 3-4 times. A few instructors divulge experiencing difficulty in employing portfolio assessment. Nevertheless, majority of research participants still use it underscoring its pedagogical significance in assessing student learning.

The table also reveals that there are some respondents who do not use these assessment tools. Eight claim they do not use performance tasks. Fourteen of them do not employ portfolio. Seven admitted they do not give a project. Eight seemingly do not engage in oral interviews, and 12 do not give essays. Nine of them do not use class presentations. Only one teacher is not involved in doing graded recitation, and ten do not implement self – assessment. Finally, 12 of them are not in favor of using peer assessment.

Relevant to these findings, Luque and Machuca (2003) investigated Production/ operations

management (POM) teaching at Spanish universities. They found that practical examination was most frequently used assessment method. The methods least used are class participation and written examinations. In addition, they also pointed out that teachers employ a variety of methods to assess student learning in these courses.

Self – reported skills in assessment

Effective assessment is a vital component of teaching – learning process. As such, it requires sound professional judgment and competence from teachers as they decide what learning and skill would be assessed, what methods would be used, and when assessment is appropriate and timely. After each assessment, they also evaluate whether learning occurs among their students or whether their students demonstrate required curricular learning outcomes. The interpretations of students' learning that teachers make need to be reliable, nondiscriminatory, without prejudices and aligned with their intended purposes. Since an assessment is valuable in student learning, teachers must therefore, be skillful in conducting assessment.

Table 4 displays respondents' self – reported skills in assessment. All participants reveal that they are skilled in constructing test and quizzes.

Table 4. Faculty Members' Skills in Assessment

Assessment Tasks	WM	VI	Rank
1. Doing diagnostic assessment	3.39	Somewhat skilled	9
2. Preparing table of specifications	3.45	Somewhat skilled	6
3. Developing criteria for assessment	3.34	Somewhat skilled	10
4. Linking assessment to learning outcomes	3.40	Somewhat skilled	8
5. Constructing test and quizzes	3.91	Skilled	1
6. Developing rubrics	3.23	Somewhat skilled	11
7. Developing checklist	3.48	Somewhat skilled	5
8. Evaluating essays and composition	3.53	Skilled	4
9. Assessing interviews	3.43	Somewhat skilled	7
10. Assessing oral presentations	3.55	Skilled	3
11. Assessing oral recitation	3.61	Skilled	2
12. Using and evaluating portfolios	3.18	Somewhat skilled	12

This item recorded a weighted mean of 3.91 and occupies first rank among these twelve items. The findings in assessment tools show that all respondents use written tests and quizzes. Therefore, it is not surprising that they are skilled in preparing this kind of assessment and hence, it ranks first among twelve items.

In second rank with a weighted mean of 3.63, respondents bare they are also skilled with respect to assessment of oral recitations. Next in third rank, participants expose they are also skilled in evaluating oral presentations. In the fourth rank, teachers indicate that they are skillful in rating essays and composition. These findings connote that respondents are very adept at doing these tasks, and find them uncomplicated and undemanding. These also means that they use these assessment tasks frequently.

With respect to other items, respondents assert that they are only somewhat skilled as these items have weighted mean ranging from 3.18 - 3.48. The findings of assessment tools used showed that respondents have vast repertoires of evaluation methods. However, this self – reported assessment skills of being somewhat skilled might indicate that most faculty members have doubts about their evaluation capability. This result implies that their knowledge and competence in doing assessment needs to be reviewed so that they can improve and promote student assessment. Faculty may need further improvement in the aspects of doing diagnostic assessment and preparing table of specifications. They may also need to enhance their skills in developing criteria for assessment and linking assessment to learning outcomes. In addition, they need to sharpen their skills with respect to developing rubrics and checklist, assessing interviews, and using and evaluating portfolios. The most powerful benefits of assessment can be attained if teachers would be assisted in meaningful utilization of evaluation results, and enhancing the quality of assessments and its

relevance to established learning goals (Guskey, 2003).

