Outcomes-based Education Assessment Practices of UEP Collegiate Faculty Members: Basis for a Training Design

ABSTRACT

It has been a lament of many educators that despite the mandate of the CHED, HEIs have not yet maximally embraced Outcomes-based Assessment (OBA). Educators are still experiencing confusion on the real OBA, hence, the difficulty in shifting from the traditional way of assessment to the real outcomes-based assessment. A descriptive research design was conducted to determine the assessment approaches utilized by UEP faculty members in terms of assessment for learning, assessment of learning, and assessment as learning; found out the perspectives of the respondents on the OBE framework; found out the different assessment tools used by the respondents; and identified the problems/concerns regarding assessment met by the respondents, data of which were used as inputs in the design of a training to enhance faculty members' assessment practices. The study utilized four-part survey instrument and employed means and percentages to analyze the data. The faculty members "very much practiced" assessment of learning and assessment for learning while they "much practice" assessment as learning. Majority of the respondents had correct perspectives in majority of the items on OBE. However, they had misconceptions on outcomes-based assessment as a norm-referenced kind of testing and that grading is done in every step of the way of the OBE curriculum. On the assessment tools, majority of the faculty members "always" practice the use of teacher-made tests, "often" use some performance based assessment while many alternative assessment format are seldom used. The specific problems encountered by the faculty members were categorized into three: limited facilities and materials, lack of knowledge on OBE and OBA, and, difficulty in the teaching-learning process. Problems met in implementing the Outcomes-based Education framework center on three areas: lack of basic knowledge of OBE and OBA, lack of facilities, and difficulty in the teaching-learning process. Based on the findings of the study, the researchers came up with a training design which will address the concerns of the respondents on assessment in the Outcomes-based Education Framework.

Keywords: *assessment; assessment practices; faculty members; outcomes-based*

I. INTRODUCTION

Quality education has been a battle cry of every higher education institutions (HEI) in the Philippines. The educational system has undergone radical changes to obtain quality education. The Commission on Higher Education mandated the higher education institution to enhance their quality assurance system through outcomes-based education.

Outcomes-based education (OBE) as advocated by the American sociologist William Spady is characterized by a comprehensive approach to organizing and operating an education system that is focused on and defined by the successful demonstrations of learning sought from each student (Spady 1994). Spady proposed that OBE transforms the educational paradigm from being an input-based to one that leans on learning outcomes – real world knowledge and skills students can understand and do as a result of learning.

Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) implies focusing and organizing an education system around what is essential for all learners to be able to succeed at the end of their learning experiences. This implies starting with a clear picture of what is important for learners to be able to do, then organizing curriculum, teaching, and assessment to make sure this learning ultimately happens. Hence, OBE is a learner-centered approach and an outcomes-oriented curriculum model (Malan, 2000).

OBE approach promotes the effective use and integration of various teaching and learning strategies by the educator, as well as the learners. The use of the OBE approach in a classrooms aims to develop learners' competency and the ability to use a particular subject in authentic situations (Schlebusch and Thobedi, 2005).

However, a shift to an OBE paradigm requires the alignment of the various components of the teaching-learning process, from the identification of the learning outcomes, to the choice of instructional strategies and resources, to the assessment of student learning. Outcomes-based assessment (OBA) offers a number of advantages to key stakeholders, including transparency of reporting alignment of teaching and curriculum goals, and sensitivity to individual needs (Brindley 2001). However, it has been a lament of many educators that despite the mandate of the CHED, HEIs have not yet maximally embraced OBA. Educators are still experiencing confusion on the real OBA, hence, the difficulty in shifting from the traditional way of assessment to the real outcomes-based assessment. Ramoroka (2007) underscored that if educators do not understand OBE, they cannot implement OBA correctly and effectively. Laguador and Dotong (2014) found that college educators have the least extent of understanding on the use of appropriate assessment. Dagdag and Cardona (2018) observed that some math educators are puzzled in constructively aligning the assessment to the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) which result to the nonalignment of assessment procedures to the ILOs.

Hence, there is a need to assess the practices of faculty members of the University of Eastern Philippines system to determine the level of awareness and implementation of assessment as an integral component of the teaching-learning process. The findings of the study would provide valuable inputs in the design of in-service trainings for the improvement of the assessment practices, which in the long run, will improve the implementation of the OBE framework in the university.

