



Document Analysis on Constructive Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes to Learning Activities and Assessment

***Rheamy Nierra Baliber**, Jimmy J. Sañosa, Jr.**

Biliran Province State University, Naval, Biliran 6560, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Constructive alignment (CA) is an outcomes-based approach to teaching in which the learning outcomes that students are expected to achieve are defined prior to the start of instruction. Moreover, teaching and assessment methods are developed to best achieve those outcomes and to assess the level at which they have been achieved (Biggs, 1996). The study was qualitative research in nature using the document analysis design and semi-structured interview to analyse the constructive alignment of course learning outcomes to learning activities and assessment of the major courses of Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNED) program. Purposive sampling method is utilized. The participants were the two (2) faculty teaching major subjects in BSNED Program both in First and Second Semester of School Year 2019-2020. Moreover, there were two (2) validators involved who analyse the course syllabus as to its constructive alignment of the teaching and learning activities and assessment tasks and evaluation to course learning outcomes. Based on the results of the study, there was no constructive alignment of the course syllabus from its course learning outcomes to the teaching learning activities and assessment tasks and evaluation. An action plan was developed for the improvement of teaching and learning quality and, as a result, positive and constructive forms of quality improvement. It is strongly encouraged and recommended to prioritize the conduct of Curriculum Quality Audit (CQA) in the BSNED Program to assure constructive alignment of the OBE course syllabus.

Keywords: *Constructive Alignment, Bachelor of Special Needs Education*

1. Introduction

Constructive alignment (CA) has two aspects. Constructive comes from the constructivist theory that learners use their own activity to construct their knowledge as interpreted through their own existing schemata. Alignment is a principle in curriculum theory that assessment tasks should be aligned to what it is intended to be learned, as in criterion-referenced assessment.

As stipulated by Biggs (1996) constructive alignment (CA) is an outcomes-based approach to teaching in which the learning outcomes that students are expected to achieve are defined prior to the start of instruction. Moreover, teaching and assessment methods are developed to best achieve those outcomes and to assess the level at which they have been achieved.

Furthermore, Shuell (1986) states that constructive alignment extends in a practical way that what students does is actually more important in determining what is learned than what the teacher does. Moreover, Hattie (2009) states that any course needs to be aligned with the learning outcomes that are intended in the course. This means that the system is consistent.

It is imperative that, the teaching is then designed to engage students in learning activities that maximize their chances of achieving those outcomes, and the assessment tasks are designed to allow for clear judgments on how well those outcomes have been attained.

* *Corresponding author.*

E-mail address: rheamy.baliber@bipsu.edu.ph

On the other hand, although the concept of CA has been around for a while, it is only recently that it has gained popularity. It was only recently that it was implemented on a reasonable scale. Primary reason for this is that the upsurge of higher education involves a diverse group of students and teaching subjects, necessitating a review of teaching and assessment on an institution-wide scale, with an emphasis on quality outcomes at the institutional, program, and unit levels constructive alignment offers a framework for adjusting teaching and assessment to address the achievement of those outcomes and standards.

Nevertheless, the outcomes provide specific details against which graduates of the curriculum can be measured, facilitating the quality-assurance process. This emphasizes the importance of aligning all aspects of educational processes and systems to the expected outcomes that all students should be able to demonstrate proficiently at the end of the curriculum, and that outcomes should not be viewed synonymously with grades or simply curricular completion, but rather authentic demonstrations of expected competencies as a result of significant learning experiences. As a result, in developing the constructively aligned course syllabus, it can be deduced that CA necessitates consistency across desired outcomes of education, teaching and learning activities, and assessment methods and practices (Macayan, 2017).

The aforesaid fact scenario was a truism and it happened also to the university which encountered the same dilemma. The researcher herself observed that there was a problem on designing the course syllabus in respect to constructive alignment.

It is along in this context that the researcher prompted to conduct this study due to the gap of knowledge existing that only few researchers conducted in this concept and no study conducted yet in this university specifically on the Constructive Alignment of the Course Learning Outcomes to Learning Activities and Assessment. In which the researcher firmly believed that the findings of this study will help improves teaching and learning quality and, as a result, positive and constructive forms of quality improvement.

1.1. Objectives of the Study

The study generally aimed to analyze the constructive alignment of the course learning outcomes to the teaching and learning activities and assessment tasks and evaluation.

1.2. Methodology

The study employed the document analysis design as qualitative research in nature. The approach to analyzing the content of documents that is referred to as 'qualitative document analysis' is in principle the same as the analysis of any qualitative data, such as in-depth interview transcripts, participant observation notes or non-participant observation recordings. It involves reading through the observations and developing themes and coding content. The approach attempts to explore the document to provide an interpretation of the actions, motivations and intentions of actors identified in the documentation. This research design is chosen mainly because it is appropriate and best suited to the current study.

The study is conducted in Biliran Province State University Main Campus particularly in the School of Teacher Education - Bachelor of Special Needs Education Program for the School Year 2019-2020 First Semester.

Purposive sampling method was used in this study. The participants of this study were two (2) faculty members teaching the major subjects both in the first and second year of Bachelor of Special Needs Education Program. Moreover, there were two (2) validators involved who analyze the course syllabus as to its constructive alignment of the teaching and learning activities and assessment tasks and evaluation to course learning outcomes. The validators are Curriculum Quality Auditors from Cebu Normal University.

The main tool that the researcher utilized is the course syllabus crafted by the faculty teaching particularly on the major subjects in BSNEd Program both in the first and second year in the first semester of school year 2019-2020.

This study utilized the semi-structured interview and document analysis as one way in data gathering procedure. Before gathering the course syllabus of the faculty, a letter asking permission is sought to conduct the study from the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and the University President of Biliran Province State University and Dean of the School of Teacher Education. To be able for the researcher to conduct the study, collection of the course syllabus (hard and soft copies) of the faculty handling subjects under the Bachelor of Special Needs Education Program that will be personally administered by the research herself. After which, document analysis immediately followed.

