

Assessment Literacy of Secondary Teachers and Their Classroom Assessment Practices

Ariel S. Cabalida

Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

Abstract— Effective classroom assessment begins with teachers who not only understand assessment but can transform evidence of learning into purposeful instructional action. This study determined the assessment literacy of secondary school teachers and their classroom assessment practices in selected public secondary schools within the Schools Division of Zamboanga del Norte and examined the relationship between these variables. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was employed, using a researcher-made questionnaire to gather data on assessment literacy across six dimensions and classroom assessment practices across five dimensions. Mean, standard deviation, and Pearson product-moment correlation were used to analyze the data. Results revealed that the teachers were highly knowledgeable in assessment literacy, with particular strengths in the development of assessment tools and ethical assessment practices, while selection of assessment methods and scoring and interpretation were comparatively lower. Classroom assessment practices were likewise highly demonstrated, with formative assessment emerging as the strongest area and summative assessment as comparatively lower. A statistically significant positive relationship was established between assessment literacy and classroom assessment practices, indicating that stronger assessment knowledge was associated with stronger classroom application. The study concludes that assessment literacy serves as an important professional foundation for purposeful classroom assessment and informed instructional decision-making. Sustained professional development emphasizing assessment-method selection, scoring and interpretation, and the practical application of assessment knowledge is recommended to further strengthen teachers' assessment competence and classroom practices.

Keywords— assessment literacy, classroom assessment practices, formative assessment, instructional decision-making, secondary school teachers.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Classroom assessment is an integral component of teaching because it enables teachers to determine what students have learned, identify learning difficulties, provide meaningful feedback, and make appropriate instructional decisions. Effective assessment, however, requires more than the administration of tests; it requires assessment literacy, which encompasses teachers' knowledge and understanding of assessment principles, appropriate selection of assessment methods, development of assessment tools, scoring and interpretation of results, utilization of assessment information, and ethical assessment practices. Such knowledge is expected to inform teachers' actual classroom assessment practices, including assessment planning and alignment, formative and summative assessment, feedback and communication of results, and instructional decision-

making. Thus, assessment literacy and classroom assessment practices are closely connected, as teachers' knowledge of sound assessment provides a foundation for translating assessment principles into meaningful actions that support student learning. These dimensions correspond directly to the variables examined in the present study.

Recent literature has increasingly emphasized that teachers' assessment knowledge must be translated into appropriate classroom practices. Pastore (2023), in a systematic review of teacher assessment literacy research, identified assessment design, construction, scoring, interpretation, use of results, and communication as central components of teachers' assessment competence and further noted continuing challenges in transferring assessment knowledge into classroom practice. Yan and Pastore (2022) demonstrated that formative assessment literacy

encompasses conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional dimensions and reported an association between teachers' formative assessment literacy and their formative assessment practices. Atjonen et al. (2022) similarly emphasized the importance of teachers' assessment knowledge, conceptions, and learning in developing their capacity to use assessment effectively. Wiese and Nortvedt (2023) further showed that assessment literacy operates within actual classroom contexts, where teachers make decisions concerning assessment formats, adaptations, equity, and validity. In the Philippine context, the Department of Education (2021) also recognized the importance of strengthening teachers' assessment strategies, methods, and content knowledge through professional development intended to improve the alignment of classroom practices with contemporary assessment demands. Collectively, these findings underscore that sound assessment depends not only on teachers' knowledge of assessment but also on their capacity to apply that knowledge consistently in classroom practice.

Despite the recognized importance of assessment literacy, there remains a need to understand how teachers' assessment knowledge corresponds with their actual assessment practices within specific educational contexts. Existing research has demonstrated that assessment literacy is multidimensional and context-dependent and that teachers may encounter difficulty translating assessment knowledge into classroom application. Within selected public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Zamboanga del Norte, evidence is needed to determine teachers' assessment literacy alongside the assessment practices they actually report using in their classrooms. Examining both variables within the same group of secondary school teachers is particularly important because knowledge of assessment principles does not necessarily establish how consistently such knowledge is reflected in planning assessments, conducting formative and summative assessment, providing feedback, and making instructional decisions. The present investigation was therefore undertaken to provide context-specific evidence concerning these aspects of secondary classroom assessment.

Accordingly, this study aimed to determine the assessment literacy of secondary school teachers and their classroom assessment practices in selected public secondary schools within the Schools Division of Zamboanga del Norte. Specifically, it examined assessment literacy in terms of assessment principles, selection of assessment methods, development of assessment tools, scoring and interpretation of results, utilization of assessment results, and ethical assessment practices. It also investigated classroom assessment practices in terms of assessment planning and alignment, formative assessment, summative assessment, feedback and communication of results, and instructional decision-making, and determined whether a significant relationship existed between the two variables. The findings may provide an empirical basis for identifying areas requiring further support and for developing relevant professional development activities, training initiatives, and school- or division-based programs aimed at strengthening teachers' assessment competence and classroom assessment practices.

Theoretical Framework

This study was anchored on the Theory of Formative Assessment developed by Black and Wiliam (2009). The theory maintains that assessment becomes formative when evidence of student achievement is systematically elicited, interpreted, and used by teachers, learners, or peers to make better-informed decisions about subsequent teaching and learning. Rather than viewing assessment merely as a means of measuring achievement after instruction, the theory positions assessment as an integral component of the instructional process. Assessment information therefore becomes meaningful when it informs what teachers and students should do next to improve learning.

Central to the theory is a continuous process of establishing learning goals, determining students' current level of understanding, and deciding how the gap between current and intended learning can be addressed. This process involves clarifying learning intentions and success criteria, eliciting evidence of student understanding, interpreting that evidence, providing feedback that advances learning, and taking

appropriate follow-up action. Schildkamp et al. (2020) emphasized that formative assessment requires teachers to interpret evidence of student achievement and translate it into decisions concerning differentiation, instructional adjustment, readiness for subsequent content, and appropriate learning support. Similarly, Lui and Andrade (2022) explained that formative assessment generates information about students' current understanding that can guide subsequent instruction and learning, with feedback serving as an important mechanism through which assessment evidence becomes actionable. Thus, assessment is not formative simply because information is collected; its formative function depends on whether the information is interpreted and subsequently used to improve teaching and learning.

The principles of the Theory of Formative Assessment were applied in the present study through the connection between teachers' assessment literacy and their classroom assessment practices. Teachers' knowledge of assessment principles, appropriate methods, assessment-tool development, scoring and interpretation, utilization of results, and ethical practices represents the knowledge base necessary for obtaining and interpreting credible evidence of student learning. This knowledge is manifested in classroom practice when teachers align assessments with intended outcomes, conduct formative and summative assessments appropriately, communicate meaningful feedback, and use assessment evidence in making instructional decisions. Schildkamp et al. (2020) demonstrated that effective formative decision-making requires teachers to identify learning objectives, gather relevant evidence, interpret students' responses, provide feedback, and determine appropriate follow-up actions. In the context of the present study, assessment literacy therefore provides the knowledge necessary for teachers to engage purposefully in these assessment processes.

Empirical research further supports the principles underlying the theory. Kippers et al. (2023), in examining changes in formative assessment among secondary mathematics teachers following professional development, operationalized Black and Wiliam's framework through practices such as

clarifying learning intentions, eliciting evidence, providing feedback, and involving learners in the assessment process; their findings also demonstrated that merely increasing the number of formative activities did not automatically improve achievement, highlighting the importance of how such practices are implemented. Wolterinck-Broekhuis et al. (2024), studying students in secondary English and mathematics classrooms, found that learning intentions and evidence-elicitation activities were more frequently experienced than peer- and self-assessment, indicating that formative assessment strategies were not yet fully integrated into classroom practice and that teachers' knowledge and skills required further attention. In another classroom-based investigation, Kippers et al. (2018) showed that implementing formative assessment required teachers to collect information about students' knowledge and skills and use it to make decisions about subsequent instruction, placing substantial demands on teachers' assessment-related knowledge and decision-making. These studies collectively demonstrate that the effectiveness of formative assessment depends not merely on administering assessments but on teachers' capacity to interpret evidence and translate it into appropriate classroom actions.

The Theory of Formative Assessment therefore provided a logical foundation for explaining the relationship examined in this study. From the perspective of the theory, assessment literacy, the independent variable, represents teachers' capacity to understand assessment principles, select and develop appropriate measures, interpret evidence accurately, utilize results meaningfully, and observe ethical assessment standards. Classroom assessment practices, the dependent variable, represent the application of this capacity through assessment planning and alignment, formative and summative assessment, feedback and communication, and instructional decision-making. The theoretical process connecting the two lies in the transformation of assessment knowledge into the collection, interpretation, communication, and instructional use of evidence about student learning. Thus, Black and Wiliam's Theory of Formative Assessment provided the theoretical foundation for explaining how teachers'

assessment literacy may be associated with the quality and extent of their classroom assessment practices.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to determine the level of secondary school teachers' assessment literacy, the extent of their classroom assessment practices, and the relationship between these variables. The study was conducted among secondary school teachers from selected public secondary schools in the Schools Division of Zamboanga del Norte. Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire consisting of 55 indicators covering six dimensions of assessment literacy and five dimensions of classroom assessment practices, rated using four-point scales. The instrument underwent content validation by experts in education, assessment, and research, and their recommendations were incorporated before its administration. After securing approval from the appropriate school

authorities, the researcher coordinated with the school heads, obtained informed consent from the respondents, administered and retrieved the questionnaires, and organized the responses for statistical analysis. Ethical principles of voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymity, secure data handling, and accurate reporting were observed throughout the study. Mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of assessment literacy and extent of classroom assessment practices, while Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Pearson r) was used to determine the significance, strength, and direction of their relationship at the 0.05 level of significance. Mean scores of 3.26–4.00, 2.51–3.25, 1.76–2.50, and 1.00–1.75 were interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, Knowledgeable, Less Knowledgeable, and Not Knowledgeable for assessment literacy, and Always, Often, Sometimes, and Never for classroom assessment practices, respectively.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 1.1 Level of Assessment Literacy of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Assessment Principles

Indicators	SD	Mean
I am knowledgeable about the purposes of assessment in the teaching-learning process.	0.59	3.24
I am knowledgeable about the principles of validity and reliability in classroom assessment.	0.45	3.29
I am knowledgeable about the alignment of assessment tasks with intended learning competencies.	0.47	3.24
I am knowledgeable about the purposes and appropriate uses of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment.	0.63	3.33
I am knowledgeable about the principles for interpreting assessment evidence to determine student learning.	0.66	3.24
Aggregated Mean		3.27 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 1.1 presents the level of assessment literacy of secondary school teachers in terms of assessment principles. The results yielded an aggregated mean of 3.27, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, indicating a generally strong understanding of the fundamental principles underlying classroom assessment. Among the indicators, the highest mean was obtained for

knowledge of the purposes and appropriate uses of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.63$), followed by knowledge of validity and reliability in classroom assessment ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 0.45$). Meanwhile, knowledge of the purposes of assessment in the teaching-learning process ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.59$), alignment of assessment tasks with

intended learning competencies ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.47$), and principles for interpreting assessment evidence to determine student learning ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.66$) obtained the comparatively lowest and identical means, although all remained within the Knowledgeable range.

The findings indicate that the teachers possess a favorable level of assessment literacy regarding the principles that guide classroom assessment. Their strongest area lies in distinguishing the purposes and appropriate uses of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments, suggesting that they understand how different forms of assessment serve different functions across the instructional process. Their knowledge of validity and reliability further reflects awareness of the importance of obtaining credible and dependable evidence of student learning. Although the three lowest-rated indicators remained favorable, their means suggest that teachers are comparatively less confident in connecting the broader purposes of assessment, aligning assessment tasks with competencies, and interpreting assessment evidence. Thus, these aspects are understood but not

yet demonstrated at the very highest level of knowledge compared with their understanding of assessment types and measurement principles.

The finding is consistent with Pastore (2023), who identified assessment design, interpretation, use of results, and related assessment knowledge as central components of teacher assessment literacy while emphasizing that assessment competence comprises multiple interconnected areas. It also supports Asamoah et al. (2023), who found variations in teachers' understanding and application of classroom assessment principles, including validity, reliability, assessment design, scoring, and assessment use. The present result therefore implies that the teachers already possess a strong foundation in assessment principles that should be sustained, while professional learning may place additional emphasis on translating these principles into competency-aligned assessment tasks and accurate interpretation of assessment evidence. Strengthening these comparatively lower areas can help ensure that teachers' sound conceptual knowledge is consistently connected to meaningful assessment decisions in the classroom.

Table 1.2 Level of Assessment Literacy of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Selection of Assessment Methods

Indicators	SD	Mean
I am knowledgeable about selecting assessment methods appropriate to intended learning outcomes.	0.64	3.22
I am knowledgeable about matching assessment methods with the type of knowledge, skill, or competency being measured.	0.66	3.18
I am knowledgeable about determining when written, oral, performance-based, or other assessment methods are appropriate.	0.65	3.19
I am knowledgeable about selecting assessment methods appropriate to students' characteristics and learning needs.	0.67	3.27
I am knowledgeable about determining when multiple assessment methods are needed to obtain sufficient evidence of learning.	0.62	3.17
Aggregated Mean		3.21 (Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 1.2 presents the level of assessment literacy of secondary school teachers in terms of the selection of assessment methods. The aggregated mean of 3.21, interpreted as Knowledgeable, indicates that the teachers generally have adequate knowledge of

choosing assessment methods suited to different learning purposes. Among the indicators, selecting assessment methods appropriate to students' characteristics and learning needs obtained the highest mean of 3.27 ($SD = 0.67$), followed by selecting

methods appropriate to intended learning outcomes with a mean of 3.22 (SD = 0.64). Determining when written, oral, performance-based, or other assessment methods are appropriate obtained a mean of 3.19 (SD = 0.65), while matching assessment methods with the type of knowledge, skill, or competency being measured recorded a mean of 3.18 (SD = 0.66). The lowest mean of 3.17 (SD = 0.62) was obtained for determining when multiple assessment methods are needed to obtain sufficient evidence of learning. Thus, four indicators were rated Knowledgeable, while the highest-rated indicator reached the Highly Knowledgeable level.

The result indicates that the teachers possess a favorable level of knowledge in selecting assessment methods, although this area has not yet reached the highest level overall. Their strongest knowledge concerns adapting assessment methods to students' characteristics and learning needs, suggesting that learner differences are considered when determining appropriate ways of assessing learning. In contrast, the comparatively lowest result for determining when multiple assessment methods are necessary suggests that teachers are somewhat less certain about

combining different forms of assessment to obtain sufficient evidence of student learning. Nevertheless, the Knowledgeable rating shows that this competency is already established and can be further strengthened toward more comprehensive assessment decisions.

The finding is consistent with Rubeba and Kitula (2024), who found that secondary school teachers demonstrated relatively greater competence in selecting assessment methods appropriate for instructional decisions, while competencies differed across particular areas of assessment literacy. Umam et al. (2023) similarly emphasized that teachers need a sound understanding of assessment concepts to determine which methods appropriately measure different learning targets and generate meaningful evidence of learning. These findings imply that teachers' existing knowledge of learner-responsive assessment selection should be sustained while strengthening their ability to match and combine assessment methods according to the nature and complexity of the learning outcomes being measured. This can enable teachers to obtain more comprehensive and appropriate evidence of student learning.

Table 1.3 Level of Assessment Literacy of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Development of Assessment Tools

Indicators	SD	Mean
I am knowledgeable about constructing assessment items aligned with intended learning outcomes.	0.62	3.24
I am knowledgeable about writing clear and appropriate directions for assessment tasks.	0.57	3.39
I am knowledgeable about developing a table of specifications to ensure appropriate content coverage.	0.50	3.45
I am knowledgeable about constructing appropriate test items and performance-based tasks.	0.31	3.11
I am knowledgeable about developing scoring rubrics or criteria appropriate to assessment tasks.	0.48	3.35
Aggregated Mean		3.31 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 1.3 presents the level of assessment literacy of secondary school teachers in terms of the development of assessment tools. The aggregated mean of 3.31, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, indicates a

strong overall knowledge of developing tools for assessing student learning. Among the indicators, developing a table of specifications to ensure appropriate content coverage obtained the highest

mean of 3.45 (SD = 0.50), followed by writing clear and appropriate directions for assessment tasks with a mean of 3.39 (SD = 0.57). Developing scoring rubrics or criteria appropriate to assessment tasks recorded a mean of 3.35 (SD = 0.48), while constructing assessment items aligned with intended learning outcomes obtained a mean of 3.24 (SD = 0.62). The lowest mean of 3.11 (SD = 0.31) was recorded for constructing appropriate test items and performance-based tasks. Thus, three indicators were rated Highly Knowledgeable, while the remaining two were rated Knowledgeable.

The findings indicate that the teachers possess a strong knowledge base in developing assessment tools, particularly in systematically planning the content to be assessed. The highest rating for developing a table of specifications suggests that teachers are highly familiar with ensuring adequate content coverage and establishing a structured basis for assessment construction. Their high knowledge of writing directions and developing scoring criteria further indicates familiarity with essential components that promote clarity and consistency in assessment. In comparison, constructing appropriate test items and performance-based tasks received the lowest rating.

Although teachers remained Knowledgeable in this area, the result suggests that the more technical process of translating learning outcomes into well-constructed assessment tasks is comparatively less developed than their knowledge of assessment planning and scoring criteria.

The result is consistent with Alcazaren (2024), who emphasized that assessment literacy requires the integration of theoretical knowledge and practical assessment skills, particularly teachers' capacity to construct and administer appropriate measures of student learning. Pastore (2023) likewise identified assessment design and construction as important components of teachers' assessment competence. The findings therefore imply that the teachers' strong knowledge of assessment-tool development should be sustained, particularly in preparing tables of specifications, clear directions, and appropriate scoring criteria, while greater attention may be directed toward strengthening the construction of quality test items and performance-based tasks. This would further support the development of assessment tools that accurately represent intended learning outcomes and generate meaningful evidence of student achievement.

Table 1.4 Level of Assessment Literacy of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Scoring and Interpretation of Results

Indicators	SD	Mean
I am knowledgeable about applying appropriate scoring procedures for different types of assessment.	0.50	3.17
I am knowledgeable about applying scoring rubrics and criteria consistently when evaluating student performance.	0.52	3.17
I am knowledgeable about interpreting assessment scores using appropriate standards or criteria.	0.55	3.30
I am knowledgeable about identifying patterns of student strengths and learning difficulties from assessment results.	0.57	3.28
I am knowledgeable about drawing appropriate conclusions about student achievement based on assessment evidence.	0.52	3.33
Aggregated Mean		3.25 (Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 1.4 depicts the level of assessment literacy of secondary school teachers in terms of scoring and

interpretation of results. An aggregated mean of 3.25, interpreted as Knowledgeable, shows that the teachers

have adequate knowledge of scoring assessment outputs and deriving meaning from assessment evidence. Among the five indicators, drawing appropriate conclusions about student achievement based on assessment evidence registered the highest mean of 3.33 (SD = 0.52), followed by interpreting assessment scores using appropriate standards or criteria at 3.30 (SD = 0.55). Knowledge of identifying patterns of student strengths and learning difficulties from assessment results obtained a mean of 3.28 (SD = 0.57). Meanwhile, applying appropriate scoring procedures for different types of assessment and applying scoring rubrics and criteria consistently when evaluating student performance both recorded the lowest mean of 3.17, with standard deviations of 0.50 and 0.52, respectively. Three indicators reached the Highly Knowledgeable range, whereas the two indicators concerning the application of scoring procedures and criteria were rated Knowledgeable.

The pattern of responses reflects a stronger command of interpreting assessment evidence than of the procedural aspects of scoring. Teachers appear particularly capable of using assessment information to arrive at appropriate judgments about student achievement, as demonstrated by the highest-rated indicator. Their favorable ratings for interpreting scores and identifying patterns of strengths and learning difficulties further suggest that they can

derive meaningful information from assessment results. In comparison, the identical lower ratings for applying scoring procedures and consistently using rubrics or criteria point to an area where their knowledge is established but has not yet reached the very highest level. This distinction suggests that teachers are more confident in understanding what assessment results signify than in the technical procedures used to generate scores consistently across different forms of assessment.

This pattern corresponds with Brown et al. (2024), who emphasized the importance of teachers' capacity to interpret assessment information and use it meaningfully to support student learning. It also relates to Alonzo et al. (2021), whose work demonstrated that interpreting evidence of student thinking involves identifying patterns in performance and connecting such evidence to appropriate educational judgments. Given the favorable results, teachers' established ability to interpret assessment evidence should be maintained and reinforced, while professional learning may give greater attention to the consistent application of scoring procedures, rubrics, and established criteria. Strengthening this comparatively lower aspect can promote greater consistency between the scores assigned to student work and the conclusions subsequently drawn from those scores.

Table 1.5 Level of Assessment Literacy of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Utilization of Assessment Results

Indicators	SD	Mean
I am knowledgeable about using assessment results to identify students' learning needs.	0.55	3.35
I am knowledgeable about using assessment results to determine appropriate instructional responses.	0.59	3.32
I am knowledgeable about using assessment information to determine appropriate remediation and enrichment.	0.64	3.31
I am knowledgeable about using assessment results to monitor student learning progress over time.	0.65	3.25
I am knowledgeable about using assessment evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction.	0.68	3.25
Aggregated Mean		3.30 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 1.5 illustrates the level of assessment literacy of secondary school teachers in terms of the utilization of assessment results. The aggregated mean of 3.30, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, reflects a strong overall understanding of how assessment information can be used to support teaching and student learning. Specifically, using assessment results to identify students' learning needs attained the highest mean of 3.35 (SD = 0.55), followed by using results to determine appropriate instructional responses at 3.32 (SD = 0.59). Using assessment information to determine appropriate remediation and enrichment registered a mean of 3.31 (SD = 0.64). Meanwhile, using assessment results to monitor student learning progress over time and using assessment evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction both obtained the comparatively lowest mean of 3.25, with standard deviations of 0.65 and 0.68, respectively. Three indicators were therefore rated Highly Knowledgeable, while the remaining two fell within the Knowledgeable range.

These results demonstrate that teachers are particularly well-equipped to use assessment evidence for immediate responses to students' learning needs. The highest rating suggests that teachers recognize assessment as an important means of identifying areas in which students require further support. Their similarly high knowledge of determining instructional responses, remediation, and enrichment further reflects an understanding that assessment information

should lead to appropriate action rather than serve merely as a basis for assigning grades. Comparatively, the lower ratings for monitoring learning progress over time and evaluating instructional effectiveness suggest that teachers are somewhat less confident in using assessment evidence for longer-term monitoring and reflection on their own instruction. Nevertheless, these areas remain favorable, indicating established knowledge that can be further reinforced rather than fundamental weaknesses.

This result aligns with Malabo (2024), who reported generally satisfactory assessment literacy among basic education teachers but identified data literacy as a comparatively less developed area, demonstrating that competence in using assessment information may vary according to its specific purpose.

Alonzo et al. (2021) likewise emphasized that assessment evidence becomes instructionally meaningful when teachers interpret information about student learning and use it to determine subsequent instructional responses. The current result therefore underscores the value of sustaining teachers' strong knowledge of using assessment results to identify learning needs and determine immediate instructional responses, while further strengthening the use of assessment evidence for tracking progress across time and evaluating the effectiveness of instruction. This would support a more continuous use of assessment information throughout the teaching-learning process.

Table 1.6 Level of Assessment Literacy of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Ethical Assessment Practices

Indicators	SD	Mean
I am knowledgeable about maintaining the confidentiality of students' assessment information.	0.68	3.33
I am knowledgeable about applying assessment criteria fairly and consistently to all students.	0.57	3.35
I am knowledgeable about recognizing and minimizing potential sources of bias in assessment.	0.70	3.28
I am knowledgeable about communicating assessment criteria and expectations clearly to students.	0.72	3.25
I am knowledgeable about observing ethical standards in recording, reporting, and communicating assessment results.	0.69	3.34
Aggregated Mean		3.31 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 1.6 summarizes the level of assessment literacy of secondary school teachers in terms of ethical assessment practices. The aggregated mean of 3.31, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, reflects a strong awareness of the ethical principles that should govern the assessment of student learning. Among the indicators, knowledge of applying assessment criteria fairly and consistently to all students attained the highest mean of 3.35 (SD = 0.57), followed by observing ethical standards in recording, reporting, and communicating assessment results at 3.34 (SD = 0.69). Maintaining the confidentiality of students' assessment information registered a mean of 3.33 (SD = 0.68), while recognizing and minimizing potential sources of bias in assessment obtained 3.28 (SD = 0.70). The comparatively lowest mean of 3.25 (SD = 0.72) was recorded for communicating assessment criteria and expectations clearly to students. Four indicators were rated Highly Knowledgeable, whereas the lowest-rated indicator remained within the Knowledgeable range.

The pattern reflects a well-established understanding of fairness, integrity, and responsible handling of assessment information among the teachers. Their strongest knowledge of applying criteria fairly and consistently suggests that equitable treatment of students is firmly recognized as an essential consideration in assessment. The similarly favorable

ratings for ethical reporting, confidentiality, and minimizing bias reinforce their awareness of professional responsibilities when evaluating and communicating student performance. In comparison, communicating assessment criteria and expectations received the lowest rating. Although still favorable, this suggests that transparency with students regarding how their work will be judged is comparatively less established than the other ethical dimensions. Clear communication of criteria is particularly important because it enables students to understand expectations and the basis upon which their performance is evaluated.

This pattern corresponds with Pastore (2023), who emphasized that contemporary assessment literacy extends beyond technical measurement skills to include the contextual and social dimensions of assessment, thereby recognizing fairness and ethical judgment as integral components of teachers' assessment competence. The result therefore calls for preserving teachers' strong awareness of fairness, confidentiality, bias reduction, and ethical reporting while giving additional attention to transparency in communicating assessment criteria and expectations. Sustaining these ethical competencies can help ensure that classroom assessment remains fair, consistent, understandable, and professionally responsible for all learners.

Table 2 Summary of the Level of Assessment Literacy of Secondary School Teachers

Variables	Mean	Interpretation
Assessment Principles	3.27	Highly Knowledgeable
Selection of Assessment Methods	3.21	Knowledgeable
Development of Assessment Tools	3.31	Highly Knowledgeable
Scoring and Interpretation of Results	3.25	Knowledgeable
Utilization of Assessment Results	3.30	Highly Knowledgeable
Ethical Assessment Practices	3.31	Highly Knowledgeable
Aggregated Mean	3.27	Highly Knowledgeable

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 2 provides an overall view of the assessment literacy of secondary school teachers across the six dimensions examined. The aggregated mean of 3.27, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, establishes that the teachers possess a strong overall knowledge of

classroom assessment. Development of assessment tools and ethical assessment practices jointly obtained the highest mean of 3.31, followed closely by utilization of assessment results at 3.30 and assessment principles at 3.27; all four dimensions were rated

Highly Knowledgeable. Meanwhile, scoring and interpretation of results obtained a mean of 3.25, while selection of assessment methods registered the lowest mean of 3.21, with both dimensions interpreted as Knowledgeable.

Viewed collectively, the results portray teachers as having a broad and favorable assessment knowledge base, with particular strength in developing assessment tools and observing ethical standards in assessment. Their high knowledge of utilizing results and fundamental assessment principles further demonstrates that their competence extends from understanding assessment concepts to recognizing how assessment evidence can inform teaching and learning. However, the comparatively lower ratings for scoring and interpretation and the selection of assessment methods reveal that these areas are not yet at the same level as the other dimensions. This does not diminish the favorable overall result; instead, it identifies specific competencies where teachers' established knowledge can be further reinforced, particularly in choosing suitable methods for different

learning targets and applying appropriate procedures when scoring and interpreting student performance.

The overall pattern is consistent with Pastore (2023), who characterized teacher assessment literacy as a multidimensional competence encompassing assessment design, construction, scoring, interpretation, use of results, and communication rather than a single body of knowledge. It also parallels Malabo (2024), whose Philippine investigation demonstrated that teachers' overall assessment literacy may be favorable while competence varies across particular assessment dimensions. The result therefore implies that the teachers' high overall assessment literacy should be sustained, particularly their strengths in assessment-tool development, ethical practice, utilization of results, and assessment principles. At the same time, focused professional learning on assessment-method selection and scoring and interpretation may help bring these comparatively lower areas closer to the level demonstrated in the teachers' strongest assessment competencies.

Table 3.1 *Extent of Classroom Assessment Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Assessment Planning and Alignment*

Indicators	SD	Mean
I identify the intended learning outcomes before preparing an assessment.	0.56	3.43
I align assessment activities with the competencies taught in class.	0.55	3.32
I select assessment methods appropriate to the type of learning outcome being measured.	0.53	3.36
I establish criteria for evaluating student performance before administering an assessment.	0.59	3.35
I use varied assessment approaches according to the intended learning outcomes.	0.60	3.26
Aggregated Mean		3.34 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable

Table 3.1 outlines the extent of classroom assessment practices of secondary school teachers in terms of assessment planning and alignment. The aggregated mean of 3.34, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, denotes a favorable level of assessment planning and alignment among the teachers. Identifying the intended learning outcomes before preparing an

assessment obtained the highest mean of 3.43 (SD = 0.56), followed by selecting assessment methods appropriate to the type of learning outcome being measured at 3.36 (SD = 0.53). Establishing criteria for evaluating student performance before administering an assessment registered a mean of 3.35 (SD = 0.59), while aligning assessment activities with the

competencies taught in class obtained 3.32 (SD = 0.55). Lastly, using varied assessment approaches according to the intended learning outcomes recorded the comparatively lowest mean of 3.26 (SD = 0.60). All five indicators were classified as Highly Knowledgeable.

The responses underscore the teachers' strong engagement in purposeful assessment planning, particularly in establishing learning outcomes before constructing assessments. The highest-rated indicator suggests that intended outcomes serve as an important reference point when teachers prepare assessment activities. Their favorable ratings for selecting suitable methods, establishing evaluation criteria, and aligning assessment activities with classroom competencies further reflect coherence between instruction and assessment. Although the use of varied assessment approaches obtained the lowest mean, it remained within the Highly Knowledgeable range, indicating

that this aspect is also favorably manifested but comparatively less pronounced than the other planning and alignment practices.

This pattern is supported by Asamoah et al. (2023), who emphasized that effective classroom assessment entails purposeful alignment among learning objectives, instructional activities, and assessment approaches. Their findings highlight the importance of selecting assessment methods capable of generating appropriate evidence of intended learning.

The current results therefore suggest that teachers should sustain their strong assessment planning and alignment practices while further diversifying the approaches used to assess different learning outcomes. Greater variety in assessment can complement their established planning practices and provide broader opportunities for students to demonstrate their learning.

Table 3.2 Extent of Classroom Assessment Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Formative Assessment

Indicators	SD	Mean
I assess students' understanding while instruction is in progress.	0.57	3.38
I use questioning techniques to check students' understanding during lessons.	0.54	3.37
I use formative assessment activities to identify learning difficulties before proceeding to new content.	0.54	3.34
I adjust my instruction based on evidence obtained from formative assessment.	0.56	3.34
I provide opportunities for students to improve their work based on formative feedback.	0.59	3.32
Aggregated Mean		3.35 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 3.2 describes the extent of classroom assessment practices of secondary school teachers in terms of formative assessment. The aggregated mean of 3.35, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, reflects a favorable level of formative assessment practice among the teachers. Assessing students' understanding while instruction is in progress obtained the highest mean of 3.38 (SD = 0.57), closely followed by using questioning techniques to check students'

understanding during lessons at 3.37 (SD = 0.54). Both using formative assessment activities to identify learning difficulties before proceeding to new content and adjusting instruction based on evidence obtained from formative assessment registered a mean of 3.34, with standard deviations of 0.54 and 0.56, respectively. Meanwhile, providing opportunities for students to improve their work based on formative feedback recorded the comparatively lowest mean of

3.32 (SD = 0.59). All five indicators were classified as Highly Knowledgeable.

Taken together, the responses reflect the teachers' active integration of formative assessment into the instructional process, particularly in checking students' understanding as learning takes place. The highest ratings for assessing understanding during instruction and using questioning techniques suggest that teachers place considerable emphasis on obtaining immediate evidence of learning. Their favorable responses concerning the identification of learning difficulties and adjustment of instruction further demonstrate that formative information is incorporated into instructional decisions. Although providing opportunities for students to improve their work based on feedback ranked lowest, its Highly Knowledgeable rating remains positive. This suggests that opportunities for students to act on formative feedback are evident but comparatively less

pronounced than teachers' practices of eliciting and responding to evidence of understanding.

The result is consistent with Yan and Pastore (2022), who emphasized that formative assessment literacy involves eliciting evidence of student learning, interpreting that evidence, and taking appropriate actions to advance learning. Kang and Lam (2024) similarly highlighted the importance of teachers' formative assessment competence in gathering evidence during instruction and using it to guide subsequent teaching and learning. The results therefore reinforce the value of maintaining teachers' strong practices in checking understanding, identifying learning difficulties, and adapting instruction, while providing more opportunities for students to use formative feedback in revising or improving their work. This can further strengthen the role of formative assessment as an ongoing process that actively supports learning rather than merely identifies students' current level of understanding.

Table 3.3 Extent of Classroom Assessment Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Summative Assessment

Indicators	SD	Mean
I administer summative assessments after completing a unit or specified period of instruction.	0.59	3.40
I ensure that summative assessments adequately cover the intended learning competencies.	0.55	3.26
I use appropriate assessment methods to determine students' achievement of learning outcomes.	0.60	3.21
I apply established scoring criteria when evaluating summative assessment outputs.	0.63	3.26
I use summative assessment results to determine students' level of achievement at the end of instruction.	0.60	3.31
Aggregated Mean		3.29 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable

Table 3.3 highlights the extent of classroom assessment practices of secondary school teachers in terms of summative assessment. The aggregated mean of 3.29, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, reflects a favorable level of summative assessment practice among the teachers. Administering summative assessments after completing a unit or specified period

of instruction yielded the highest mean of 3.40 (SD = 0.59), followed by using summative assessment results to determine students' level of achievement at the end of instruction at 3.31 (SD = 0.60). Both ensuring adequate coverage of intended learning competencies and applying established scoring criteria when evaluating summative assessment outputs obtained a

mean of 3.26, with standard deviations of 0.55 and 0.63, respectively. In contrast, using appropriate assessment methods to determine students' achievement of learning outcomes registered the lowest mean of 3.21 (SD = 0.60). Four indicators were classified as Highly Knowledgeable, while the lowest-rated indicator fell within the Knowledgeable range.

The distribution of responses suggests that summative assessment is firmly incorporated at appropriate points in the instructional cycle. Teachers appear particularly consistent in administering assessments after completing a unit or instructional period and in using the resulting evidence to determine students' achievement. Their favorable ratings for competency coverage and established scoring criteria also reflect attention to the content and evaluation of summative assessments. However, the comparatively lower rating for selecting appropriate methods to measure achievement suggests that teachers may be more established in the administration and use of summative assessments than in determining which assessment format best captures particular learning outcomes. Despite being the lowest, the Knowledgeable rating

confirms that this competency remains adequately developed.

This pattern relates to Asamoah et al. (2023), who emphasized that effective classroom assessment requires teachers to align assessment approaches with intended learning objectives and select methods capable of producing appropriate evidence of achievement. Their findings reinforce the importance of purposeful assessment selection alongside the administration and interpretation of assessment results.

The current results therefore point to the need to preserve teachers' established summative assessment practices while further strengthening their selection of assessment methods according to the learning outcomes being measured.

Greater attention to this aspect can help ensure that end-of-instruction judgments are supported not only by properly timed assessments but also by assessment methods that accurately capture the competencies students are expected to demonstrate.

Table 3.4 Extent of Classroom Assessment Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Feedback and Communication of Results

Indicators	SD	Mean
I provide students with timely feedback on their assessment performance.	0.63	3.37
I explain students' strengths and areas that need improvement.	0.64	3.35
I communicate assessment results in a clear and understandable manner.	0.63	3.32
I discuss assessment criteria with students so they understand how their work is evaluated.	0.61	3.35
I provide constructive suggestions that help students improve their subsequent performance.	0.60	3.33
Aggregated Mean		3.34 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable

Table 3.4 captures the extent of classroom assessment practices of secondary school teachers in terms of feedback and communication of results. The aggregated mean of 3.34, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, reflects a favorable level of practice in communicating assessment information and providing feedback to students. Providing students with timely feedback on their assessment performance

obtained the highest mean of 3.37 (SD = 0.63). This was followed by both explaining students' strengths and areas that need improvement at 3.35 (SD = 0.64) and discussing assessment criteria with students so they understand how their work is evaluated at 3.35 (SD = 0.61). Providing constructive suggestions that help students improve subsequent performance registered a mean of 3.33 (SD = 0.60), while

communicating assessment results in a clear and understandable manner recorded the comparatively lowest mean of 3.32 (SD = 0.63). All five indicators were classified as Highly Knowledgeable.

The responses point to feedback as an integral component of the teachers' classroom assessment practices. The strongest emphasis on timely feedback suggests that teachers recognize the importance of returning assessment information while it remains relevant to students' learning. Their similarly favorable practices in explaining strengths and areas for improvement, discussing assessment criteria, and offering constructive suggestions further show that feedback extends beyond simply reporting scores. Although clear and understandable communication of assessment results ranked lowest, its Highly Knowledgeable rating remains favorable. The comparatively lower result suggests that clarity in communicating assessment outcomes may receive slightly less emphasis than the timeliness and

developmental aspects of feedback, despite being consistently evident in teachers' practices.

The result finds support in Pitt and Winstone (2023), who emphasized that effective feedback requires more than the transmission of information and should enable learners to understand and use feedback productively. To et al. (2023) likewise highlighted the value of learner-centered feedback practices that move beyond identifying errors toward helping students understand their performance and take meaningful action for improvement.

The results consequently reinforce the importance of sustaining timely, constructive, and criteria-based feedback while further enhancing the clarity with which assessment results are communicated to students. Strengthening this aspect can help students better understand their current performance, recognize what needs improvement, and translate assessment feedback into subsequent learning actions.

Table 3.5 *Extent of Classroom Assessment Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Terms of Instructional Decision-Making*

Indicators	SD	Mean
I use assessment results to identify concepts that require additional instruction.	0.54	3.37
I modify teaching strategies when assessment results indicate learning difficulties.	0.52	3.32
I provide remediation to students who have not achieved the intended learning outcomes.	0.48	3.30
I provide enrichment activities to students who demonstrate mastery of the intended learning outcomes.	0.54	3.27
I use patterns in assessment results when planning subsequent lessons and learning activities.	0.56	3.28
Aggregated Mean		3.31 (Highly Knowledgeable)

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 3.5 portrays the extent of classroom assessment practices of secondary school teachers in terms of instructional decision-making. The aggregated mean of 3.31, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, reflects a favorable level of using assessment information to guide instructional actions. Among the indicators, using assessment results to identify concepts that

require additional instruction obtained the highest mean of 3.37 (SD = 0.54), followed by modifying teaching strategies when assessment results indicate learning difficulties at 3.32 (SD = 0.52). Providing remediation to students who have not achieved the intended learning outcomes registered a mean of 3.30 (SD = 0.48), while using patterns in assessment results

when planning subsequent lessons and learning activities obtained 3.28 (SD = 0.56). The comparatively lowest mean of 3.27 (SD = 0.54) was recorded for providing enrichment activities to students who demonstrate mastery of the intended learning outcomes. All five indicators were classified as Highly Knowledgeable.

The responses demonstrate that assessment information plays a meaningful role in shaping teachers' subsequent instructional decisions. The strongest practice involves identifying concepts that require additional instruction, suggesting that teachers use assessment evidence primarily to locate areas where students need further support. Their favorable practices of modifying teaching strategies and providing remediation further show responsiveness to identified learning difficulties. At the same time, teachers also use patterns in assessment results for subsequent lesson planning. Although enrichment for students who have already demonstrated mastery received the lowest mean, the rating remains favorable. This pattern suggests that assessment-driven decisions tend to emphasize addressing

learning difficulties slightly more than extending learning opportunities for students who have already achieved the expected outcomes.

The result is supported by Alonzo et al. (2022), who emphasized that teachers' ability to interpret assessment evidence is essential to making informed pedagogical decisions and determining appropriate instructional responses.

Their work reinforces the role of assessment as a basis for adapting teaching according to evidence of student learning.

The results therefore underscore the importance of continuing the use of assessment evidence to identify instructional needs, modify teaching strategies, and provide remediation, while giving greater attention to enrichment opportunities for students who demonstrate mastery. Balancing remediation and enrichment can enable assessment-informed decision-making to respond not only to students who require additional support but also to those who are ready for more advanced learning experiences.

Table 4. Summary of the Extent of Classroom Assessment Practices of Secondary School Teachers

Variables	Mean	Interpretation
Assessment Planning and Alignment	3.34	Highly Knowledgeable
Formative Assessment	3.35	Highly Knowledgeable
Summative Assessment	3.29	Highly Knowledgeable
Feedback and Communication of Results	3.34	Highly Knowledgeable
Instructional Decision-Making	3.31	Highly Knowledgeable
Aggregated Mean	3.33	Highly Knowledgeable

Scale: 3.26–4.00 = Highly Knowledgeable; 2.51–3.25 = Knowledgeable; 1.76–2.50 = Less Knowledgeable; 1.00–1.75 = Not Knowledgeable.

Table 4 summarizes the extent of classroom assessment practices of secondary school teachers across the five dimensions examined. The aggregated mean of 3.33, interpreted as Highly Knowledgeable, reflects a consistently favorable level of classroom assessment practice. Among the dimensions, formative assessment obtained the highest mean of 3.35, followed by both assessment planning and alignment and feedback and communication of results at 3.34. Instructional decision-making registered a mean of 3.31, while summative assessment obtained the comparatively lowest mean of 3.29. Despite these

slight variations, all five dimensions were classified as Highly Knowledgeable, demonstrating favorable results across the entire range of classroom assessment practices.

Considered as a whole, the results depict classroom assessment as an established component of the teachers' instructional practice, encompassing activities before, during, and after instruction. The highest mean for formative assessment suggests particular emphasis on gathering evidence of student understanding while learning is taking place and using

such information to support instruction. The equally favorable results for planning and alignment and feedback and communication further demonstrate that assessment is connected to intended outcomes and communicated meaningfully to students. Although summative assessment ranked comparatively lowest, its Highly Knowledgeable rating indicates that it remains strongly manifested. The narrow range of means across all dimensions also suggests a generally balanced application of assessment practices rather than a pronounced concentration in only one area.

This overall pattern is consistent with Yan and Pastore (2022), who emphasized that effective assessment competence involves gathering and interpreting

evidence of learning and using that evidence to support subsequent actions. Asamoah et al. (2023) likewise underscored the interconnected nature of assessment planning, method selection, evidence gathering, and instructional use within classroom assessment.

The results therefore emphasize the importance of sustaining the teachers' favorable practices across all five dimensions while further refining summative assessment as the comparatively lower area. Maintaining this balanced approach can support an assessment process in which planning, formative and summative assessment, feedback, and instructional decisions function together to promote meaningful evidence of student learning.

Table 5. *Test of Significant Relationship between Assessment Literacy and Classroom Assessment Practices of Secondary School Teachers*

Test Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p value	Decision
Assessment Literacy and Classroom Assessment Practices	0.624	< 0.001	Reject the H0

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, there is a significant relationship.

Table 5 reports the relationship between the assessment literacy and classroom assessment practices of secondary school teachers. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.624 with a p-value of < 0.001. Since the p-value is lower than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus, there is a statistically significant positive relationship between teachers' assessment literacy and their classroom assessment practices. The positive coefficient further indicates that higher levels of assessment literacy are associated with stronger classroom assessment practices.

The result demonstrates a meaningful connection between what teachers know about assessment and how they carry out assessment in the classroom. Teachers with greater knowledge of assessment principles, method selection, tool development, scoring and interpretation, utilization of results, and ethical practices tend to demonstrate stronger practices in assessment planning, formative and summative assessment, feedback, and instructional decision-making. This relationship highlights the practical relevance of assessment literacy because teachers' knowledge is associated with how assessment is

implemented throughout the instructional process. However, the result establishes an association rather than a causal relationship; it does not by itself demonstrate that higher assessment literacy directly causes stronger classroom assessment practices.

This result is consistent with Yan and Pastore (2022), who emphasized that teachers' assessment literacy encompasses the knowledge and competencies necessary to effectively implement formative assessment processes.

Brown et al. (2024) similarly underscored the connection between teachers' assessment knowledge and their capacity to interpret and use assessment information within classroom practice. The significant relationship therefore implies that strengthening teachers' assessment literacy may be an important component of professional development aimed at supporting effective classroom assessment practices. Professional learning can integrate assessment knowledge with practical application so that teachers are better equipped to translate assessment principles into purposeful and responsive classroom practices.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The study concludes that secondary school teachers possess a strong foundation in assessment literacy that is meaningfully reflected in their classroom assessment practices. Their assessment knowledge enables them to plan assessments, monitor learning, provide feedback, evaluate achievement, and make informed instructional decisions. Moreover, the significant positive relationship between assessment literacy and classroom assessment practices establishes that stronger assessment knowledge is associated with more developed classroom application. Thus, assessment literacy serves as an important professional foundation for ensuring purposeful, appropriate, and instructionally useful classroom assessment.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, school administrators and Schools Division officials are encouraged to provide sustained professional development, workshops, and learning action cells that strengthen teachers' competencies, particularly in assessment-method selection, scoring, and interpretation, while reinforcing established assessment strengths. Secondary school teachers may further enhance their competence by aligning assessment methods with learning outcomes, applying appropriate scoring procedures, and using assessment results for remediation and enrichment. Students may be encouraged to understand assessment criteria, use feedback constructively, and participate actively in activities responsive to their learning needs. Future researchers may extend the investigation to other schools, divisions, subject areas, or educational levels and employ observations, interviews, or mixed-method approaches to provide broader evidence on assessment literacy and classroom assessment practices.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alcazaren, H. K. G. (2024). Developing language assessment literacy of filipino pre-service teachers: reflections from a language assessment course. *TEFLIN Journal*, 35(2), 216-231.
- [2] Alonzo, A. C. (2021). Learning progressions as models and tools for supporting classroom assessment.
- [3] Asamoah, D., Shahrill, M., & Abdul Latif, S. N. (2023). Towards developing classroom assessment literacy: Exploring teachers' approaches to assessment across cultures. *Cogent Education*, 10(2), 2280301.
- [4] Atjonen, P., Pöntinen, S., Kontkanen, S., & Ruotsalainen, P. (2022, July). In enhancing preservice teachers' assessment literacy: Focus on knowledge base, conceptions of assessment, and teacher learning. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 7, p. 891391). Frontiers Media SA.
- [5] Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31.
- [6] Brown, T. D., Barnes, M., & Finefter-Rosenbluh, I. (2024). Teacher perspectives and experiences of assessment literacy in Victorian junior secondary schools. *Australian Journal of Education*, 68(1), 5-22.
- [7] Department of Education. (2021). DepEd launches the Professional Development Program on Assessment and Emerging Literacies with focus on PISA.
- [8] Kang, M., & Lam, R. (2024). Understanding university English instructors' assessment literacy: a formative assessment perspective. *Language Testing in Asia*, 14(1), 52.
- [9] Kippers, W. B., Wolterinck, C. H., Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., & Visscher, A. J. (2018). Teachers' views on the use of assessment for learning and data-based decision making in classroom practice. *Teaching and teacher education*, 75, 199-213.
- [10] Lui, A. M., & Andrade, H. L. (2022). The next black box of formative assessment: A model of the internal mechanisms of feedback processing. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 7, p. 751548). Frontiers Media SA.
- [11] Malabo, E. (2024). Assessment literacy of basic education teachers in a private institution. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 21(7), 1-1.

- [12] Pastore, S. (2023, July). Teacher assessment literacy: A systematic review. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 8, p. 1217167). Frontiers Media SA.
- [13] Pitt, E., & Winstone, N. (2023). Enabling and valuing feedback literacies. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(2), 149-157.
- [14] Rubeba, A. M., & Kitula, P. R. (2024). The assessment literacy for secondary school teachers in Tanzania. *Journal of Issues and Practice in Education*, 16, 256-275.
- [15] Schildkamp, K., Van Der Kleij, F. M., Heitink, M. C., Kippers, W. B., & Veldkamp, B. P. (2020). Formative assessment: A systematic review of critical teacher prerequisites for classroom practice. *International journal of educational research*, 103, 101602.
- [16] Umam, A., Malinda, M. D., Indah, Y. A., & Rahmawanti, M. R. (2023). ASSESSING ENGLISH TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT LITERACY IN INDONESIA CONTEXT. *English Journal*, 17(2), 138-145.
- [17] Wiese, E., & Nortvedt, G. A. (2023). Teacher assessment literacy in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms: A Norwegian case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 135, 104357.
- [18] Wolterinck-Broekhuis, C. H., Poortman, C. L., Schildkamp, K., & Visscher, A. J. (2024). Key stakeholder voices: Investigating student perceptions of teachers' use of assessment for learning. *Educational assessment, evaluation and accountability*, 36(2), 257-275.
- [19] Yan, Z., & Pastore, S. (2022). Are teachers literate in formative assessment? The development and validation of the Teacher Formative Assessment Literacy Scale. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 74, 101183.