The study explored the perspectives of faculty members on outcomes – based assessment. Specifically, the study determined the assessment approaches utilized by the teachers; identified the frequency of use of the different assessment tools by the respondents; identified the problems/concerns regarding assessment met by the respondents; and designed a training to enhance faculty members' assessment practices.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted within the University of Eastern Philippines System. It involved 184 faculty members proportionally sampled through Slovin's formula from the 342 faculty members of the three campuses of the University system 30 0r 16% respondents from Laoang Campus; 14 or 8% from Catubig Campus; and 140 or 76% from UEP Main Campus. Employing the descriptive research design, the study utilized a four-part survey instrument to gather data. The first part determined the extent of practice of the respondents on assessment of learning, for learning, and as learning. Responses weighted mean were obtained and interpreted into 1.00-1.79 – Not Practiced (NP); 1.80-2.59 – Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.60-3.39 – Practiced (P); 3.40-4.19 – Much Practiced (MP); and 4.20-5.00 – Very Much Practiced (VMP). The second part determined the perspective of the respondents on some OBE assessment principles. The respondents determined whether the statements were true or false. Correct answers for each item were taken from various sources, particularly from Dagdag and Cardona (2018), Spady et al (2018), CHED handbook on Typology (2013). Mean was utilized to determine the average number of faculty in percent who correctly identified outcomes-based assessment. Items where faculty members had correct perspective and misconceptions were determined. The third part assessed the respondents' frequency of use of assessment tools. Responses were interpreted into A – Always, O – Often, So – Sometimes, S – Seldom, and N – Never. The mean of the items was derived and identified which among the different assessment tools were frequently used by the respondents. The fourth part is an open-ended question where the respondents wrote the most pressing problems they encountered in implementing OBE assessment. Statistical tools utilized in the study are percentages and means.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Assessment Approaches utilized by Faculty Members

Table 1.1 shows the assessment approaches used by faculty members in terms of "assessment of learning". The table further shows that the faculty members "very much practiced" the use of assessment to determine students' mastery of learning objectives and the effectiveness of instruction. They also "very much practiced" the use of assessment to prepare students for major examinations and to determine students' final grade. The lowest means in the table are on communicating classroom assessment results to school officials and conducting item analysis for teacher-made tests.

Assessment of learning is summative and done to provide evidence of a students' level of achievement in relation to curricular outcomes (de Guzman & Adamos 2015). As expected, faculty members employ the approach to a high extent since they practice the documentation of the over-all performance of students for the purpose of grading the student and seeing the extent of attainment of the learning outcomes set for the course. However, lower means were reflected on the teachers' conduct of test item analysis. The test item analysis is a technique to gauge the effectiveness of the construction of the items, particularly in a multiple choice format. But even in performance tasks, the result of the rubrics can be analyzed to determine the criterion where students may have difficulty in. This indicates that as a whole, item analysis is not regularly done particularly on summative assessment. Another item which registered a lower mean is communicating classroom assessment to parents and school officials. Unlike in the basic education, higher education institutions seldom have Parents-Teachers Association where

meetings can be done to share findings on the performance of students. In the case of school officials, summative assessment which are communicated to them are usually the results of Licensure/Board Examination which result can affect over-all administration of the institution.

Table 1.1 Assessment Approach in terms of Assessment of Learning

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I use assessment to determine whether my students have mastered the learning objectives.	4.53	Very Much Practiced
I use assessment to determine the effectiveness of my instruction.	4.49	Very Much Practiced
I give classroom assessment to prepare students for the major examinations.	4.46	Very Much Practiced
I use classroom assessment to determine student grade.	4.43	Very Much Practiced
I use assessment to formally document the students` growth in learning.	4.05	Much Practiced
I use assessment to provide information to parents about the performance of their children in school.	3.69	Much Practiced
I revise my test items based on item analysis results.	3.60	Much Practiced
I communicate classroom assessment results to school officials.	3.51	Much Practiced
I conduct item analysis (item difficulty or item discrimination) for my teacher-made tests.	3.51	Much Practiced
Weighted Mean	**4.03**	**Much Practiced**

Table 1.2 shows the assessment approaches used by faculty members in terms of "assessment for learning". The table further shows that generally, with a mean of 4.22, the faculty members "very much practiced" approaches along assessment of learning. It is shown that the highest mean of 4.48 corresponded to the teachers' use of assessment to help students improve their learning process and class performance. Out of the 11 indicators, 8 were "very much practiced".