Faculty members' self – reported perceptions of factors affecting their assessment practices

Assessment of learning must be very relevant and carefully planned because it will be used as the basis for making decisions about student learning. Since teachers' assessment practices may affect student learning and development, there is a need to identify factors influencing their assessment practices. Relevant to this, McCullough and Jones (2014) found that faculty satisfaction varied across academic programs. Assessment methodologies, resources, support, participation, and effective leadership seemingly enhance faculty involvement in evaluation. In contrast, lack of comparative data across institutions, increased workload and continuous change in assessment plans negatively affect faculty satisfaction.

Table 5 presents respondents' self –reported perceptions of factors affecting their assessment practices. The perceptions of respondents on factors affecting their assessment practices, although there are slight differences in their weighted mean, show that all factors considered are regarded as modifying their practices to a great extent.

All respondents disclose that university academic guidelines guide their assessment practices to a very significant extent(4.23). Academic guidelines are adopted after passing through a rigid examination process. The members of a university academic council critically examine an academic guideline presented to them. Then, this is forwarded to the university governing board whereby members subject such guideline to scrutiny again before approval. This finding would mean that all of them are very much aware of academic rules and standards. In addition, the result indicates that teachers believe these guidelines would promote and ensure student learning hence they adhere to them.

Table 5. Respondents' Perception of Factors Affecting Their Assessment Practices

Factors Affecting Assessment Practices	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. University Grading Standard	3.89	To a great extent	3
2. University Academic Guidelines	4.23	To a great extent	1
3. Professional Licensure / Board Examination	4.18	To a great extent	2
4. Qualifying /Classification Examination	3.67	To a great extent	4
5. Dean/Associate Dean	3.58	To a great extent	5

External influences can affect faculty's engagement in assessment (Grunwald & Peterson (2003). Applicable professional licensure examination is an example of such peripheral influence. This item occupies the second rank with a weighted mean of 4.18 verbally interpreted as affecting respondents' assessment practices to a great extent. If a degree program has an applicable licensure examination, graduates of that program must pass it so that they would be eligible to practice their profession with all privileges appertaining thereto. The performance of graduates in a licensure examination indirectly reflects quality of education provided by schools and thereby, its faculty members' teaching competencies. As passing this licensure examination will affect graduates' future, respondents deem it necessary to prepare their students for this examination and thus improving their assessment practices.

The instructors also unveil that university grading standard (3.89) alters their assessment practices. Likewise, they concede that qualifying examination or classification examination (3.67) for some courses also alters the way they do assessment.

Administrative support patterns can also affect faculty's satisfaction with their institution's approach to and support for student assessment.

The supervisory competency of immediate supervisor of faculty who is either the dean or associate dean ranks the lowest (3.58). This finding implies that instructors feel that their performance should be focused on promoting student learning and should not mainly depend on supervisor's influence on them.

Table 6. Problems and Concerns in Classroom Assessments

Problems and Concerns	f	Rank
1. The number of teaching load affects time for preparing assessment	49	2
2. The number of required summative examinations given is too many per semester	23	5
3. The number of teaching preparations makes it difficult to prepare assessment tools	48	3
4. Other assignments and administrative designations affect time for preparing assessment tools	37	4
5. There is little support from supervisor	6	6
6. More seminars and training on assessment are needed.	55	1

Table 6 shows problems and concerns of respondents when it comes to assessment. In first rank, majority or 55 of them reveal that they need more seminars and trainings in classroom assessment. As they might feel that their knowledge and skills in assessment is not very adequate, they express their intention to improve their evaluation skills through participation in seminars.

A high percentage of respondents also discloses that their teaching loads affect their time for preparing assessment. It could be that most of them have many teaching duties that are a mix of their regular teaching load and overload. For teaching hours in addition to normal load, faculty members receive additional compensation or honoraria. In spite of this incentive, findings show that it is still considered as a factor affecting their classroom assessment.

The respondents also claim that number of teaching preparations makes it difficult for them to prepare assessment tools. The number and kinds of courses given to instructors directly determines quantity of summative examination to be prepared. Since summative written test must be based on a table of specifications, writing test items can be time-consuming and tedious, and this might have affected quality of assessment tools they prepared. For this reason, the researcher assume that respondents would like it very much to have their teaching preparation reduced so they can develop better assessment tools.