In analyzing the data (course syllabus) to achieve the objective number one (1), the researcher seek help from a Curriculum Quality Auditor that served as the validators to analyse the course syllabus of the faculty. The validators used their

CQA form, a controlled document from the Cebu Normal University.

2. Results and Discussion

The constructive alignment of the course outcomes of Bachelor of Special Needs Program was ascertained in terms of course learning outcomes, teaching learning activities and assessment task. These were gathered during the validation by two (2) validators who gave similar comments and suggestions on the five (5) courses forwarded by the latter.

Matrix 1 shows the constructive alignment of course learning outcomes to teaching learning activities and assessment in SNED 218 Instructional Adaptation in Language and Literacy Instruction.

Course Learning Outcomes. Based on the validator's opinion regarding the SNEd 218 Instructional Adaptation and Language and Literacy Instruction, it was disclosed during validation that the number one (1) course outcomes can be done in a day-to-day activity. The course learning outcomes must be clear in describing the learning that will take place across the curriculum through concise statements made in specific and measurable statements what students will know and/or be able to do as the result of having successfully completed a course.

Matrix 1: Constructive Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) to Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs) and Assessment

COURSE		
SNED 218 Instructional Adaptation in Language and Literacy Instruction		
ANALYSIS		
<i>Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)</i>	<i>Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs)</i>	<i>Assessment</i>
<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The number one (1) course outcome can be done in a day-to-day activity. The course outcomes must be clear in describing the learning that will take place across the curriculum through concise statements, made in specific and measurable terms, of what students will know and/or be able to do as the result of having successfully completed a course. ➤ BTI is not aligned to the outcomes 1.7.1 was not evident in the course outcomes ➤ I would suggest to have it align in the course description like: ➤ Design an instructional material needed in teaching Language and Literacy ➤ <i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of research-based variety of adapted strategies and techniques related to teaching language and literacy. (1.2.1)</i> this course outcomes is based on the language of the standards. ➤ <i>Design or develop variety of teaching and learning resources including ICT to address learning goals. (4.5.1)</i> ➤ <i>Use strategies responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents. (3.3.1)</i> this Course outcome is 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Duration of the topic must be specific so that the activities for that particular week must be clear. ➤ The TLA's is not SMART and learner-centered. ➤ It did not lead to the course outcomes ➤ Remember that the Course Learning Outcomes should be perform by the students. During the weekly task align to your topic you can see already that you are developing your students leading to your course outcomes. ➤ In conclusion the TLA's stated on this particular syllabus is not explicitly stated in the syllabus. 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Very long and many assessments: assessment must be aligned also to the course description and to the course outcomes. If the assessments are not aligned; students may do some things that is not necessary in the course. It will burden the students and at same time burden to the teacher teaching the course; Remember to create a rubrics per activity given to the students. > Make a specific description of your Performance task. > I would suggest to focus in the course outcomes on what would be the best assessment that will measure their capability after learning the course: Suggested assessment: > Portfolio of a research-based variety of adapted strategies and techniques in teaching language and literacy. (1.2.1)

<p>very clear and aligned to 3.3.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ These 3 outcomes can address already the description of the course. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Develop teaching and learning resources using ICT to address learning goals. (4.5.1) > Demonstration of strategies to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents. (3.3.1)
<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The CLO1 is relevant and aligned to the course description, however CLO2 requires the students to do demonstration teaching which is not the focus of the course. Per course description, the students will only have to show evidence of examining various adapted strategies. Therefore, they can only do critiquing or comparative analysis. 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The topics are appropriate and aligned to the course description and course outcomes. The list is exhaustive enough to adequately address the course outcomes. ➤ It has also specified that TLAs (although some TLAs are just repeated) 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Some assessment tasks appear to be activities only to be placed in the teaching-learning columns (e.g., brainstorming, discussion, etc.) ➤ ‘Adequate knowledge’ is not measurable. Enabling outcomes maybe place under TLAs. Clarity of focus as one the OBE Power Principles means to identify the culminating outcomes of significance. What can the students do with what they learned?

As Towers and Pallapu (2003) stated that what the students are to learn must be clearly identified. What learners should achieve in a learning activity should be made clear to them before they can engage in the activity. It is essential for learners to know what they should do or demonstrate in order to show that they have achieved the desired outcomes. Moreover, it was emphasized that Beginning Teacher Indicator (BTI) as reflected in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) is not aligned to the course outcomes like demonstrate an understanding of the range of verbal and nonverbal classroom communication strategies that support learners understanding participation engagement and achievement.

The validator suggested to have it align in the course description provided by the CHED Memorandum Order No. 77 series of 2017 like design an instructional material needed in teaching language and literacy.

Another course learning outcomes which is based on the language of the standards was to demonstrate an understanding of researched based variety of adapted strategies and techniques related to teaching language and literacy (BTI 1.2.1).

The validator 1 seemingly believed that the course learning outcomes should design or develop variety of teaching and learning resources including ICT to address learning goals (BTI 4.5.1). Likewise, to use strategies responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents. The course learning outcomes was very clear and aligned to BTI 3.3.1 which was to use strategies responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents.

As discussed incisively by the validator these three (3) outcomes can address already the description of the course. On the other hand, the validator 2 asserts during validation that the course learning outcome one (1) is relevant to the course description, however course learning outcomes two (2) requires students to do demonstration teaching which is not the focus of the course.

As Killen (2003) states that educators should be clear on what they want their learners to know, understand and be able to do successfully. When educators clearly define the outcomes that learners should achieve, they will choose suitable teaching strategies and learning resources to help learners achieve those outcomes (Ramoroka, 2007). Per course description, the students will only have to show evidence of examining various adapted strategies. Therefore, they can only do critiquing or comparative analysis.