Assessment for learning pertains to diagnostic and formative assessment tasks which are used to determine learning needs, monitor academic progress of students during a unit or block of instruction and guide instruction (de Guzman & Adamos 2015). Good enough, the faculty members practice approaches along assessment of learning to a great extent. Fook and Sidhu (2014) found out that students favored formative assessment over final examination and that they expressed a positive response to receiving more constructive feedback from lecturers to help them, learn better. Formative assessment offers a more individualized approach than summative assessment. Teachers use formative assessment to help students improve their learning process

and class performance. Through this approach, faculty members can follow up students' performance. However, lower means were reflected on the use of the formative assessment to decide on individual students and determining specific students' mistakes. This difficulty lies on the usual observation of teachers' bulk of teaching load where classes sometimes exceed the limits set by CHED. If teachers will focus on this aspect of assessment, they can have a harder time in meeting the demands of the other approaches to assessment. Another lower mean is on the use of formative assessment to group students for instruction purposes. Differentiated instruction has been emphasized in the past couple of years. Grouping students usually happen only in the giving of activities or learning tasks and not on planning how to differentiate instruction.

Table 1.2 Assessment Approach in terms of Assessment for Learning

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I use assessment to help students improve their learning process and class performance.	4.48	Very Much Practiced
I give classroom assessment to motivate students.	4.35	Very Much Practiced
I give classroom assessment to monitor students` learning progress.	4.32	Very Much Practiced
I use assessment to improve instruction for the next lesson	4.30	Very Much Practiced
I use assessment to rank students based on their class performance.	4.29	Very Much Practiced
I use assessment to diagnose strengths and weaknesses in my own teaching and instruction.	4.24	Very Much Practiced
I use assessment to create an environment where it is helpful for students to complete an assigned task.	4.23	Very Much Practiced
I use assessment to provide feedback to students as s/he progress through the course.	4.20	Very Much Practiced
I use assessment results for decision-making about an individual student.	4.11	Much Practiced
I determine why students make specific mistakes.	3.96	Much Practiced
I use assessment to group students for instruction purposes	3.90	Much Practiced
Weighted Mean	**4.22**	**Very Much Practiced**

Table 1.3 shows the assessment approaches used by faculty members in terms of "assessment as learning". The table further shows that generally, the faculty members "much practice" approaches along assessment of learning. It is shown that the highest mean of 4.19 corresponded to the teachers' use of assessment to guide students to set their goals and monitor their own learning progress. In monitoring the students' work, the use of assessment to help students recognize the specific aspect from which to improve their work is also practiced by the faculty members as seen in the mean of 4.18. The item with the lowest mean is the provision of written comments along with grades. All 11 indicators were "much practiced".

Assessment as learning employs tasks or activities that provide students with an opportunity to monitor and further their own learning, to think about their personal learning habits and how they can adjust their learning strategies to achieve their goals (de Guzman & Adamos 2015). Among the three approaches, assessment as learning had the lowest over-all mean, indicating that this approach is not the usual mindset of teachers when conducting assessment activities. The items included in assessment as learning covers the teachers' follow-up of students' learning in as much as personal learning goals are concerned. While this is not done to a high extent in most subjects, portfolios as assessment tasks provide answers to these concerns. In portfolio activities, students can be provided opportunities to reflect on their performance while seeing their growth in their respective subjects. Low means were reflected on the provision of written comments along with grades. This practice could not be done in the tertiary education setting since the report of grades do not have spaces for qualitative remarks.

Table 1.3 Assessment Approach in terms of Assessment as Learning

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
I use assessment to guide students to set their goals and monitor their own learning progress.	4.19	Much Practiced
I use assessment to help students in recognizing what aspects to their own work need to be improved.	4.18	Much Practiced
I use assessment to facilitate students to become independent learners.	4.12	Much Practiced
I give classroom assessment to make students accountable for their learning.	4.11	Much Practiced
I use assessment to allow students to discover their learning difficulties in class.	4.09	Much Practiced
I give assessment to determine how students can learn on their own in class.	4.08	Much Practiced
I use assessment to support students` independence in learning.	4.04	Much Practiced
I use assessment to assist students to identify means of getting personal feedback.	3.99	Much Practiced
I use assessment to provide examples of good self-assessment practice for students.	3.97	Much Practiced
I provide written comments along with grades.	3.49	Much Practiced
Weighted Mean	**4.03**	**Much Practiced**

Perspective of Faculty Members on Outcomes-based Assessment

Table 2 presents the percent of faculty members who correctly indicated their perspectives of outcomes-based assessment. Majority of the respondents had correct perspectives in items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. The respondents strongly agreed in the alignment of curriculum and assessment, the backward design of the curriculum and the flexibility of the curriculum components. They agree that assessment should not only be at the end of the learning period.

However, only a bit more than half agreed on public assessment to determine achievement of learning outcomes and changing student record when there is an improved learning.

Majority of the respondents had correct perspectives in six out of ten items. They had misconceptions that OBE is norm-referenced, similar to the study of Dagdag and Cardona (2018). OBE is not norm-referenced since the performance of an individual student is seen in how s/he attains the learning outcomes expected for him/her in the course, and not compared to the performance of the whole class. Spady, et al (2018) state that in the OBE paradigm, performance standards are to be criterion defined and universally applied to all students. The respondents had also misconceptions on permanently grading students every step of the way in all segments of the curriculum, similar to Dagdag and Cardona (2018). In the OBE, not all assessment tasks are graded. Formative assessments may be recorded, but these will not be used in gauging the final performance of students.

Table 2. Perspectives on Outcomes-based Assessment

In outcomes-based assessment, teachers……	**Expected Response**	**Percentage**					
		f	**% who got correct answer**	**f**	**% who got wrong answer**	**Total**	**%**
1. Align primarily the curriculum and assessment to the intended learning outcomes, not to the subject matter/content	True	**165**	**89.67**	19	10.33	184	100%
2. Employ a system of norm-referenced evaluation in determining the standing or performance level of a student in class.	False	20	10.87	**164**	**89.13**	184	100%
3. Use public assessment so that students know if they are able to achieve the intended learning outcomes	True	**98**	**53.26**	86	46.74	184	100%
4. Define the desirable end results and work backwards to identify the building blocks that learners must achieve to reach the end-outcomes.	True	**149**	**80.98**	35	19.02	184	100%
5. Treat curriculum, instruction, and assessment as alterable or flexible means to achieve	True	**155**	**84.24**	29	15.76	184	100%

the end goals of education							
6. Change the student record when there is an improved learning and performance that warrants it	True	**96**	**52.17**	88	47.83	184	100%
assess students learning only at the end of the learning period	False	119	64.67	**65**	**35.33**	184	100%
7. Use student achievement at the end of the learning period as the final result of all students prior learning, not the average of all the results of the students' activities.	True	**90**	**48.91**	94	51.09	184	100%
8. Test and permanently grades students every step of the way in all segments of curriculum.	False	38	20.65	**146**	**79.35**	184	100%
9. View that assessment of learner`s learning is separate from teaching and occurs entirely through testing.	False	77	41.85	**107**	**58.15**	184	100%

Frequency of use of Assessment Tools

Table 3 presents the frequency of use of various assessment tools by the faculty members. It is much noticeable that teacher-made written tests are "always" used by the faculty members. Faculty members "often" use oral questioning, written assessment or homework, group discussion/group work, performance-based examinations, oral presentations, essays, projects, observations, checklists/rating scales and portfolios. However, the lowest mean was on inventories, which is "sometimes" used by faculty members.

Teacher-made written tests are used to a high extent by the faculty members since these tests are easy to prepare, administer, and check, aside from the fact that teacher-made written tests are anchored on the particular assessment needs for a certain lesson. However, not all teacher-made written tests are appropriate for outcomes-based assessment. There are outcomes which call for performance or products, hence, written tests are not advisable. The tools that are more relevant to OBE assessment are the ones used by teachers in a bit lower extent. There is a need to explore the advantages and disadvantages of the other types of assessment tools to determine their viability and applicability to the subjects handled by faculty members.

Table 3. Frequency of use of Assessment Tools

Assessment Tools	Mean	Interpretation
Teacher-made written test	4.74	Always
Oral questioning	4.23	Often
Written assessment or homework	4.21	Often
Group discussion/group work	4.17	Often
Performance-based examinations	4.14	Often
Oral presentations	4.07	Often
Essays	3.99	Often
Projects	3.93	Often
Observations	3.91	Often
Checklists or rating scale	3.78	Often
Portfolios or work samples	3.76	Often
Peer assessment	3.36	Sometimes
Self-assessment	3.54	Sometimes
Conferencing or interviews	3.37	Sometimes
Simulations/Simulated examinations	3.33	Sometimes
Case study/Feasibility study/Research papers	3.30	Sometimes
Games	3.24	Sometimes
Term papers	3.17	Sometimes
Exemplars	3.15	Sometimes
Journals	3.11	Sometimes
Panel discussion	3.10	Sometimes
Graphic organizers	2.99	Sometimes
Round -table discussion	2.98	Sometimes
Departmentalized test	2.94	Sometimes
Learning contracts	2.93	Sometimes
Inventories	2.83	Sometimes

Problems met in implementing outcomes-based assessment

Table 4 shows the problems met by the faculty members in implementing outcomes-based assessment. The table shows that the problems met by the respondents can be grouped into three categories. The specific problems were categorized into three: lack of knowledge on OBE and OBA, lack of facilities and learning materials, and, difficulties in the teaching-learning process.

The problems met by faculty members were grouped into three: limited facilities and materials, lack of knowledge on OBE and OBA, and, difficulty in the teaching learning process. On the lack of basic knowledge of OBE and OBA, it is shown that there is a dire need to update faculty members' knowledge on the framework through seminars and other in-service activities. Seminars are usually held to orient faculty members on OBE but the coverage of the seminars just end on the general principles, and not on ideas that can be applied on specific learning areas. On the lack of facilities, faculty members have difficulty in maximizing their efforts to integrate OBE in teaching due to the unavailability of library materials and other important equipment and facilities. OBE entails performance/product assessment but may not be realized if there is a

constraint on the needed facilities. On the difficulty in the teaching-learning process, faculty members complain on the time constraints on meeting the specific targets of OBE. The OBE assessment is rigorous as it goes into the intricacies of the performance of a particular students, hence, with the scenario of bulky teaching loads with big number of students, OBE assessment can be taxing.

Table 4. Problems met in implementing Outcomes-based Assessment

Category of Problem	Specific Problematic Areas
Lack of basic knowledge on OBE and OBA	In-depth workshop on OBE assessment Hands-on training on TOS aligning to test question OB assessment tools on specific course Information dissemination Contradicts with the type of examination on the licensure exam Teacher`s skills in implementing OB assessment Rubrics Not knowledgeable in item analysis Lack of trainings or seminars No specific instructions on OBE Not clearly define what OBE
Lack of facilities and learning materials	Limited facilities and equipment Lack of laboratory apparatus/equipment/facilities Budget Lack of references Projector for the lecture Not ventilated room Lack of facilities in nursing arts laboratory No WIFI connections Provision of E-library Lack of books/journals Inappropriate facilities Unavailability of technical facilities IM resources No E-library Unavailability of updated reference Lack of instructional materials Lack of equipment/materials/supplies
Difficulties in the teaching-learning process	Student learning activities Teacher-student learning processes Grading system How to align class discussion with outcomes How to come up with class learning outcomes Problem solving activities

	□ Designing an OBE syllabus that cover OBE requirements which also ensures that all topics cover the board exam □ CHED requirements limited time to cover all the topics in the syllabus □ Initiatives of students □ Objectivity of the results □ Attitudes towards work □ Field trips □ Time constraints/time consuming □ Pressures due to goals □ Students lack of cognitive approach

Training design

Based on the findings of the study, the researchers came up with a training design which will address the concerns of the respondents on assessment in the Outcomes-based Education Framework. Presented in Table 5 are the details of the Training Design.

In response to the foregoing findings of the study, a training design was come up by the researchers. The topics in the training design were culled out from the findings of the approaches to assessment, assessment tools, and problems met in the implementation of OBE. The training design includes a rationale, the objectives, and data on the implementing unit, venue, duration, participants, modes of delivery, evaluation scheme, program matrix, funding, and resource persons.

As a whole, faculty members of the University system practice different approaches in line with assessment in learning. This indicates that the faculty members have different reasons in employing the different approaches of assessment. Though the faculty members have the right perspectives of the Outcomes Based Education framework, there are still misconceptions along the nature of assessment and the frequency of grading in an OBE set-up. Most of the assessment tools used by faculty members are the traditional assessment formats along with some performance based formats which are not used to a high extent. There are alternative formats which are not extensively used by the faculty members. The faculty members experience problems along the implementation of the OBE framework, where the most pressing are problems along the in-depth knowledge of the OBE framework, facilities and equipment, and difficulty in the teaching-learning process. This indicates that there is still a big room for work to fully embrace the OBE framework.

Along with these points, faculty members should be given more opportunities to learn about the intricacies of the Outcomes Based Education, particularly on assessment. The college administration, particularly the Deans and Department Chairs, should observe classes to validate the practices of the faculty members in the implementation of the OBE in the teaching-learning process.

Table 5. Training Design

Rationale	Assessment in learning is an integral component of the teaching-learning process. As such, the assessment process forms an essential component of the Outcomes-based Education framework espoused by higher education institutions. However, while it is recognized that assessment should be aligned constructively with the other

	components of the teaching-learning process like the curriculum content and the instructional strategies, faculty members still lack the desired competence to integrate appropriate assessment tools in instruction. Hence, the need for capability enhancement along this topic.
Objectives	At the end of the training-workshop, the faculty members are expected to: 1. be reoriented on the nature of Outcomes-Based Education and assessment on OBE framework; 2. be familiarized with the different approaches in assessment; 3. craft Table of Specifications and Item Analysis; 4. develop sample rubrics for their assessment tasks; and 5. identify assessment tools along the assessment tasks.
Implementing Unit	Office of the Director for Instruction, Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Program Venue	Farmers Training Center or UEP Kapihan
Program Duration	Two (2) days
Target Participants	Fifty (50) faculty members, five faculty members coming from each college in the main campus and the two external campuses, identified by the respective Deans/Campus Directors as to the dire need of the faculty members
Modes of Delivery	The two-day training-workshop will feature lectures on assessment concepts. In some of the topics, opportunities for workshops will be given. Open forum can be done after the delivery of every topic. Workshop outputs will be collected before certificates of training will be given. It is encouraged that participants bring with them samples of syllabus and mid-term or final test questions.
Evaluation	An evaluation instrument will be given to the participants to evaluate the seminar.
Seminar Matrix	

Day 1	
Morning Session	
7:00 – 8:30	Registration
8:30 – 9:00	Opening Program
9:00 – 10:00	What is Outcomes-based Education? What is Assessment like in the OBE Framework?
10:00 – 10:15	Health Break
10:15 – 12:00	Approaches in Assessment (AfL, AoL, AaL)
Lunch Break	
Afternoon Session	
1:00 – 1:15	Recapitulation of Morning Session
1:15 – 1:45	Table of Specifications
1:45 – 2:45	Workshop 1 (Table of Specifications)
2:45 – 3:15	Item Analysis

	3:15 – 3:30 3:30 – 4:30 4:30 – 5:00 Day 2 Morning Session 8:00 – 8:15 8:30 – 9:30 9:30 – 11:00 11:00 – 12:00 Lunch Break Afternoon Session 1:00 – 1:15 1:15 – 3:30 3:30 – 3:45 3:45 – 4:00 4:00 – 4:30	Health Break Workshop 2 (Item Analysis) Rubric Development Recapitulation of Day 1 Afternoon Workshop 3 (Rubrics Development) Types of Assessment in Outcomes-Based Education Workshop 4 (Aligning Assessment in the OBE Syllabus) Recapitulation of Day 2 Morning Session Presentation of Workshop Outputs Health Break Synthesis Closing Program
Fund Source	The training-workshop can be supported from Administration Funds. A college/campus may also adopt the training design as part of their College In-Service Training.	
Speakers	Dr. Ronato S. Ballado Campus Director, UEP Laoang Dr. Mae Joy T. Espinar Faculty, College of Education Dr. Leonila A. Longcop Faculty, College of Arts and Communication	

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

The faculty members of the UEP campuses practices different approaches in line with Assessment of Learning. They use assessment to determine students' mastery of learning objectives and to measure the effectiveness of their instructions. Likewise, they also assess to prepare students for their major examinations and to determine students' final grades. Seldom they conduct item analysis for their teacher-made tests. Similarly, they perform assessment along Assessment *for* Learning. They use these assessments to help students improve their learning process and class performance. They believe that through assessment, students will be motivated to participate and to perform well in class. Alongside Assessment *as* Learning, the faculty members regularly practice assessment to guide students to set their goals and monitor their own learning progress, and to help them recognize what aspects of their work needs to be improved.

In line with the respondents' perspective on Outcomes-based Assessment, they have misconceptions that Outcomes-Based Assessment is a norm-referenced. They are also wrong in thinking that the students are being rated/graded every step of the way in all segments of curriculum.

The most frequent assessment tools use by the respondents are teacher-made tests, oral questioning, written assessment or homework, group discussions or group works, performance-based examinations, oral presentations, essays, projects, observations, checklist, rating scales and portfolio. Though, the respondents sometimes use inventories.

Generally, the respondents experience problems in the implementation of outcomes-based assessment like lack of in-depth knowledge on OBE and OBA, limited facilities and equipment, and difficulty in the teaching-learning process, specifically aligning class discussion with outcomes.

LIMITATIONS

This research, however, is subject to several limitations that could be addressed in future researches. First, the four-part survey instruments adopted from Dagdag & Cardona, Spady et al, CHED Handbook on Typology were not subjected to pilot testing for the reason that the instruments were just adopted form valid sources. For future researches, it is suggested that a dry run of the instrument be done. Second, the frequently used assessment tool was just identified by the respondents themselves, they are therefore subject to biases and preconception. It is therefore suggested that an actual observation of the future researchers be done.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers are grateful for the cooperation of the faculty members of the three campuses who served as respondents of the study. Same gratitude is extended to the University administration for approving the conduct of the study.

References

Brindley, G. (2011) Outcomes-based assessment in practice: Some examples and emerging insights. Language Testing, 18:393, doi:10.1177/026553220101800405

CHED Implementation Handbook for Outcomes-based Education (OBE). (2013) Commission on Higher Education, Quezon City, Philippines.

Dagdag, J. D. and Cardona, R. S. (2018) Perspectives and practices on Outcomes-based assessment (OBA) among college mathematics educators in Northeastern Luzon, Philippines. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 6(2), 18-25

De Guzman, E. S. & Adamos, J. L. (2015) Assessment of Learning 1. Adriana Publishing Co., Inc.: Quezon City

Fook, C. Y. and Sidhu, G. K. (2014) Assessment practices in higher education in United States. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 123, 299-306

Laguador, J. M. and Dotong, C. I. (2014) Knowledge versus Practice on the Outcomes-based Education Implementation of the Engineering Faculty Members in LPU. International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 3(1), 63-74.

Malan, S. P. T. (2000). The 'new paradigm' of outcomes-based education in perspective. *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumer Sciences/Tydskrifvir Gesinsekologie en Verbruikerswetenskappe*, *28*(1).

Ramoroka, N. J. (2007) Educators' understanding of the premises underpinning outcomes-based education and its impact in their classroom practices. University of Pretoria. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/qHzQzQ

Schlebusch, G., & Thobedi, M. (2005). "Linking English First Additional Language teaching and learning with Outcomes-based Education: what is really happening?" *Journal for Language Teaching= TydskrifvirTaalonderrig*, *39*(2), p-306.

Spady, W., et al (2018) Beyond Outcomes Accreditation: Exploring the Power of 'Real' OBE Practices. Rex Bookstore: Manila

Spady, W. (1993) Choosing outcomes of significance. Educational Leadership, 51(6), 18-22

Spady, W. (1994) Outcome-based Education: Critical issues and answers. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. Retrieved [date] from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED380910.pdf