The respondents also acknowledge that other assignments and administrative designations affect their time for preparing assessment tools. In addition to instruction, faculty members conduct research, render extension services and participate in school activities all geared to enrich the curriculum and to provide relevant quality education to students. Having other assignment and administrative designation means that a considerable part of one's official time would be used. Time for doing other tasks like preparing assessment tools would be lessened, and quality of assessment tools might be unfavorably compromised.

The participants also consider number of required summative examinations given per semester as a concern. The university requires instructors to administer four summative tests per semester, and to prepare each test using a table of specifications. With this scenario, teachers may find writing tests a tedious and difficult task. In the last rank, six respondents admit that they receive little support from their supervisors. This response implies that supervisors fail

to meet teachers' expectations of the kind of support that they should receive from them hence considered a problem.

Proposed strategies for enhancing faculty member's assessment perceptions, skills, and practices

The enhancement of assessment perceptions, skills and practices requires varied strategies like reviews, policy examination, staff placement and development, and a significant teaching and learning project (Radbourne, 2002).

This research aims to enhance assessment perceptions, skills, and practices of teachers. The research used findings to identify growth areas, and it culminated in designing strategies to accomplish this goal.

Growth areas and strategies for improving perceptions on assessment. The perceptions of respondents on assessment that it is an additional work to instruction may adversely influence faculty's assessment practices. Also, perceptions that it should be implemented only at an end of a topic may have a similar effect. For these growth areas, the university administration may organize various assessment study groups to advance and enrich teachers' perceptions. In this assessment study group, teachers can focus deeper on the concepts of classroom assessment. They can share about, compare thoughts about, discuss, observe and deliberate about assessment to clarify their perceptions. The administration may schedule a fixed meeting for each study group to ensure participation among faculty members.

Growth areas and strategies for improving assessment tools used. For assessment tools used, the analysis led to the conclusion that some do not use authentic assessment methods like portfolio and performance tasks. To address this concern, the school may conduct a chain of seminar – workshops on authentic assessment. An ongoing, focused professional development in program assessment can have a positive impact on faculty understanding, confidence, and attitudes related to program assessment (Haviland and Turley, 2011). Furthermore, professional development would give faculty participants opportunities to work together during these seminars to develop assessment plans built around shared learning goals (Haviland & Turley, 2011).

The university administration may supplement this strategy by mentoring of faculty members

identified to be very competent in using authentic assessment. The management may conduct an assessment tool audit to monitor faculty development. This review aims to document and monitor assessment tools used by faculty to encourage them to use authentic evaluation methods.

In addition, the university should also encourage teachers to engage in further personal reading and studying about assessment tools. The management should see to it that teachers are provided reading materials on assessment instruments. What they read about and learned can be discussed in the assessment study group. These plans would enable teachers to gain more knowledge about authentic assessment and appreciate its role in learning.

Growth areas and strategies for enhancing faculty members' assessment skills. The respondents reveal that they are only somewhat skilled in doing diagnostic assessment as well as preparing table of specifications. They also admit being only somewhat skilled in developing criteria for assessment, linking assessment to learning outcomes, and developing rubrics. In addition, respondents are also somewhat adept only in developing checklist, assessing interviews, and using and evaluating portfolios. Strategies to address these concerns may include a series of seminar – workshops on these assessment tasks. Then, mentoring and assessment observation should follow as enrichment activities. During assessment observation, teachers would visit classrooms of a faculty mentor to observe how different evaluation methods are done. They can later discuss how to improve their assessment approaches and skills.

The school may also require faculty to submit an assessment plan for each month. An evaluation plan would serve as an important device for reshaping faculty's perceptions about how assessment must be effectively and efficiently done. It would also be contributory in developing new attitudes that would promote quality assessment. The school must monitor implementation of the evaluation plan and conduct teachers' conferences.

Growth areas and strategies for problems and concerns on assessment identified. Problems and concerns on assessment include number of teaching load and number of main examinations. Additionally, respondents also mention number of teaching preparations, other assignments and administrative designations as problems. The participants also identify support from immediate supervisor and need

for more seminar and training on assessment as constricting their evaluation practices.

The administration may organize an intensive faculty conference to discuss matters seen by faculty as problems but are essential part of a teaching-learning process. One of these issues is concerned about number of required summative examinations. The administration should emphasize the favorable impact of examinations to teachers, and that they are indispensable to overall curriculum and student development.

