



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENT PRACTICES OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN CAMARINES NORTE: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Jethro T. Ramirez *

DepEd Division of Camarines Norte, Institute of Open and Distance Education Open University System, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Sta. Mesa, Manila.

* Corresponding Author

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 31(02), 1317–1327

Publication history: Received on 01 July 2026; revised on 20 August 2026; accepted on 22 August 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.31.2.2140>

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

ABSTRACT

This study examined the authentic assessment practices of public elementary school teachers in the First Congressional District of the Schools Division Office of Camarines Norte. Specifically, it investigated the extent to which teachers implemented performance task assessment, outcome-based assessment, and portfolio assessment, identified challenges encountered in implementation, and determined differences in practices and challenges when grouped according to selected profile variables. A descriptive research design was employed involving 320 public elementary school teachers selected through proportionate stratified random sampling. Data were gathered using a researcher-developed and validated questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, Kruskal-Wallis H Test, and Mann-Whitney U Test were utilized in analyzing the data.

Findings revealed that teachers highly practiced authentic assessment across all dimensions. Performance Task Assessment and Outcome-Based Assessment both obtained a grand mean of 4.30, while Portfolio Assessment registered a grand mean of 4.21. Challenges in implementation were fairly encountered ($M = 3.37$), with time constraints, inadequate resources, and insufficient training emerging as the most commonly reported concerns. Significant differences were observed in Performance Task Assessment when respondents were grouped according to position and in Outcome-Based Assessment when grouped according to sex. No significant differences were found in the challenges encountered when respondents were grouped according to age, sex, position, or years of teaching experience. The study concludes that authentic assessment has become an established classroom practice among elementary school teachers; however, sustained professional development and institutional support remain necessary to strengthen implementation. A training program, Project REAL Assessment, is proposed to address identified needs.

Keywords: Authentic Assessment, Performance Task Assessment, Portfolio Assessment, Outcome-Based Assessment, Elementary Education, Teacher Professional Development

1 INTRODUCTION

Assessment is integral to teaching because it provides evidence of learner achievement, guides instructional decisions, and helps improve learning experiences. Contemporary assessment must therefore extend beyond recall and allow

learners to apply knowledge, explain reasoning, create products, and demonstrate competencies in meaningful situations. Authentic assessment addresses this expectation through purposeful tasks, observable performances, reflection, feedback, and transfer of learning. It provides teachers with richer evidence of what learners can do and supports the development of critical thinking, problem solving, communication, collaboration, and creativity^{32,33}.

Globally, authentic assessment supports Sustainable Development Goal 4 and the Education 2030 Agenda, which promote equitable, learner centered, and relevant education^{30,31}. In the Philippines, Republic Act No. 10533 and Department of Education policies encourage competency based instruction, varied classroom assessment, and meaningful demonstrations of learning^{9,10,11,25}. These policies position performance tasks, outcome based assessment, and portfolios as important components of classroom practice. They also respond to the need for deeper learning highlighted by the country's continuing difficulties in reading, mathematics, and science in PISA 2022²¹. However, policy adoption does not automatically ensure technically sound and consistent implementation. Studies report that teachers may understand authentic assessment while experiencing difficulties in aligning tasks with outcomes, constructing rubrics, providing feedback, documenting progress, and maintaining valid and fair scoring^{3,22,17}. Performance tasks can become activities without sufficiently demanding higher order thinking. Outcome statements may appear in lesson plans but remain weakly connected to the evidence collected. Portfolios may function only as storage folders when learner reflection, selection of evidence, clear criteria, and progress monitoring are limited^{5,14,26}.

Implementation is further influenced by workload, preparation time, class size, available materials, technology, training, student readiness, and stakeholder support. These conditions may reduce the depth and consistency of assessment even when teachers value authentic approaches^{6,19}. Although research on authentic assessment has expanded, much of it concerns higher education, particular subjects, or settings outside Camarines Norte. Limited local evidence explains how public elementary teachers in the division apply the three assessment forms or whether their practices and challenges differ across demographic and professional groups. Consequently, division officials lack context-specific evidence for targeting resources, mentoring, and assessment training appropriately. This gap limits the design of responsive professional development and provides the rationale for the present investigation.

Thus, the study aimed to examine authentic assessment practices among public elementary school teachers in the First Congressional District of Camarines Norte. Specifically, it sought to describe the respondents' profile in terms of age, sex, position, and number of years in teaching; determine the level of authentic assessment practices in terms of Performance Task Assessment, Outcome Based Assessment, and Portfolio Assessment; identify the challenges encountered by teachers in using authentic assessment at the intermediate grade level; test whether authentic assessment practices differed significantly when respondents were grouped according to their profile; and determine whether the challenges encountered differed significantly across the same profile variables. The results served as the basis for the proposed Project REAL Assessment Training Program.

1.1 Authentic Assessment in Elementary Education

Authentic assessment evaluates learners' ability to apply knowledge and skills in meaningful situations. Unlike conventional examinations that often emphasize recall, it uses projects, demonstrations, investigations, portfolios, and other contextualized activities. Assessment evidence should guide instructional improvement and support learning⁷, while meaningful assessment should determine whether learners can transfer understanding to unfamiliar and practical situations³². In Philippine basic education, DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015 identifies performance tasks as a major component of classroom assessment⁹. DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2020 further supports varied assessment methods that consider learners' circumstances and provide continuing evidence of achievement¹⁰. The MATATAG agenda also promotes foundational competencies, manageable learning expectations, and relevant classroom experiences¹¹. These reforms are necessary because the PISA 2022 results showed that Filipino learners remained below international averages in reading, mathematics, and science²¹. Authentic assessment may help address this concern by strengthening problem-solving, critical thinking, and knowledge application.

1.2 Respondent Profile and Its Relevance to Authentic Assessment

Teachers directly influence the quality of authentic assessment because they design tasks, develop criteria, evaluate outputs, provide feedback, and use results for instructional decisions. The respondents' age, sex, teaching position, and years of teaching experience provide a clearer context for interpreting their assessment practices and challenges. However, personal characteristics alone may not fully explain implementation. Assessment practice reflects a complex relationship among teachers' perceived value of assessment, actual classroom application, and assessment proficiency⁸. The connection between assessment knowledge and practice is also shaped by workload, professional preparation, and institutional support¹⁷. Examining teacher profiles remains necessary because particular groups may have different responsibilities, experiences, and access to professional development.

1.3 Performance-Task Assessment

Performance tasks require learners to demonstrate knowledge and skills through projects, investigations, presentations, demonstrations, and practical products. These activities allow teachers to evaluate not only what learners know but also how they use knowledge to solve problems. Performance-based assessment can support engagement and critical thinking in practical learning environments¹. Authentic mathematics assessment can likewise encourage learners to explain their reasoning and apply problem-solving strategies²⁰.

The educational value of performance tasks depends on their design. Tasks should be connected to learning competencies, realistic situations, clear directions, and measurable standards. Difficulties in preparing performance tasks have led to recommendations for using the GRASPS framework, which specifies the goal, role, audience, situation, product, and standards of a task¹⁵. Research has also identified gaps between teachers' reported assessment practices and their consistent application of assessment principles¹⁶. Authentic assessment in elementary schools may not always be implemented as prescribed when teachers struggle to develop instruments and manage classroom implementation²⁷. These findings indicate that frequent use of performance tasks does not necessarily guarantee their quality. Teachers must possess sufficient assessment literacy to construct valid tasks and reliable scoring tools.

1.4 Outcome-Based Assessment

Outcome-based assessment begins with clearly stated learning outcomes and identifies the evidence needed to demonstrate their attainment. It requires alignment among curriculum competencies, instructional activities, assessment tasks, and scoring criteria. Teachers may understand the principles of outcome-based education while their assessment practices remain inconsistently aligned with intended outcomes³. They may also state appropriate learning objectives yet continue using methods that do not fully measure the identified competencies⁵. Assessment quality becomes limited when standards are applied mechanically without determining whether the evidence represents actual learning²⁸. Strong assessment literacy enables teachers to select suitable methods and interpret learner evidence accurately²². Thus, outcome-based assessment should extend beyond listing objectives in lesson plans. Teachers must determine what learners should demonstrate, develop suitable assessment activities, and apply clear criteria for judging performance. This alignment allows assessment results to provide meaningful evidence of learner mastery.

1.5 Portfolio Assessment

Portfolio assessment uses a purposeful collection of learner outputs to document progress, effort, reflection, and achievement over time. It provides broader evidence than a single examination because it includes drafts, completed outputs, feedback, revisions, and learner reflections. Portfolio assessment can improve motivation and reflection by helping learners recognize their strengths and areas for improvement²³. It can also promote active participation, self-monitoring, and higher-order thinking when learners help select and review their work¹⁴. Portfolios are useful for documenting learner development in primary schools²⁶ and have been associated with favorable learning outcomes and learner attitudes²⁹. Nevertheless, portfolios become meaningful only when teachers provide clear criteria, regular feedback, and opportunities for reflection. Learner involvement and consistent feedback are essential to effective portfolio assessment¹³. Without these elements, portfolios may become simple collections of completed activities. Limited time, workload, and unclear procedures can also prevent teachers from using portfolios for instructional decisions⁵. Therefore, portfolio assessment requires organized artifact selection, learner participation, reflection, feedback, and consistent scoring.

1.6 Challenges Encountered in Using Authentic Assessment

Teachers encounter several difficulties when implementing authentic assessment, including limited preparation time, heavy workload, inadequate resources, insufficient training, unclear scoring criteria, and large class sizes. Institutional requirements and time limitations may restrict teachers' ability to create realistic assessment tasks¹². Limited resources, inadequate professional preparation, and resistance to unfamiliar methods may also hinder implementation⁴.

Unclear criteria, substantial demands on teachers' time, and insufficient training remain continuing concerns¹⁸. Authentic assessment may improve learners' scientific knowledge, critical thinking, and communication, but its implementation requires adequate resources and clearly defined standards³⁴. In the Philippine context, teachers may remain committed to classroom assessment despite difficulties in preparing tools, evaluating outputs, and managing assessment requirements². These challenges may result in simplified performance tasks, poorly aligned assessments, inconsistent scoring, and portfolios that merely store outputs. Addressing them requires practical training, sample assessment materials, collaborative planning, common rubrics, and sustained instructional support.

1.7 Differences in Practices and Challenges Across Teacher Profiles

The literature indicates that teachers' practices and challenges may vary because their professional experiences, responsibilities, and opportunities for training are different. Assessment proficiency and perceived value may influence classroom practices more directly than demographic characteristics alone⁸. Institutional conditions and professional support also affect the connection between assessment knowledge and actual classroom practice¹⁷. Therefore, differences according to age, sex, teaching position, and years of teaching should be examined empirically. Such comparisons can determine whether particular teacher groups require differentiated assistance or whether common challenges call for division-wide interventions.

2 METHOD

The study employed a quantitative descriptive survey design. This design was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to describe existing authentic assessment practices and implementation challenges without manipulating the variables. Comparative analysis was also conducted to determine whether practice and challenge scores differed when respondents were grouped according to their profile.

2.1 Participants

The participants were 320 public elementary school teachers from a population of 1,885 teachers in the First Congressional District of Camarines Norte during School Year 2025-2026. Cochran's formula with finite population correction was used to determine the sample size. Proportionate stratified random sampling allocated respondents across Santa Elena (46), Capalonga (41), Labo West (53), Labo East (54), Paracale (62), Jose Panganiban East (39), and Jose Panganiban West (25). This procedure gave each district representation according to its teacher population.

2.2 Source of Data / Research Instrument

Data were collected through a researcher-developed questionnaire based on Department of Education policies, scholarly literature, and related studies on authentic assessment. The first part gathered age, sex, position, and years of teaching experience. The second part measured practices in Performance Task Assessment, Outcome-Based Assessment, and Portfolio Assessment. The third part measured ten implementation challenges. The practice and challenge statements used five-point Likert-type response scales. The instrument underwent language, statistical, and subject-matter validation and was pilot-tested with 30 teachers who were not part of the main sample.

2.3 Data-Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured the required institutional ethics clearance and written authorization from the Schools Division Office and participating districts before administering the questionnaire. Potential respondents received information about the study's purpose, procedures, voluntary nature, and privacy safeguards. Informed consent was obtained before participation. Names and direct identifiers were excluded, responses were reported in aggregate, digital files were password-protected, and printed records were kept in a restricted location in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The records will be retained for five years and then securely destroyed. Completed responses were checked, encoded, organized, and prepared for analysis²⁴.

2.4 Analysis of Data

Frequency and percentage summarized the respondents' profile, while mean scores described the level of authentic assessment practices and the extent of challenges encountered. The Kruskal-Wallis H Test examined differences across age, position, and years-of-teaching groups. The Mann-Whitney U Test examined differences between male and female respondents. All inferential analyses used a .05 level of significance.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the respondents' profile, their authentic assessment practices, the challenges they encountered, and the differences observed across profile groups. The original thesis results were consolidated into five tables to provide a concise IMRAD presentation while retaining the principal descriptive and inferential findings.

Table 1 presents the demographic and professional profile of the 320 public elementary school teachers according to age, sex, position, and years in teaching. Findings revealed that in terms of age, the largest group consisted of respondents aged 46 years and above, with 88 teachers or 27.50%. This was followed by those aged 36–40 and 41–45, with 59 respondents or 18.44% in each group. Teachers aged 31–35 comprised 17.50%, while those aged 26–30 represented 16.88%. Only four respondents or 1.25% belonged to the 21–25 age group. These results show that the respondents came from different age groups, although most were in the more mature stages of their careers. This age

distribution may provide varied perspectives on authentic assessment based on differences in professional exposure, familiarity with assessment reforms, and access to recent professional development.

Regarding sex, 263 respondents or 82.19% were female, while 57 or 17.81% were male. Thus, the findings primarily represent the experiences and assessment practices of female teachers. However, sex alone should not be considered a direct explanation of teachers' authentic assessment practices. Assessment practices are shaped by the interaction among assessment proficiency, perceived value, and actual classroom application⁸.

Table 1: Demographic and Professional Profile of the Respondents

Profile Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age	21-25 years old	4	1.25
	26-30 years old	54	16.88
	31-35 years old	56	17.50
	36-40 years old	59	18.44
	41-45 years old	59	18.44
	46 years old and above	88	27.50
	Subtotal	320	100.00
Sex	Male	57	17.81
	Female	263	82.19
	Subtotal	320	100.00
Position	Teacher I	73	22.81
	Teacher II	26	8.13
	Teacher III	188	58.75
	Master Teacher I	25	7.81
	Master Teacher II	8	2.50
	Subtotal	320	100.00
Years in Teaching	1-5 years	51	15.94
	6-10 years	95	29.69
	11-15 years	58	18.13
	16-20 years	59	18.44
	21 years and above	57	17.81
	Subtotal	320	100.00

In terms of position, Teacher III comprised the majority, with 188 respondents or 58.75%. Teacher I followed with 73 or 22.81%, while Teacher II accounted for 26 or 8.13%. Meanwhile, 25 respondents or 7.81% were Master Teacher I, and eight or 2.50% were Master Teacher II. Overall, 287 respondents or 89.69% occupied Teacher I to Teacher III positions, indicating that the results largely reflect the experiences of classroom teachers who directly design, administer, and evaluate authentic assessment activities. The smaller number of master teachers may nevertheless provide perspectives informed by their instructional leadership and mentoring responsibilities.

With respect to years in teaching, the largest group had served for 6–10 years, accounting for 95 respondents or 29.69%. This was followed by teachers with 16–20 years of experience, with 59 or 18.44%, and those with 11–15 years, with 58 or 18.13%. Teachers with 21 years or more comprised 17.81%, while those with 1–5 years represented 15.94%. More than half of the respondents had over 10 years of teaching experience. This suggests that the study involved many teachers with substantial classroom exposure while still representing those in the earlier stages of the profession.

The varied profile of the respondents provides an appropriate basis for examining whether authentic assessment practices and challenges differ according to demographic and professional characteristics. Nevertheless, these

characteristics should be interpreted together with teachers' working conditions, assessment knowledge, professional preparation, workload, and institutional support. Professional and organizational conditions influence how teachers translate assessment knowledge into classroom practice¹⁷. Therefore, the succeeding analyses are necessary to determine whether the observed differences in authentic assessment practices and challenges are statistically associated with age, sex, position, or years in teaching.

Table 2: Summary of the Level of Authentic Assessment Practices

Assessment Domain	Grand Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Key Findings / Areas for Development
Performance Task Assessment	4.30	Highly Practiced	Strongest in creativity (4.34) and collaboration (4.33); comparatively lower in addressing diverse needs and requiring critical thinking (both 4.26).
Outcome-Based Assessment	4.30	Highly Practiced	Strongest in active learner engagement (4.33) and measuring intended outcomes (4.32); comparatively lower in feedback and transfer to real-life situations (both 4.27).
Portfolio Assessment	4.21	Highly Practiced	Strongest in guiding selection of portfolio evidence (4.25); comparatively lower in monitoring progress (4.19) and providing clear organizing criteria (4.17).

Table 2 summarizes the respondents' authentic assessment practices across performance-task, outcome-based, and portfolio assessment. All three domains were rated Highly Practiced, indicating that teachers frequently incorporated meaningful and competency-based assessment approaches into classroom instruction. Performance-task and outcome-based assessment obtained the highest grand means of 4.30, while portfolio assessment received a slightly lower grand mean of 4.21. Although the differences were small, the findings indicate that teachers practiced activity-based and outcome-aligned assessments more consistently than the systematic documentation of learner progress through portfolios.

Performance-task assessment obtained a grand mean of 4.30, interpreted as Highly Practiced. Creativity recorded the highest mean of 4.34, followed by collaboration at 4.33. These findings indicate that teachers commonly designed tasks that allowed learners to generate ideas, produce outputs, and work with others. This pattern is consistent with evidence that performance-based assessment encourages active participation and the application of competencies in practical settings¹. However, addressing diverse learner needs and requiring critical thinking received the comparatively lower means of 4.26. Although both indicators remained highly practiced, their lower ratings suggest that performance tasks could be further differentiated and designed to demand deeper analysis and problem solving. Authentic tasks should encourage learners to explain their reasoning and apply problem-solving strategies²⁰. Structured task design is likewise necessary to ensure that performance activities measure meaningful and higher-order learning¹⁵.

Outcome-based assessment also obtained a grand mean of 4.30, interpreted as Highly Practiced. Active learner engagement received the highest mean of 4.33, while measuring intended learning outcomes followed closely at 4.32. These results suggest that teachers generally developed assessments that involved learners and gathered evidence of expected competencies. This finding contrasts with reports that assessment activities are not always properly aligned with stated learning outcomes^{3,5}. Nevertheless, providing feedback and promoting the transfer of learning to real-life situations received comparatively lower means of 4.27. These areas deserve further attention because outcome-based assessment should not end with determining whether an outcome has been achieved. Assessment literacy also involves interpreting evidence and using it to guide subsequent learning²². Meaningful assessment should further determine whether learners can transfer their understanding to unfamiliar and practical situations³².

Portfolio assessment obtained the lowest grand mean of 4.21, although it was still interpreted as Highly Practiced. Guiding learners in selecting portfolio evidence received the highest mean of 4.25, indicating that teachers actively assisted learners in identifying outputs that demonstrated their learning. This practice is supported by evidence that learner participation in selecting and reviewing work promotes self-monitoring and higher-order thinking¹⁴. However, monitoring learner progress obtained a comparatively lower mean of 4.19, while providing clear criteria for organizing portfolios received the lowest mean of 4.17. These findings suggest that portfolios may be used more consistently for collecting outputs than for systematically tracking development over time. Portfolios may become repositories of completed outputs when teachers experience limited time, heavy workload, and unclear procedures⁵. Clear criteria, learner participation, and consistent feedback are therefore necessary for portfolios to serve as meaningful assessment tools¹³.

Table 3: Challenges Encountered in Implementing Authentic Assessment

Challenge Encountered	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
Limited time for assessment preparation and evaluation	3.52	Moderately Encountered
Inadequate resources and instructional materials	3.48	Moderately Encountered
Insufficient training on authentic assessment	3.43	Moderately Encountered
Limited communication and stakeholder support	3.38	Fairly Encountered
Limited student readiness for unfamiliar assessment formats	3.36	Fairly Encountered
Difficulty aligning assessment with standards and competencies	3.34	Fairly Encountered
Difficulty establishing validity and reliability	3.33	Fairly Encountered
Difficulty ensuring fair and objective evaluation	3.30	Fairly Encountered
Continued reliance on traditional assessment practices	3.30	Fairly Encountered
Resistance to adopting authentic assessment practices	3.24	Fairly Encountered
Grand Mean	3.37	Fairly Encountered

Table 3 shows an overall grand mean of 3.37, interpreted as Fairly Encountered. Limited time for preparation, administration, feedback, documentation, and evaluation was the leading challenge ($M = 3.52$). Inadequate resources and instructional materials ($M = 3.48$) and insufficient training ($M = 3.43$) were also moderately encountered. Authentic assessment commonly requires detailed task planning, rubric development, observation, and evaluation of complex outputs. Without sufficient time, materials, and technical preparation, teachers may find it difficult to sustain the intended quality of implementation ^{4,17,19}.

The remaining concerns were fairly encountered. Communication and stakeholder support obtained 3.38, while student readiness obtained 3.36. Alignment, validity, reliability, and objective scoring also remained concerns. Continued reliance on traditional assessment and resistance to adoption received comparatively lower ratings, suggesting that the main barriers were operational rather than simple unwillingness to use authentic assessment. Philippine studies likewise identify workload, documentation, resources, assessment tools, and professional preparation as recurring constraints ^{2,5,6}.

The combination of highly practiced assessment domains and fairly to moderately encountered challenges indicates that teachers continued to comply with assessment expectations despite difficult implementation conditions. The challenges therefore appear to moderate the consistency and technical quality of practice rather than prevent adoption. This finding supports division-wide interventions that provide protected planning time, practical models, shared rubrics, mentoring, and accessible assessment resources.

Table 4: Differences in Authentic Assessment Practices When Grouped According to Profile

Assessment Domain	Profile Variable	Test Statistic	p Value	Remarks
Performance Task	Age	$H = 7.732$	0.172	Not significant
Performance Task	Sex	$U = 0.059$	0.808	Not significant
Performance Task	Position	$H = 11.331$	0.023	Significant
Performance Task	Years in teaching	$H = 5.317$	0.256	Not significant
Outcome-Based	Age	$H = 5.388$	0.370	Not significant
Outcome-Based	Sex	$U = 4.047$	0.044	Significant
Outcome-Based	Position	$H = 5.294$	0.258	Not significant
Outcome-Based	Years in teaching	$H = 5.312$	0.257	Not significant
Portfolio	Age	$H = 7.887$	0.163	Not significant
Portfolio	Sex	$U = 0.209$	0.648	Not significant

Portfolio	Position	H = 7.098	0.131	Not significant
Portfolio	Years in teaching	H = 4.193	0.381	Not significant

Table 4 presents twelve comparisons across the three authentic assessment domains. Position produced a significant difference in Performance Task Assessment, $H = 11.331$, $p = .023$. Master Teacher II obtained the highest descriptive mean rank (237.56), followed by Teacher II (191.67), but the omnibus result alone does not identify which specific position pairs differed. The finding suggests that rank-related responsibilities, expertise, or leadership exposure may shape performance-task implementation and should be examined further. Professional knowledge and role-related opportunities may influence authentic assessment practice¹⁷.

Outcome-Based Assessment differed significantly according to sex, $U = 4.047$, $p = .044$. Female teachers had a higher mean rank (164.88) than male teachers (140.28). This difference should be interpreted cautiously because the study did not examine the professional experiences or assessment-literacy factors that might explain it. Understanding outcomes, alignment, and assessment competence may be more informative than sex considered alone³. However, no significant differences were found in Performance Task Assessment according to age, sex, or years in teaching. Outcome-Based Assessment did not differ significantly by age, position, or years in teaching. Portfolio Assessment was also statistically comparable across all four profile variables. These results indicate that most authentic assessment practices were broadly shared across demographic and career groups. Common policies, curriculum expectations, and school routines may have provided a shared implementation framework.

Overall, only two of the twelve practice comparisons were significant. The results do not support limiting professional development to particular age or tenure groups. Instead, division-wide support should remain the primary approach, while the position-related and sex-related findings may guide follow-up inquiry, mentoring, and more detailed analysis of assessment literacy, work assignments, and access to professional learning.

Table 5: Differences in Challenges Encountered When Grouped According to Profile

Profile Variable	Test Statistic	p Value	Remarks	Interpretation
Age	H = 1.074	0.956	Not significant	Comparable challenges across age groups
Sex	U = 0.743	0.389	Not significant	Comparable challenges between male and female teachers
Position	H = 3.682	0.451	Not significant	Comparable challenges across positions
Years in teaching	H = 6.013	0.198	Not significant	Comparable challenges across experience groups

Table 5 shows no significant differences in the challenges encountered according to age, $H = 1.074$, $p = .956$; sex, $U = 0.743$, $p = .389$; position, $H = 3.682$, $p = .451$; or years in teaching, $H = 6.013$, $p = .198$. Teachers across demographic and professional groups therefore reported broadly comparable implementation difficulties.

The uniform pattern supports the interpretation that time, resources, training, alignment, and scoring concerns are systemic and contextual rather than confined to one group. Classroom assessment challenges are commonly connected with workload, available tools, and institutional support^{5,6}. Consequently, interventions should be inclusive and division-wide, while allowing schools to adapt examples and support mechanisms to their local conditions.

4 CONCLUSION

The study found that public elementary school teachers in the First Congressional District of Camarines Norte highly practiced Performance Task Assessment, Outcome-Based Assessment, and Portfolio Assessment. The first two domains obtained grand means of 4.30, while Portfolio Assessment obtained 4.21. Teachers strongly supported creativity, collaboration, active learner participation, alignment with outcomes, reflection, and selection of portfolio evidence. However, they reported comparatively weaker practices in differentiating performance tasks, developing higher-order demands, providing feedback, supporting transfer, establishing portfolio criteria, and monitoring progress over time. Challenges were fairly encountered overall, with time, resources, and training as the most prominent concerns. Most

practice comparisons were not significant, except Performance Task Assessment by position and Outcome-Based Assessment by sex. Challenges were statistically comparable across age, sex, position, and teaching experience.

These findings indicate that authentic assessment has become an established classroom practice, but its quality and sustainability depend on supportive implementation conditions. Project REAL Assessment should therefore provide division-wide professional development on authentic task design, constructive alignment, rubric development, feedback, validity, reliability, and portfolio management. Learning Action Cell sessions, mentoring by experienced teachers, shared banks of contextualized tasks and rubrics, protected collaborative planning time, and improved access to materials and technology may reduce the reported constraints. The two significant subgroup findings warrant follow-up study but do not justify restricting support to selected groups. Inclusive and sustained institutional assistance is more consistent with the evidence and may help teachers provide meaningful, fair, and competency-focused assessment for all learners.

STATEMENTS ON COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my Thesis Adviser, **Dr. Emejedio C. Gepila Jr.**, for his invaluable guidance, insightful advice, unwavering support, and expert mentorship throughout this research journey. His encouragement and scholarly expertise greatly contributed to the completion of this study. I also extend my sincere appreciation to **Dr. Desserie T. Maynes-Blanco**, Program Chair of the PUP Open University System Master in Education Management Program, for her assistance, leadership, and constant support in ensuring the successful completion of our academic requirements. Their dedication and commitment to academic excellence have inspired me and significantly enriched my graduate school experience.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript.

Statement of informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Adri, D. Suryadi, and T. Turmudi, Performance-based assessment in practical learning environments: Implications for learner engagement and critical thinking, *Journal of Education and Learning* 11(2), 45–56 (2022).
- [2] M. B. Agawin and R. C. Alferez, Teachers' challenges in the conduct of assessment and their teaching performance, *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 26(6), 620–632 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13931549>
- [3] D. Alonzo, J. Bejano, and V. Labad, Alignment between teachers' assessment practices and principles of outcomes-based education in the context of Philippine education reform, *International Journal of Instruction* 16(1), 489–506 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16127a>
- [4] A. A. Aziz, Challenges in implementing authentic assessment in 21st-century ESL classrooms, *Journal of Language and Education* 7(4), 89–101 (2021).
- [5] L. Cagasan, E. Care, P. Robertson, and R. Luo, Developing a formative assessment protocol to examine formative assessment practices in the Philippines, *Educational Assessment* 25(4), 259–275 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2020.1826171>
- [6] M. Caromay and M. Bebanco, Level of classroom assessment practices and their effectiveness as perceived by teachers, *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 42(8), 1–12 (2025).
- [7] B. Davis, Assessment as learning: Rethinking classroom assessment practices, *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 38(4), 32–39 (2019).
- [8] C. C. Deneen, G. W. Fulmer, G. T. L. Brown, K. Tan, W. S. Leong, and H. Y. Tay, Value, practice and proficiency: Teachers' complex relationship with assessment for learning, *Teaching and Teacher Education* 80, 39–47 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.12.022>

- [9] Department of Education, DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015: Policy guidelines on classroom assessment for the K to 12 basic education program (2015). <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- [10] Department of Education, DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2020: Interim guidelines for assessment and grading in light of the Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan (2020). <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- [11] Department of Education, MATATAG: DepEd's agenda to strengthen basic education (2023). <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- [12] T. Dinning, Developing authentic assessment in higher and basic education: Barriers and enablers, *Teaching in Higher Education* 23(1), 112–126 (2018).
- [13] M. Evans and E. Tragant, Assessing language learning through portfolios: Practices, challenges, and learner involvement, *Language Teaching Research* 24(4), 457–476 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818783526>
- [14] M. Farahian, F. Avarzamani, and S. Rajabi, Portfolio assessment and learner engagement: Fostering higher-order thinking skills through authentic assessment, *Journal of Language and Education* 7(2), 72–86 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.11446>
- [15] R. V. Flores, Challenges in the preparation of performance tasks: Basis for a proposed GRASPS-based guide on performance tasks in mathematics, *Online Submission* (2023).
- [16] H. T. Gebremariam and A. D. Gedamu, Primary school teachers' assessment for learning practice for students' learning improvement, *Frontiers in Education* 8, Article 1145195 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1145195>
- [17] R. Hains-Wesson and S. Le Roux, Bridging teacher knowledge and practice: Exploring authentic assessment across educational levels, *Education Sciences* 14(8), Article 894 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14080894>
- [18] H. Kim and J. Park, Teachers' perceptions of challenges in implementing authentic assessment in EFL classrooms, *Asian EFL Journal* 25(2), 98–117 (2021).
- [19] V. A. Mariappan and K. Osman, A systematic literature review of authentic assessment in K–12 ESL/EFL education, *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 8(5), Article e002303 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v8i5.2303>
- [20] P. J. McFeetors, R. Marynowski, and A. Candler, Generative unit assessment: Authenticity in mathematics classroom assessment practices, *Education Sciences* 11(7), Article 366 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11070366>
- [21] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, PISA 2022 results: Philippines country note (2023). <https://gpseducation.oecd.org>
- [22] S. Pastore, Teacher assessment literacy: A systematic review, *Frontiers in Education* 8, Article 1217167 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1217167>
- [23] E. Pitri, Portfolio assessment as a tool for improving learner motivation and reflection, *Journal of Educational Research and Practice* 11(1), 65–77 (2021).
- [24] Republic of the Philippines, Republic Act No. 10173: Data Privacy Act of 2012 (2012).
- [25] Republic of the Philippines, Republic Act No. 10533: Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (2013).
- [26] M. K. Rizal, Rochmiyati, A. Ambarita, and E. Y. Hainilah, Portfolio assessment in primary schools, *Jurnal Ilmiah Teunuleh: International Journal of Social Sciences* 2(2), 329–336 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.51612/teunuleh.v2i2.54>
- [27] M. N. Rosyada and H. Retnawati, The implementation of authentic assessment of Curriculum 2013 in elementary school: A review of evaluations, *AIP Conference Proceedings* 2575, Article 040011 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0107899>
- [28] L. H. Schellekens, W. D. J. Kremer, M. F. Van der Schaaf, C. P. M. Van der Vleuten, and H. G. J. Bok, Between theory and practice: Educators' perceptions on assessment quality criteria and its impact on student learning, *Frontiers in Education* 8, Article 1147213 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1147213>
- [29] T. Sulisty, K. P. N. Eltris, S. Mafulah, S. Budianto, S. Saiful, and D. F. Heriyawati, Portfolio assessment: Learning outcomes and students' attitudes, *Studies in English Language and Education* 7(1), 141–153 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i1.15169>

- [30] UNESCO, Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (2015).
- [31] UNESCO, Transforming education: An urgent political imperative for our collective future (2022).
- [32] G. Wiggins and J. McTighe, Understanding by design, expanded 2nd ed., ASCD (2014).
- [33] E. C. Wylie and C. Lyon, Developing assessment for learning literacy in schools, Review of Education 8(1), 181–214 (2020).
- [34] H. Yu and Y. Chen, Authentic assessment in science education: Opportunities and challenges, International Journal of Educational Research 107, Article 101745 (2021).