The result means that the course learning outcomes is not aligned to the teaching learning activities and assessment which further explains that Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) should be constructively aligned to the learning program of the SNEd 218.

This implies that constructive alignment of the course learning outcomes is vital and/or of prime importance. This further implies that the validators adopt the notion of quality alignment and consistency of course learning outcomes.

The results of this study are enlightened of Spady underscores outcome as clear learning results that we want students to demonstrate of the significant learning experience and reflect learners' competence in using content, information, ideas and tool successfully. The beginning of the learning journey is the learning outcomes to be achieved. In this way, both the learner and the teacher are guided by what to accomplish.

With this sharply rising demand for constructive alignment of the course outcomes to the teaching learning activities is considered as seen in the aforestated matrix.

Teaching Learning Activities. The validator 1 asserts that duration of the topic must be specific so that the activities for that particular week must be clear. The TLA is not SMART and learner-centered. It did not lead to the course outcomes. It should be remembered that the course learning outcomes should be performed by the students. During the weekly task align your topic so you can see already that you are developing your students leading to your course outcomes. With this in mind, the validator concluded that the TLA's stated on this particular course is not explicitly stated in the course syllabus.

On the other hand, the prevailing view of the validator 2 with regard to TLA the topics are appropriate and aligned to the course description and course learning outcomes. The list is exhaustive enough to adequately address the course outcomes. It has also specified that some TLAs are just repeated. In so far as teaching learning activities is concerned the validators claimed that TLAs should be learner-centered on the underlying philosophy that the child is the center of the educative process and he must an active participant of the teaching learning situation.

Therefore, the findings clearly speaks that the weekly topics are not align to the course learning outcomes and there was a repetition of usage on the teaching learning activities. Constructive alignment of the course learning outcomes is needed to TLA and assessment. It must use variety of teaching strategies or techniques method for the TLA in teaching the BSNEd Program.

The findings implies that learning takes place if it is focused on the learner not the teacher. Needless to say, that students learning is measured through assessment as illustrated in the same matrix.

Assessment. It is important to note that in considering the assessment the validator 1 emphasized that very long and many assessments are provided. This prompted the validator to suggest that assessment must be aligned also to the course description and to the course learning outcomes. If the assessments are not aligned, students may do something that is not necessary to the course. It will burden the students and at the same time burden to the teacher teaching the course. Remember to create a rubric per activity given to the students.

In addition, make a specific description of your performance task. It further suggested to focus in the course learning outcomes on what would be the best assessment that will measure the capability of learning. The latter further cited among others, the following suggestions: Portfolio of a research-based variety of adapted strategies and techniques in teaching language and literacy; Develop teaching and learning resources using ICT to address learning goals; And demonstration of strategies to learners with disabilities, gifted and talents.

On another viewpoint of validator 2, some assessment tasks appear to be activities only to be placed in the teaching learning activities (e.g., brainstorming, discussion and etc.). The validator further observed that adequate knowledge is not measurable. Enabling outcomes may be placed OBE Power Principles means to identify the culminating outcomes of significance like what can the students do with what they learned.

The results shows that the assessment given to the students in SNEd 218 is not aligned to the course description and the course learning outcomes. There must be a uniform or standard rubrics to be used by the teacher in the assessment.

This implies that assessment is deemed to be linked to the outcomes that learners should be achieve. Effective assessment implies quality assessment in effective assessment implies low quality.

Matrix 2 shows the constructive alignment of course learning outcomes to teaching learning activities and assessment in SNEd 217 Adapted Physical Education and Recreation, Music and Health.

Course Learning Outcomes. The results in validation show that the course learning outcomes, BTI's are not appropriate to the course learning outcomes it should be explicitly stated not implied.

Matrix 2: Constructive Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) to Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs) and Assessment

COURSE		
SNED 217 Adapted Physical Education and Recreation, Music and Health		
ANALYSIS		
<i>Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)</i>	<i>Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs)</i>	<i>Assessment</i>
<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The course outcomes are aligned to the course description. Need to modify using the language of the standards. ➤ The course outcomes BTIs are not appropriate to the course outcomes it should be explicitly stated and not implied. ➤ Focus on domain 3; I would suggest to write your Course learning outcomes this way: ➤ <i>CLO 1.) Demonstrate an understanding of research-based knowledge in analyzing appropriate instructional adaptation, techniques and strategies in teaching Physical Education recreation, music and health for students with special needs. (1.2.1, 3.5.1)CLO 2.) Design and use an inclusive differentiated teaching plan that focuses on instructional adaptation, techniques and strategies in teaching Physical Education, recreation, music and health for students with special needs. (3.1.1, 3.3.1)</i> 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Activities prepared by the teacher is not clear that will lead them to the course learning outcomes. ➤ The teacher may clarify on the specific activities that will gear towards her goal in achieving the course learning outcomes based on the course description. Example: What do you mean of creative activities? Do you think this activity/ies can address your CLO's if yes please describe or give a little description of this activity/ies. ➤ Remember that in every activity you provide to your students always ask yourself if it is leading to your course learning outcomes? It is described in the course description? Or you will end up asking them to do some tasks that are not essential to the course 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The assessments were so many. Focus on what is essential and necessary. ➤ I would suggest to go back again to your CLO's so that you have an alignment on the assessment that you provide to your students. ➤ Remember that each assessment you need to have an evidence and rubrics how you grade them. ➤ The more assessment you provide the more evidences you need to produce and the more rubrics you need to make. ➤ Focus on what is essential, other assessment that you mention can be part of their weekly activities in your classroom we called it Formative assessment. ➤ Design assessment that will measure the skills that you want your students to acquire at the end of the lesson. Do you think that these assessments are good enough to measure them? How did you rate them? Again, go back to your course description, Course learning outcomes and topics in crafting your assessment.

<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CLO1 is only an enabling outcome and not be regarded as an ultimate course outcome. ➤ CLO2 does not fully support the course description since the course focuses on educational adaptations for students with special or additional needs and not for all types of students. 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Topics for the first 3 weeks must be on understanding the nature of educational adaptations for specific type of students, that is, those which require special/additional needs. (not for inclusive education) ➤ The succeeding topics on adaptations are very relevant and aligned to the course description. 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Assessment tasks do not categorically address the CLOs. Majority are mere activities to be placed in the TLAs column.
---	---	--

With the quest to sincerely pursue constructive alignment, validator one (1) said focus on Domain 3 which is Diversity of Learners and write the course learning outcomes this way: CLO 1.) Demonstrate an understanding of research-based knowledge in analysing appropriate instructional adaptation, techniques and strategies in teaching Physical Education recreation, music and health for students with special needs (1.2.1, 3.5.1); CLO 2.) Design and use an inclusive differentiated teaching plan that focuses on instructional adaptation, techniques and strategies in teaching Physical Education, recreation, music and health for students with special needs (3.1.1, 3.3.1).

Believing the relevance of constructive alignment, validator 2 observed that CLO 1 is only outcome and be regarded as an ultimate course learning outcome. Likewise, CLO 2 does not fully support the course description since the course focuses an educational adaptation for student with special needs or additional needs and not for all types of students.

The results shows that activities prepared by the teacher is not clear that will lead to the course learning outcomes. Succeeding topics on adaptations are very relevant and aligned to the course description.

The implication here is that the course learning outcomes is expected to be constructively aligned to the teaching learning activities that will cater the needs of the students with special needs.

The recent study is supported with the study of Biggs (1996) that focusing on what and how students are to learn, rather than on what topics the teacher is to teach, requires that an intended learning outcome, specifies not only what is to be learned, the topic, but how it is to be learned and to what standard. In constructive alignment, the course learning outcomes are written to include an activity, not just a topic: for example, to *explain* a particular concept. That activity, *explain* is then specified in the teaching context so that it is activated in order to achieve the outcome. Likewise, that activity, *explain*, is specified in the assessment task, to ascertain if the outcome has been achieved and how well. The target verb *explain* is represented in the teaching/learning context and in the assessment. Likewise in driving instruction, the intention is that the learner learns how to drive a car. The teaching focuses on the learning activity itself: driving a car, not giving lectures on car driving, while the assessment focuses on how well the car is driven. The alignment is achieved by ensuring that the intended verb in the outcome statement is present in the teaching/learning activity and in the assessment task.

Vis-à-vis to the alignment of the course learning outcomes as a result it also enabled the SNEd 217 to align it to the teaching learning activities and assessment task as gleaned in the same matrix.

Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs). Apparently, activities prepared by the teacher is not clear that will lead them to the course outcomes according to the first validator. The teacher may clarify on the specific activities that will gear towards her goal in achieving the course learning outcomes based on the course description. A gentle reminder is forwarded by the latter that in every activity you provide to your students always ask yourself if it is leading to your course learning outcomes.

However, the second validator underscores those topics for the first three weeks must be on understanding the nature of educational adaptation for specific type of students that is, those which require special/additional needs (not for inclusive education). But the succeeding topics on adaptations are very relevant and aligned to the course description.

Summing up, the validators were mindful of the constructive alignment from course outcomes to the teaching learning activities and the assessment tasks as well. This would imply that there must be a consistency on the evaluation of the TLAs to the course description and course learning outcomes as far as OBE is concerned.

Assessment. In as much as assessment is concerned it was observed that the assessment was so many. It is deemed

necessary to focus on what is essential. The assessment task does not categorically address the CLOs. Majority are mere activities to be placed in the TLAs accordingly.

Sutton (1991) stated that through assessment educators can determine students' progress and level of achievement in the learning process. Furthermore, teachers should think about assessment when planning their classroom activities. Their assessment procedures should indicate clearly what students will be doing or will be learning. Teachers should plan thoroughly and show clearly what students will be learning if they have an understanding of what learners have to do.

In lieu, Assessment should not be thought of at the end of the learning activity. It should form an integral part of the learning activity. It guides the learning process by telling whether students achieve the outcomes or not. Assessment can help teachers to review their teaching and assessment strategies from time to time. This will be done so that teaching and assessment strategies help students to achieve the outcomes teachers wish they should achieve in the learning environment as cited by the aforementioned author.

Moreover, the validators gave their suggestions pertaining on the assessment to go back again to your CLOs so that you have an alignment on the assessment that you mention can be part of their weekly activities in your classroom we called it formative assessment. Design assessment that will measure the skills that you want your students to acquire at the end of the lesson.

It is on this premise, the results show that assessment given to the students in SNEd 217 Adapted Physical Education and Recreation, Music and Health were so many and it does not categorically address to the course learning outcomes. This further means that there is no consistency on the alignment of the assessment to the CLOs and TLAs. In other words, it is not constructively aligned to the course outcomes.

The implication for this, teachers failed put emphasis on outcomes. Learners are deemed expected to attain the desired outcomes. Every learner should be taken as an individual who can learn and succeed.

The findings are in agreement with the statement of Sutton (1991) that assessment lies at the heart of promoting children. Van der Horst and McDonald (1997) argue that assessment should be a part of planning and preparation. It is important for assessment procedures to give a clear indication of what learners are learning.

The constructive alignment of course learning outcomes to teaching learning activities and assessment in SNEd 219 is illustrated in the Matrix 3 below.

Matrix 3: Constructive Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) to Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs) and Assessment

COURSE		
SNED 219 Early Childhood Inclusive Education		
ANALYSIS		
<i>Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)</i>	<i>Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs)</i>	<i>Assessment</i>
<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Some of the course learning outcomes are just an activity/ties please refer to PSG's.</i> ➤ <i>Some of the BTI's are inappropriate to the course better choose the best BTI that will hit your course.</i> ➤ <i>You may come up with 2 minimum outcomes or 4 maximum outcomes.</i> ➤ <i>Conduct of survey and profiling are just activities that can be done during the weekly class.</i> ➤ <i>Prepare tool/s or rubrics on how you will measure them. See to it that the outcomes are SMART and competency/ies based.</i> 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The teaching learning activities were not written in the CQA form. I can't see the relevance of the activity. But I notice that the topic is also anaemic and need to improve to align it to the course description and to the course learning outcomes. 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Align the assessments to the course description and to the learning outcomes. ➤ Use always the higher order thinking skills. Let them create or design program plan as what you have written in your Course Learning Outcomes. What does it mean? You were not able to assess if your students were able to deliver the skills that you want them. ➤ Check the assessments if

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Outcomes should align to the course description.</i> ➤ <i>Always ask yourself? Are the Course learning outcomes aligned to the description of the course? Thus, my students need to learn those skills before they graduate? Are they beneficial? Necessary to the course? If yes go for it, if not change it to what is/are essential/s.</i> ➤ <i>Visit your CLO's</i> ➤ <i>I would suggest to have written this way:</i> ➤ <i>CLO 1) demonstrate knowledge of policies, guidelines and procedures that provide safe and secure learning environments in addressing the educational needs of special learners. (3.1.1)</i> ➤ <i>CLO 2) demonstrate understanding of the special educational needs of learners from ages 0-9 with emphasis on early intervention and home-school partnership. (3.4.1)</i> ➤ <i>CLO 3) Demonstrate knowledge of the planning, design and selection of an individualized educational program for learners with special needs. (5.1.1)</i> 		<p>it measures the skills of the students in your particular course.</p>
<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CLO1 is overloaded in terms of student deliverables: survey, early intervention and home-school partnership. The course description requires only for identifying educational needs, developing/doing early intervention and fostering home-school partnership. <p>Note: It is important to clearly address the concepts and the parameters stated in the course description.</p>	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The listed topics do not cover all the essential components of how to address educational needs, how to design and/or implement early intervention, types and nature of interventions and principles in organizing and building links between the school and home. 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The assessment tasks do not fully address the fundamentals of the course. ➤ While a case analysis maybe a building block to attain the outcome of significance, it does not directly contribute to the development of the intervention plans. This can be taken as unit outcome. In the same token a learning visit portfolio can be enabler considering that this course is not a field course.

Course Learning Outcomes. As revealed in the validation of the course learning outcomes in SNEd 219 Early Childhood Inclusive Education, some of the course learning outcomes are just activities. This must be referred to Policy Standard Guidelines (PSG) in the BSNEd Program. Some of the BTIs are inappropriate to the course better choose the best BTI that will hit your course. Furthermore, the validator 1 encouraged to come up with two (2) minimum outcomes or four (4) maximum outcomes. The more course outcomes there are, it would also become more difficult to align teaching and learning activities and assessment tasks to each. It is noted that the conduct of survey and profiling are just activities that can be done during the weekly class. It is further encouraged to prepare tools or rubrics on how you will measure them. See to it the outcomes are SMART. The outcomes should align to the course description.

There was an urgent call for all concerned by the validator to have a self-reflection. Always ask yourself. Are the course learning outcomes aligned to the description of the course? Thus, my students need to learn those skills before they graduate? Are they beneficial or necessary to the course? If yes, go for it but if not, change it to what are essentials.

The aforesaid data opted the validator to suggest to visit your CLOs to have written as shown in the illustrated matrix 3.

Undeniably, validator 2 noted that CLO 1 is overloaded in terms of student deliverables. This challenged the teachers teaching the course to conduct a survey on early intervention and home-school partnership. In lieu, the course description requires only for identifying educational needs, developing or doing early intervention and fostering home-school partnership. It is important to note to clearly address the concepts and the parameters stated in the course description.

The results aptly means that the learning program is not align best fitted to the needs of the learners and some of the beginning indicators are inappropriate and it did not hit to the course outcomes. The statements should be SMART: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Result Oriented and Time bound.

This would imply that the beginning of the learning journey is the learning outcomes to be achieved. Sieborger (2004) argues that outcomes should be used as the means of control over teaching and learning. If outcomes are made clear, teachers and learners will know what to aim at when they engage themselves in the teaching and learning processes. In this way, both teachers and learners are guided by.

It is always good to keep in mind that independent learning activities allow learners to develop personal responsibility. The degree of independence to learn how to learn is enhanced which further explains the essence of OBE which is a learner-centered approach.

On the other hand, the teaching and learning activities of SNEd 219 is displayed in similar matrix.

Teaching and Learning Activities. Analysis showed that the teaching learning activities of SNEd 219 Early Childhood Inclusive Education were not written in the CQA form. The topic was also anaemic and need to improve and align it to the course learning outcomes.

Moreover, the listed topics do not cover all the essential components of how to address educational needs and how to design and/or implement early interventions types and nature of interventions and principles in organizing and building links between the school and home.

The result simply means that there was a gray area on the part of the teacher regarding the constructive alignment of the course description to the course outcomes and the topic was also limited and not substantial. This further means that the teacher failed to include the most common essential competencies in early childhood inclusive education.

This would imply that different mindset may result to different outcomes. The result is strengthened with the statement of learning is enhanced when students learn how to learn together, engage in serious discussion, examine important topics and have shared responsibility for applying what they know to new situation.

According to Bilbao, et.al (2015) learning occurs most effectively when students receive feedback i.e., when they receive information on what they have already learned. The process by which this information is generated through assessment.

Assessment task in SNEd 219 is portrayed in similar matrix above.

Assessment. From the validators point of view as regards to the assessment alignment of the course description to the learning outcomes is needed. As suggested, use always the higher order thinking skills (HOTS). Let them create or design program plan as what you have written in your course learning outcomes and check these assessments if it measures the skills of the students in your particular course.

Likewise, the assessment tasks do not fully address the fundamentals of the course. While case analysis maybe a building block to attain the outcome of significance, it does not directly contribute to the development of the intervention plans. This can be taken as unit outcome. Since the course is not a field course, a portfolio can be used as enables.

The result means that the assessment is not align in the course outcomes and higher order thinking skills (HOTS) is needed to the college students particularly those learners with additional needs for the purpose of cognitive development.

This implies that the higher of cognitive intelligence is the better the learner. Hence the focus is to develop HOTS among the students. Fraser et.al (2004) explains that learners must be exposed to challenges at a higher level that will raise the standard of performance for successful learning. Higher standards of learning should be set for all the learners. Every learner is

able to do something. Learners are expected to become something in their lives as OBE focuses on the ultimate end results. On the other side of the fact, the students must not be treated as passive learners but rather as active learners exploring and going beyond the information given.

However, Matrix 4 illustrates the constructive alignment of course learning outcomes to teaching and learning activities and assessment in SNED 111 Foundations of Special Needs and Inclusive Education.

Matrix 4: **Constructive Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) to Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs) and Assessment**

COURSE		
<i>SNED 111 Foundations of Special Needs and Inclusive Education</i>		
ANALYSIS		
<i>Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)</i>	<i>Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs)</i>	<i>Assessment</i>
<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Some of the Course learning outcomes are not necessary to the course like designing and demonstrating learning activities other courses may handle that one. ➤ Foundation will focus on the theory generation so that on the other course the student will use this in the preparation of the instructional material and the improvement of their skill and strategies in demonstrating the lesson. ➤ If the foundation Subject will ask also demonstration there will be a duplication of the task that later on will burden the students. ➤ Teachers focus on the content since, content is necessary in getting the LET exam. ➤ Making brochures maybe focus on the different theories about inclusive education or brochure on how to understand the different characteristics of the students with special needs. It is like a Awareness Brochure for Inclusive Education Program. ➤ I would suggest that teacher should address 1.1.1 as necessary for the students to learn the content and pedagogy needed in teaching the students with special needs and 1.2.1 for the research-based theory needed to understand learners' characteristics. and 2.1.1 to address legal bases in inclusive education. ➤ This can be written this way: CLO1) <i>demonstrate content knowledge and understanding of researched-based theories, principles and legal bases of Inclusive Education and special needs education.</i> 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The topics were also anaemic. Provide more content especially theories. ➤ Legal bases where not taught as the course description mentioned. ➤ Teaching and learning activities will focus on the understanding the characteristics of a learners with special needs based on theories and discuss all the legal basis that will help our pre-service teachers in the field late on. 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Some of the assessments are not align to the course description, course learning outcomes, and topic. ➤ Focus on what them to learn in your course. ➤ Do not ask if it not necessary. ➤ Do not burden yourself nor your students. ➤ Focus on what is essential. ➤ You are in charge of the content let others in charge of the skills on how to apply their learning from you. The more content you give to them the possibility in passing the LET. ➤ Possible assessments ➤ CLO 1 Assessment Portfolio of all the legal cases about Inclusive education. (1.1.1, 1.2.1) ➤ CLO 2 Brochure on how to understand learners with special needs. (2.1.1, 2.2.1) <p>> Paper and pencil test (1.1.1)</p>

<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CLOs 1 and 3 maybe fused since CLO1 is a prerequisite to CLO3. CLO4 may just focus on microteaching (a learning episode) showcasing management strategies in an inclusive classroom. 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Topics do not bear the essentials of the components listed in the course description and CLOs ➤ TLAs fail to provide adequate scaffolds for the students to meet the competencies required to perform the CLOs 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Assessment tasks and assessment tools must be specified (e.g., Performance Task: Creating/Designing a brochure on Assessment Tool: Scoring Rubric)
---	--	---

Course Learning Outcomes. The validators noted that some of the course outcomes are not necessary to the course like designing and demonstrating learning activities other courses may handle that one. Foundation will focus on the theory generation so that on the other course the student will use this in the preparation of instructional material and the improvement of their skill and strategies in demonstrating the lesson.

If in case the foundation subject will ask also demonstration there will be a duplication of the task that later on will burden the students. The teachers focused on the content since content is necessary in getting the licensure examination. Other comments were made during validation as portrayed in the above illustrated matrix.

Making brochures may be focus on the different theories about inclusive education or brochure on how to understand the different characteristics of the students with special needs. It is like an Awareness Brochures for Inclusive Education Program. Suggestions are made by the validators as gleaned in the same matrix.

With regard to the comments of another validator, CLO 1 and CLO 3 may be fused since CLO 1 is a pre-requisite to CLO 3; CLO 4 may just focus on micro teaching (a learning episode showcasing management strategies in an inclusive classroom).

The validators further cited among others the following suggestions that teacher should address BTI 1.1.1 (Demonstrate content knowledge and its application within and/or across curriculum teaching areas) as necessary for the students to learn the content and pedagogy needed in teaching the students with special needs and BTI 1.2.1 (Demonstrate an understanding of research-based knowledge and principles of teaching and learning) for the research-based theory needed to understand the learners characteristics and BTI 2.1.1 (Demonstrate knowledge of policies, guidelines and procedures that provide safe and secure environments) to address legal basis in inclusive education. This can be written this way: CLO 1) Demonstrate content knowledge and understanding of researched-based theories, principles and legal bases of inclusive education and special needs education.

The result is imperative that there is a problem on the constructive alignment of the course outcomes to the TLAs and there are some CLOs that are no longer necessary to the course like designing and demonstrating learning activities.

This implies that Biggs and Tang (1996) identified another problem which is that teachers start with the topics to be taught and then try to write outcomes for those topics. This is contradictory to the principle of OBE which is design down. You start with the aims of the course in relation to the program as a whole, then list the important topics that are to be addressed and then design TLAs and assessment appropriate in achieving the course outcomes. This approach will help you achieve the alignment of the course from its course learning outcomes down to the teaching learning activities and assessment.

Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs). As presented in the same matrix it vividly seen that the topics were also anaemic. Given the fact that it is important to provide adequate content especially theories. The legal bases were not taught as the course description mentioned. Teaching and learning activities should focus on the understanding the characteristics of a learner with special needs on theories and discuss all the legal basis that will help on pre-service teachers in the field later on.

Corollary to this, based on the analysis of validator 2 that topics do not bear the essentials of the components listed in the course description and CLOs. It can be said that selecting the actual topics to teach is obviously a matter of specific content expertise and judgment. You, as the content expert, are the best able to decide on this, but when doing so note the tension between coverage and depth of understanding. Consequently, teaching learning activities in this course fail to provide adequate scaffolds for the students to meet the competencies required to perform the CLOs.

Meaning to say that the CLOs is not being attained for the reason that the TLA design by the teacher does not suffice the intended course outcomes to be achieved. Therefore, the alignment between the teaching and learning activities to the course outcomes is not constructively aligned.

Assessment. In the context of assessment in SNEd 111 Foundations of Special Needs and Inclusive Education, some of the assessments are not aligned to the course description, course learning outcomes and teaching learning activities. Heretofore, the validators suggested to focus on what to learn in your course and do not ask if it is not necessary. Do not burden yourself nor your students. Focus on what is essential. If you are in-charge of the content, let others in-charge of the skills on how to apply their learning from you. This means that educators should focus all their classroom practices on the outcomes that learners should achieve.

In addition, possible assessment should be provided like: CLO 1 Assessment Portfolio of all the legal cases about inclusive education (BTI 1.1.1 & 1.2.1); Brochure on how to understand learners with special needs (BTI 2.1.1 & 2.2.1); and Paper and pencil test. Assessment tasks and assessment tools must be specified (e.g., Performance Tasks on Creating or Designing a brochure on Assessment Tool: Scoring Rubric).

This implies that what and how students learn depends to a major extent on how they think they will be assessed. Assessment practices must send the right signals to students about what they should be learning and how they should be learning it. Students learn what they think they will be tested on. This is a backwash, a term coined by Lewis Elton (1987) to refer to the effects assessment has on student learning. Let us always be reminded that assessment determines what and how students learn more than the curriculum does.

Matrix 5 presents the constructive alignment of Course Learning Outcomes (CLO) to Teaching Learning Activities (TLA) and Assessment Task (AT).

Matrix 5: Constructive Alignment of Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) to Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs) and Assessment

COURSE		
<i>SNED 122: Learner's with Developmental Disabilities</i>		
ANALYSIS		
<i>Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)</i>	<i>Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs)</i>	<i>Assessment</i>
<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Course Learning Outcomes are appropriate to the course. ➤ I would suggest to use the language of the standards so that it would be easy to identify the standards that you are hitting. ➤ Some of the BTI's were also not align to the course description and course learning outcomes. If you want to carry it out. Align your course description and should be explicitly stated. ➤ I would suggest that profiling should not be part of the Course Learning Outcomes but part of the activity/ies of the students. ➤ <i>You may improve your course learning outcomes by writing this way:</i> ➤ <i>CLO1) demonstrate content knowledge and its application within and/or across curriculum teaching areas. (1.1.1)</i> 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The topics were appropriate but needs also to be measure after they have learned it. What would be the possible activities for these topics that will lead to the Course learning Outcomes? Are the topics beneficial to our students? If yes provide activities for them where they can showcase their skills. 	<p>Validator 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Assessment was aligned to the Course Learning outcomes but it may improve after some of the revision later. ➤ CLO2 were not address In the assessment. ➤ Always align your assessment to your course learning outcomes. Your assessment will identify if the students were able to learned the skills

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>CLO2) Demonstrate knowledge of the design and selection of learning activities for learners with developmental disabilities. (5.1.1)</i> ➤ <i>CLO 3) Demonstrate knowledge in the preparation of the instructional materials that is responsive to learners with disabilities. (3.3.1)</i> 		
<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CLO 1 need to be expressed in terms of the students' performance using strong verb. Since CLO1 is a prerequisite to come up with developmentally appropriate learning activities, it may be placed in the intended learning outcomes, keeping the two CLOs. (CLOs 2 and 3) 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Topics 1 and II are aligned to the course learning outcomes while topic III may focus on the learning of various strategies to facilitate learning among those identified with developmental disabilities. The essentials of lesson planning may be covered in another course. 	<p>Validator 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A portfolio covers already the profiling, compilation of strategies and designed instructional materials. In other words, a portfolio can provide an adequate proof of students' acquisition of the competencies.

Course Learning Outcomes. The validator 1 suggested to use the language of the standards so that it would easy to identify the standards that you are hitting. Profiling should not be part of the course learning outcomes but part of the activities of the students. As divulge in the subsequent matrix, it is worthy to mention that the course learning outcomes are appropriate to the course which made the validators gave their suggested learning outcomes by writing this way: CLO 1) Demonstrate content knowledge and its application within and/or across curriculum teaching areas (BTI 1.1.1); CLO 2) Demonstrate knowledge of the design and selection of learning activities for learners with developmental disabilities (BTI 5.1.1); and CLO 3) Demonstrate knowledge with preparation of instructional materials that is responsive to learners with disabilities (BTI 3.3.1).

The prevailing view of validator 2 indicates that CLO 1 need to be expressed in terms of the students' performance using strong verb.

In effect to the data mentioned earlier, it shows that defining that standard of outcome of learning is important. Verbs like 'understand', 'comprehend', 'be aware of' are unhelpful in course outcomes because they do not convey the level of performance we require if the course outcomes are to be met. One of the key criteria of a good course outcomes is that the student, when seeing a written course outcome, would know what to do and how well to do it in order to meet the course learning outcomes as further stressed by the validators.

Thus, to achieve most intended learning outcomes a range of verbs from high to low cognitive level needs to activated. The highest would refer to such activities as reflecting and theorizing, the lowest to memorizing and recalling, while in between are various levels of activity. The students should be able to use the full range of desired learning activities. They should learn terminology; they memorize formula but move from there to applying these formulate to new examples rather than having those low level and inappropriate learning activities. Moreover, decide what kind of knowledge is to be involved in writing your CLO may it be declarative knowledge which mainly talks about knowing about phenomena, theories, disciplines and specific topics or functioning knowledge that requires the student to exercise active control over problems and decisions in the appropriate content domains.

The course learning outcomes should be clear as to what kind of knowledge you want and why. As Jansen (2001) states that outcomes are clear, observable demonstrations of student learning that occur at or after the end of a significant set of learning experiences. These are not values, attitudes, feelings, beliefs, activities, assignments and goals. Spady (1993) emphasizes that outcomes are observable things learners can do during or after a learning activity. For us to say that learners have achieved certain outcomes evidence is needed to support that.

The result explains that the course learning outcomes are appropriate to the course.

The teaching learning activities is shown in Matrix 5 pertaining in SNEd 122 The learners with developmental disabilities.

Teaching Learning Activities (TLAs). As viewed by the validators regarding teaching learning activities, the topic was appropriate but needs also to be measured after they have learned it. Self-reflections on the part of teachers are deemed necessary as gleaned in the above matrix.

Based on the observation of validator 2, topics 1 and II are aligned to the course learning outcomes while topic III may focus on the learning of various strategies to facilitate learning among those identified with developmental disabilities. The essentials of lesson planning may be covered in another course.

The result shows that the teaching learning activities need to be improved as to its accuracy in achieving the desired learning outcomes. Schunk, et.al (2002) emphasizes that effective teaching requires that we eliminate those aspects of our teaching that encourage surface approaches to learning and that teachers should set the stage properly so that students will more readily use deep approaches to learning. This involves getting students realize that appropriate task engagement is a good and impelling idea and that we should establish the kind of climate that will optimize appropriate interactions with our students. An essential aspect to effective teaching is reflective practice which involves us, teachers, reflecting on our current teaching in order to create an improved teaching and learning strategies (Moore, et.al, 1993).

This would imply that any strategy chosen should suit the purpose of teaching. Choice of teaching strategies should be based on the desired outcomes to be reached by students.

Assessment. Both of the validators claimed that assessments in SNEd 122 were aligned to the course learning outcomes but it may improve after some of the revision later.

Unfortunately, CLO 2 did not address in the assessment. Hence, always align your assessment to your course learning outcomes. Your assessment will identify if the students were able to learn the skills.

While another validator stated that a portfolio covers the profiling compilation of strategies and designed instructional materials. In other words, a portfolio can provide an adequate proof of students' acquisition of the competencies.

The findings aptly means that teachers should always consider in planning the assessment tasks and making it align to the ultimate end goal. Assessment is the senior partner in learning and teaching. Moreover, it reinforces learning.

This implies when you get it wrong, everything collapses and this will lead to failure of constructive alignment to the course learning outcomes.

3. Conclusion

The course outcomes in the five identified major courses in BSNEd Program is not aligned to the teaching learning activities and assessment tasks and evaluation. Some of the course learning outcomes are just an activity and not necessary to the course. Therefore, the course learning outcomes are not constructively aligned to the teaching learning activities and assessment task and evaluation.

4. Recommendation

Based on the findings and conclusion from this study, the following recommendations are hereby forwarded.

1. The Key Officials of BiPSU are encouraged to prioritize to conduct Curriculum Quality Audit (CQA) in the BSNEd Program to assure constructive alignment of the OBE course syllabus.
2. Invite experts from the different fields of SUCs for the conduct of Training, Seminars and/or Writeshop in designing constructively aligned course syllabus.

REFERENCES

- Biggs, J., C. Tang (2007), "Teaching for Quality Learning at University Fourth Edition", The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press
- Biggs, J.B. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment, *Higher Education*
- Bilbao, P. et. al. (2015). Curriculum Development for Teachers. Metro Manila, Philippines. Lorimar Publishing Inc.
- Elton, L. (1987). Teaching in higher education: appraisal and training. London: Kogan Page
- Hattie, J. (2009). The Black Box of tertiary assessment: an impending revolution, in L.H. Meyer, S. Davidson, H. Anderson et.al *Tertiary Assessment and Higher Education Student Outcomes: Policy, Practice and Research*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ako Aotearoa
- Jansen, J. (1999). "A very noisy OBE": The implementation of OBE in Grade 1 Classrooms. In Jansen, J. & Christie, P. (Eds.), *Changing curriculum: Studies in outcomes-based education in South Africa* (p. 203-217). Cape Town: JUTA.
- Killen, R. (2002). Validity in outcomes-based assessment. *Perspective in education*. Volume 21 1 March 2003
- Killen, R. (2003). Outcomes-based Education: Principles and Possibilities. University of New Castle, Australia
- Macayan, J. (2017), "Implementing Outcomes-based Education (OBE) Framework: Implications of Assessment of Students' Performance", Research Gate, Mapua University
- Ramoroka, N.J (2006), "Educators' Understanding of the Premises Underpinning Outcomes-based Education and its Impact on their Classroom Assessment Practices", University of Pretoria etd
- Schunk DH, Pintrich PR, Meece JL. Motivation in education: Theory, research, and applications, 3rd. Pearson Education, Inc, Upper Saddle River, NJ2008
- Shuell, T.J. (1986). Cognitive conceptions of learning, Review of Educational Research.
- Spady, W. (1993). Outcomes-based education. Australian Curriculum Studies Association.
- Van Der Horst, H & McDonald, R. 1997. OBE. A teacher's manual. Pretoria. Kagiso.