The university has academic guidelines on overload teaching and reduction of teaching load when faculty members are given administrative assignment. The implementation of these guidelines shall address other problems identified by faculty.

The school may also encourage faculty collaboration to conduct an action research on assessment. This action research would give them an avenue to utilize new approaches to evaluation and document their experiences and success. Additionally, they would be able to apply what they learn to improve their evaluation practices. They could also share and compare what they have learned with one another.

CONCLUSIONS

This investigation across departments and colleges in a campus leads to the discovery of its instructors' perceptions, practices and skills on assessment. These findings converge in a number of classes.

The analysis of these findings lead to a conclusion that faculty members look at classroom assessment as useful, beneficial, necessary, and an integral part of a teaching – learning process. Deeper examination of data showed that respondents also regarded identified purposes of assessment as necessary in their instruction.

The assessment practices of faculty members converge on an inference that respondents used various assessment tools with slight differences in frequency these tools are used. Emerging as most common tools used are written tests and quizzes.

The investigation of assessment skills of respondents synthesizes to a conclusion that respondents in general are only moderately skilled in performing some tasks incident to assessment function.

Internal factors like university academic guidelines and grading system, classification or

qualifying examination, and their immediate supervisor modify classroom assessment practices of faculty members. External factors also affect faculty members' assessment practices specifically applicable professional licensure examination. No other external factor that seemed to influence assessment practices was mentioned by the respondents in the study.

The results serve as basis in proposing strategies with the end view of enhancing faculty members' perceptions, skills, and practices on assessment of student learning. The researcher hopes that this proposed plan of actions would also be functional and beneficial in institutions of higher learning where assessment environment is similar.

The results support related research on assessment in higher education specifically that of perceptions of faculty members on the assessment and assessment tools used. The outcomes back up previous findings that assessment used by faculty can be classified into formative and summative types according to the purpose and to traditional and authentic types according to the nature of tasks involved. This endeavor adds to research literature on how faculty conduct assessment in higher education setting. The results also add to knowledge on factors affecting assessment practices. Finally, this investigation enriches research literature how these findings can be used as a basis for improving faculty's perceptions, skills, and practices in assessment towards enhancing student learning in higher education institutions.

RECOMMENDATION

This research investigated faculty's perceptions, skills, and practices of assessment in undergraduate programs. The findings serve as guide in designing strategies to enhance faculty's perceptions, skills, and practices in assessment. Before these strategies are implemented, the researcher recommends that they are reviewed and improved to ensure appropriateness of each activity to its target recipients. Moreover, in as much as this piece of work was limited only to responses of faculty members in an extension campus of a state university, a similar investigation may be conducted to verify its findings. These studies may include establishing relationships between faculty profile and their assessment skills and practices.

Acknowledgments

The author is indebted to Batangas State University ARASOF Nasugbu Campus Executive

Director, Prof. Enrico M. Dalangin, who provided invaluable direction and support. She is also grateful to University Research Administration and Research Office for their editing and encouragement. This research was made possible with support of her university, Batangas State University and its administration.

REFERENCES

- Angelo, T. A. (1995). *AAHE Bulletin*, 7.
- Bell, B. & Cowie, B. (2001). The characteristics of formative assessment in science education. *Science Education*, 85(5) 536–553. DOI: 10.1002/sce.1022
- Bergh, V.V., Mortelmans, D., Spooren, P., Petegem, P.V., Gijbels, D. & Vanthournout, G. (2006). New assessment modes within project-based education – the stakeholders. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 32, 345–368.
- Black, P.J. & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 5 (1) (1998), pp. 7–74
- Flores, M.A., Simão, A.M., Barros, A., & Pereira, D. (2014). Perceptions of effectiveness, fairness and feedback of assessment methods: a study in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079.2014.881348#.VMiZ4_7LdG4
- Grunwald, H. & Peterson, M.W. (2003). Factors That Promote Faculty Involvement in and Satisfaction with Institutional and Classroom Student Assessment. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(2), 173-204.
- Guskey, T. R. (2003). Using data to improve student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 60. (5).
- Harlen, W. (2005). Trusting teachers' judgment: research evidence of the reliability and validity of teachers' assessment used for summative purposes. *Research Papers in Education*, 20 (3).
- Haviland, D. & Turley, S. (2011). Changes over time in faculty attitudes, confidence, and understanding as related to program assessment. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 20 (1).
- Hutchings, P. (2010). Opening doors to faculty involvement in assessment (NILOA Occasional Paper No.4). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment.
- James, D. & Fleming, S. (2004) Agreement in student performance in assessment agreement in student performance in assessment. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(1).
- Joughin, G. (2007). Student conceptions of oral presentations. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(3). DOI:10.1080/03075070701346873.
- Ketelhut, D.J., Nelson, B., Schifter, C., & Kim, Y. (2013). Improving science assessments by situating them in a virtual environment. *Education Sciences*, 3(2), 172-192
- Luque, R.A. & Machuca, J. A. (2003). An empirical study of POM teaching in Spanish universities (II). *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 23(4).
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). *Classroom Assessment & Grading That Work*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- McCullough, C. A. & Jones, E. (2014). Creating a culture of faculty participation in assessment: factors that promote and impede satisfaction. *Journal of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness*, 5(1), 85-101.
- McDonald, B. & Boud, D. (2003). The impact of self-assessment on achievement: the effects of self-assessment training on performance in external examinations. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 10(2). DOI:10.1080/0969594032000121289
- MacDonald, S, K., Williams, L. M., Lazowski, R. A., Horst, S. J. & Barron. K. E. (2014). Faculty attitudes toward general education assessment: a qualitative study about their motivation. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, 9.
- Militello, M., Bass, L., Jackson, K.T., & Wang, Y. (2013). How data are used and misused in schools: perceptions from teachers and principals. *Education Sciences*, 3(2), 98-120.
- Mueller, J. (2014). *Authentic Assessment Tool Box*. <http://jfmuller.faculty.noctrl.edu/toolbox/whatisit.htm>
- Myers, C. B., Myers, S.M., Stewart, T. & Nynas, S. (2014). Institutional Policies on Assessment of Pedagogy and Faculty Classroom Practices: Evidence from 4-Year Colleges and Universities in the United States. *Higher Education Policy*. doi:10.1057/hep.2014.13
- Newble, D. I. & Jaeger, K. (2009). The effect of assessments and examinations on the learning of medical students. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.1983.tb00657.x
- O'Farrell, C. (2011). *Enhancing Student Learning through Assessment: A Toolkit Approach*.

- Öz, H. (2014). Turkish teachers practices of assessment for learning in the english as a foreign language classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(4), 775-785.
- Paris, D. (2012). *Quality assurance in higher education: A focus on student learning and learning outcomes*. Interview by Kathryn Dodge, Allison Griffin, and Elise Scanlon. Podcast. Radio HigheEd., 28 Mar. 2012. Web.
- Radbourne, J. (2002). *A case study of the Faculty of Business at Queensland University of Technology*.<http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/assessinglearning/02/immersing.html>
- Rao, S., Collins, H.L., & DiCarlo, S.E. (2002). Collaborative testing enhances student learning. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 26(1), 37-41. DOI: 10.1152/advan.00032.2001
- Scouller, K. (1998). The influence of assessment method on students' learning approaches: Multiple choice question examination versus assignment essay. *Higher Education*, 35 (4), 453-472.
- Serra, V. Q., Gómez, G. R., Sáiz, M.S. (2014). What are We Missing? Spanish Lecturers' Perceptions of Their Assessment Practices. *Innovations in Educations and Teaching International*.
- Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-276. doi: 10.3102/00346543068003249
- Western and Northern Canadian Protocol for Collaboration in Education. (2006). *Rethinking Classroom Assessment with Purpose in Mind: Assessment for Learning, Assessment as Learning, Assessment of Learning*.
- Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 37(1), 3-14. doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2011.03.001
- Wiliam, D., Lee, C, Harrison, C. & Black, P. (2004). Teachers developing assessment for learning: impact on student achievement, *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 11:1, 49-65, DOI: 10.1080/0969594042000208994
- Wilson, Steve (2001). Using peer- and self-assessment to engage with assessment criteria and learning outcomes: a case study from a course for lecturers. *Investigations in University Teaching and Learning*, 1(2).
- Zhang, Z., & Burry-Stock, J. A. (1994). *Assessment practices inventory*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama