Classroom Assessment of Bangladesh: A Review

Jasim Uddin Ahmmed

Principal
Ideal College
65 Central Road, Dhanmondi, Dhaka-1205, Bangladesh

ABSTRACT

Quality education is very much essential for growth and development of any country. For ensuring quality education, classroom assessment is a very much important element. Classroom assessment helps the teacher for improving teaching. Classroom assessment is very important for any country even for Bangladesh. However the present study has conducted to review the classroom assessment of Bangladesh and to explore the classroom assessment of Bangladesh. The study was documentary analysis type. Data and information were collected from secondary sources. Secondary data were collected from books, research reports, journal, annual reports, website of Ministry of Education of Bangladesh, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS), Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics(BANBEIS), internet etc. From the result it was found that the classroom assessment can be any activities such as tests, oral questioning and observations by teachers, portfolios, homework, or group work that the teachers use in the classroom to collect data on students' learning which guides the teachers' further instruction in the classroom. In the literature, the terms *classroom assessment* and *formative assessment* are often used interchangeably as classroom assessment is well-known for its formative role in classroom-based informal approaches in enhancing students' learning. However, not all CA is formative in nature. There is no consensus on whether FCA should be graded or not. Some authors think that CA, as a valid and reliable source of evidence regarding students' learning, can be graded and linked to accountability or summative assessment for a better inference about quality of education. They propose that there are advantages to such blending and are optimistic that effectively blending these two assessments can accomplish this. The need for integrating formative classroom assessment and summative accountability assessment to enhance the reliability, validity, and utility of the accountability assessment data has been expressed by many assessment experts and educationists. From the result it was also found that classroom assessment can improve students' learning if practiced formatively. According to some reviews there are different features of classroom assessment, making it especially powerful for helping students enhance their learning. Features such as effective feedback, classroom questioning, and self-assessment of the students were discussed to make it formative classroom assessment. All of these studies show that innovations that aimed to strengthen formative assessment practice in the classroom produced significant and often substantial learning gains. Formative classroom assessment is also helpful in closing achievement gaps in classrooms. The classroom assessment helps to identify what students have and have not achieved by using classroom assessment techniques such as teacher observation and classroom discussion, interviews and brief, in-class writing assignments, class tests and homework. Then, the teachers can make responsive changes in teaching and ultimately in students' learning. Since formative assessment is tightly linked with instructional practices, teachers must first consider how their classroom activities, assignments, and tests support learning aims and allow students to communicate what they know and then use this information to improve teaching and learning.

Key words: *Education, Classroom assessment, Formative Classroom Assessment, Feedback, Teaching, Learning, Evaluation, Teacher, Student, Policy, Teaching*

INTRODUCTION

Classroom assessments are of great importance in an era of accountability. Worldwide, there has been a huge increase in class room assessment isnd the trend is growing (Kamens, & McNeely, 2010). In Bangladesh, for example, an increasing number of reforms in the classroom assessment and examination system in Bangladesh have occurred during the past five to ten years. For example, a new examination pattern was introduced in 2008 for the Secondary School Certificate exams (SSC) after grade ten. This involves a reduced proportion of multiple-choice questions (MCQ) and the introduction of alternative question styles (structured questions) to replace the then current narrative or essay type questions. It is expected that these reforms will enable testing all learning objectives of the curriculum and overcome the current over-emphasis on recall of facts from the textbooks. New procedures to ensure more valid

question settings and processes for more equitable and reliable marking of student answers have also been adopted. Until 2013, students took two public examinations after completing grades ten and twelve. Since then, the Ministry of Education has added two additional examinations, one after grade five and another after grade eight. However, less focus has been put on reforming CA. Compared to reforms in high stake public examination; reforms of CA have been both minimal and sporadic. School Based Assessment (SBA) was introduced in 2007 and had several components for formative CA. SBA was subsequently replaced by Continuous Assessment in the 2012 School Curriculum.

The practice of CA is significantly influenced by teacher preparation (Stiggins, 1999; Plake, 1993). We need to know how teachers are prepared to use CA in schools. We also need to know if teachers are sufficiently prepared in training institutes to transform the particular changes in curriculum regarding CA. Policy dimension of teacher preparation is a less researched area in Bangladesh. Existing empirical studies on CA explore and identify only the problems in CA practice. This body of research merely investigates the underlying reasons for the problems in CA practice: 1) why teachers do not use CA in a formative way as Assessment for Learning, or 2) why teachers cannot apply what they have learned in teacher preparation, or 3) what are the policies on CA that can influence CA practice in classrooms and teachers learning in teacher preparation programs.

OBJECTIVES
The objective of the study is as follows:
1. To review the classroom assessment of Bangladesh.
2. To explore the classroom assessment of Bangladesh.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY
The study was documentary analysis type. Data and information were collected from secondary sources. Secondary data were collected from books, research reports, journal, annual reports, website of Ministry of Education of Bangladesh, Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (BBS), Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics(BANBEIS), internet etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Classroom Assessment
In this section, I describe the concept of Formative Classroom Assessment (FCA), its role in improving learning, the practice of FCA including issues related to this practice, and possible reasons behind these practice- related issues. Finally, I explore the policy and teacher preparation-related aspects of CA that constrain the practice of CA. The practice of CA in Bangladesh is described in the first chapter.

Formative Classroom Assessment
Classroom assessment can be any activities such as tests, oral questioning and observations by teachers, portfolios, homework, or group work that the teachers use in the classroom to collect data on students' learning which guides the teachers' further instruction in the classroom. Popham (2009) defined classroom assessment as, "….formal and informal procedures that teachers employ in an effort to make accurate inferences 22 about what their students know and can do" (p. 6). To draw from the literature, the main features of classroom assessments are that these assessments:
(1) have the potential to be formative in purpose and aim to improve students' learning
(2) are internal to the classroom and closely linked to classroom instruction
(3) use tests or assessment activities that are usually teacher-made, not standardized
(4) focus on providing feedback to the students which is crucial for improving students' learning
(5) are informal in nature
(6) are usually low stake in nature for both teachers and students
(7) are usually not graded (Popham, 2009; Black & William, 2004; Garrison & Ehringhaus, 2011; Stiggins & Chappuis, 2005; Shepard, Penuel, & Pellegrino, 2018)

In the literature, the terms *classroom assessment* and *formative assessment* are often used interchangeably as classroom assessment is well-known for its formative role in classroom-based informal approaches in enhancing students' learning. However, not all CA is formative in nature. Black & William (2004) argue that any kind of assessment must promote learning, and assessment needs to be formative in nature to do so. They defined formative assessment as a kind of assessment which has the main purpose of improving students' learning. They support the idea that classroom assessment has the potential to be formative in nature and raise the standard of learning but conclude that Classroom Assessment is not necessarily formative assessment and vice-versa.

There is no consensus on whether FCA should be graded or not. Some authors think that CA, as a valid and reliable source of evidence regarding students' learning, can be graded and linked to accountability or summative assessment for a better inference about quality of education. They propose that there are advantages to such blending and are

optimistic that effectively blending these two assessments can accomplish this. The need for integrating formative classroom assessment and summative accountability assessment to enhance the reliability, validity, and utility of the accountability assessment data has been expressed by many assessment experts and educationists (Wilson & Carstensen, 2007; Banta, 2007; Wilson & Draney, 2004). Bennett (2011) also believes that the purposes of summative and formative assessments are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, they can coexist as primary and secondary purposes of the same assessment.

An opposing view regarding grading and blending FCA with summative one has been presented by other researchers. For example, Black and William (2009) think that classroom assessment is effective in raising standards only when the purpose is to improve students' learning, rather than grading. Black & William (2004) worked with teachers in six secondary schools for the project, the King's-Medway-Oxfordshire Formative Assessment Project (KMOFAP), in 1999 which encouraged teachers to experiment with rich formative assessment techniques which proved to be successful based on previous research. . The experiments include, for example, rich questioning, comment-only marking, sharing criteria with students, self-assessment, and peer assessment. They found that some teachers and students believe that classroom and accountability assessments are fundamentally different in their purpose, philosophy and process and need to be kept separate. In interviews, when asked if and how summative assessment affected their teaching and assessment, teachers responded they had to teach to the (summative) test even while understanding that the summative test questions have less validity compared to formative assessment in terms of national curriculum specifications. Similarly, Shepard, Penuel, and Pellegrino (2018) proposed that to have integrity in the intention of formative assessment culture and to motivate students in learning, grading policies should avoid using points and grades. Rather, assessment should create opportunities for students to use feedback to improve their work.

Role of FCA in Facilitating Students' Learning
Classroom assessment can improve students' learning if practiced formatively. Black & William (1998, 2004, 2009) conducted an extensive literature review of CA. The populations for these studies were diverse, ranging over ages from 5-year-olds to university undergraduates, across several school subjects, and over several countries such as Portugal, the United States, Australia, and the UK. They claimed that there are different features of classroom assessment, making it especially powerful for helping students enhance their learning. Features such as effective feedback, classroom questioning, and self-assessment of the students were discussed to make it formative classroom assessment. All of these studies show that innovations that aimed to strengthen formative assessment practice in the classroom produced significant and often substantial learning gains (for example, Fontana & Fernandes, 1994; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1986; Wininger, 2005). Formative classroom assessment is also helpful in closing achievement gaps in classrooms (Black & William, 2009).

Unlike summative classroom assessment, such as end-of-the-semester or year-end tests, FCA is integrated into classroom instruction which gives immediate feedback to teachers and students on their teaching and learning so that teachers can improve their teaching and give feedback to students to improve their learning. An example of formative CA can be an oral question-answer session after teaching a unit (Garrison & Ehringhaus, 2011). William (2011, p.3) described the formative role of classroom assessment as both "Assessment for Learning" and "Assessment as Learning" as opposed to summative, high-stakes, and accountability assessment, which mainly plays the role of "Assessment of Learning". While assessment of learning refers to focusing on measuring by providing final scores, grades, certificates, or ranking, which is not immediately meaningful for the students to improve their learning, assessment for learning is used especially to help students further enhance their learning. Assessment as Learning, which is a more sophisticated way of thinking about assessment, means that the assessment process itself can be a way to help students learn. Self-assessment, peer assessment, and other alternative ways of assessment such as games, debates, projects, presentations used in classroom assessment are not only used for measuring learning but themselves constitute a rich learning process for the students. According to William (2011), the formative feature of classroom assessment is its most powerful aspect, which has a diagnostic use of assessment to provide feedback to teachers and students over the course of instruction. The goal of formative assessment is to identify what students have and have not achieved by using classroom assessment techniques such as teacher observation and classroom discussion, interviews and brief, in-class writing assignments, class tests and homework. Then, the teachers can make responsive changes in teaching and ultimately in students' learning. Since formative assessment is tightly linked with instructional practices, teachers must first consider how their classroom activities, assignments, and tests support learning aims and allow students to communicate what they know and then use this information to improve teaching and learning.

Besides the work of Popham, Black, and William, Hatties's research on CA also found that CA practice is an important tool for facilitating students' learning. Over the past decade Hattie (2009, 2012, & 2013) has been trying to trace the major influences on student achievement or learning. In a research conference paper, Hattie (2013) summarized his findings on the influences on students' learning and focused significantly on assessing students. He found providing effective feedback to be the most significant factor influencing students' learning. While describing seven principles to promote effective learning, "maintenance of learning" (p. 33) was included, which he thinks needs

to be deliberately taught and embedded in the student. He believes this is the reason for educators to spend a significant amount of time developing assessment tools for teachers to help them know their impact (Hattie, Brown, & Keegan, 2005). This is also why teachers need to know how "to assist students to become assessment savvy to help in their own diagnosis, response to intervention and evaluation of learning, and why we see the 'teacher as evaluator of their impact' as central to the Visible Learning messages" (p. 33). He argues that the key aspect of maintenance is feedback because it influences what happens after instruction. Meta-analyses relating to feedback show very high values ($d = 0.75$) of influencing students' learning.

Among the most powerful notions is that when the feedback to the teacher is maximized about their impact on students, this has the greatest beneficial effects for the student, as it is then teachers are adaptive in their interventions, have a more effective sense of the magnitude of the influence they are having, and the prevalence of their impact is shown to them in terms of how many students are "learning." (Hattie, 2013, p. 34)

He mentions that one of the most powerful ways for teachers to recognize the impact of their teaching is to have classroom dialogue (d = 0.82), which is usually rare in U.S. classrooms. He concluded about feedback, saying, "We need to be more attentive to observing students learning in classrooms and less attentive to how teachers teach. Watch the students not the teacher; watch the impact of the teacher on students not the teaching methods of the teacher". (p. 34).

There are critiques regarding the research that advocates FCA for its role in promoting learning. Dunn & Mulvenon (2009) argue that although there is a plethora of literature arguing that classroom assessment in the form of formative assessment can raise educational outcomes of students, the definition of classroom assessment and formative assessment remain vague and excepting theoretical arguments, there is very little empirical research showing that real educational achievements result from formative classroom assessment. Another critique of most such research is that the outcome of FCA is measured through conventional paper pencil tests or summative tests which are not always a good measure of learning. Bennett (2011) argues that though widely acknowledged, the effectiveness of formative assessment claims is not always well grounded because of the lack of a uniform definition of the concept of formative assessment. Therefore, more empirical research on CA practice can shed light on this FCA topic.

Formative Classroom Assessment: Poverty of Practice
There is evidence that FCA can raise the standard of students' learning. Yet, CA is not practiced formatively in classrooms. Black & William (2001) referred to this as "poverty of practice" (p. 4). Research studies on the implementation of the UK's educational reforms have also found that formative assessment is "seriously in need of development" (Russell, Qualter, & McGuigan, 1995). William & Black (2001) described some practices of classroom assessment which make formative assessment ineffective in terms of promoting students' learning in the classroom. For example, rather than giving feedback, sometimes assessment is based on marking and grades which seems ineffective for students to improve their learning. Like accountability assessments, classroom assessment can also focus on memorizing facts and trivial learning rather than important learning such as critical thinking and problem solving. Black & William (2001) summarized studies in UK and found that though the teachers say that they want to promote understanding and higher order learning, what they actually measure using classroom assessment is sometimes more or less recalling facts. This ultimately drives students to memorize facts, not understand. In many cases, the questions and other methods used for CA are not discussed with or shared between teachers in the same school, and they are not critically reviewed in relation to what they actually assess. The CA is not aligned to curriculum goals and objectives. Sometimes the assessment is used to segregate, or rank students based on their score and the students are compared to each other which encourage unhealthy competition rather than cooperative learning and support. Consequently, feedback from classroom assessment teaches pupils with low attainment that they lack 'ability'; as a result, they are de-motivated, believing that they are not able to learn (Black & William, 2001). In the secondary schools of Bangladesh, too, FCA is not practiced; CA is rather dominated by summative assessments (see Introduction).

There are different reasons for this "poverty of practice" in classroom assessment. Black and William (2001) explain the issue from two perspectives from the larger system's perspective and the teacher's individual view- related perspective. They argue that the most significant reason for this poverty of practice is the influence or dominance of high-stakes accountability assessment on classroom assessment. They believe that because of the pressure of high-stake examinations and summative assessments, teachers are teaching to tests and are more inclined to increase students' test scores rather than students' learning by providing descriptive feedback. They also mentioned another reason for this poverty of practice of formative assessment teachers' beliefs and perceptions based on a "Fixed IQ view", rather than an "untapped potential" view. Teachers may not truly believe that changing classroom instruction and assessment can make changes in students' learning and motivation (Black & William, 1998, p. 9).

Popham (2011) also tries to explain this ineffective practice of classroom assessment, but from a different perspective. He focuses more on teachers' preparation, or professional development scope and experience. He explains that those

teachers who are not using classroom assessment in an effective way may have experienced the same practice when they were students. Moreover, they did not have any further professional experience or learning which could help them unlearn this practice and instead learn effective ways of using classroom assessment. Popham (2011) mentioned that many teachers do not have adequate and clear ideas about the potentials of classroom assessment for students' learning. They also do not know how to use it effectively in the classroom. Popham (2011), based on his experience as an educator in the preservice teacher training in the United States, showed that professional education programs are not fruitful in educating teachers for using classroom assessment as the teacher professional development curriculum does not include important matters on formative assessment.

Some authors propose that poverty of practice can also prevail because of the policies of teacher preparation of CA. For example, Stiggins (2002) found that fewer than half of the states in the United States require competence in assessment for licensure as a teacher. This policy limits and discourages the scope of teachers to acquire competencies on CA as professional skills.

To summarize, the literature suggests the following factors which contribute to the ineffective use of CA: (1) dominance of high stake exams in policy, (2) teachers' perceptions and beliefs regarding students' change, which do not focus on classroom practice, (3) less or ineffective teacher preparation programs on CA, and (4) teacher preparation policies (curriculum) that do not encourage CA. Among these factors, the dominance of high-stake exams is related to CA related policy and can therefore be included in the larger policy related issues. On the other hand, teachers' perceptions, beliefs, and skills all can be attributed to teacher preparation. Therefore, the poverty of practice can be explored in two levels larger policy, and teacher preparation practice and experience.

Classroom Assessment in Policy
Policies need to support FCA to happen in classrooms and to be taught to the teachers in teacher preparation programs. Therefore, to ensure formative use of classroom assessment, the school curriculum needs to provide the scope for teachers to practice it in the classroom. Then teacher preparation, both pre-service and in service teacher education and training, needs to ensure enough and effective experience so that the teachers can acquire appropriate and relevant KAS on CA to practice in the classroom. There needs to be a clear link between the CA-related content of school curriculum and teacher preparation curriculum. Besides the curricula, other grand education policies at the larger systemic level, such as policies related to the examination system and teacher promotion should also encourage, incorporate, and promote FCA (DeLuca & Bellara, 2013; Brown, 2004).

Classroom assessment, although much praised in the literature as key for students' learning, does not receive as much policy attention as accountability assessment (Black & William, 2001). They argue that in some cases, attention has been put towards classroom assessment in policy papers as the policy focuses on raising education standards or student achievement, and they know that classroom assessment is crucial for this purpose. However, actual change in assessment practice in the school level is absent. For example, in England and Wales, there have been some changes in policy and practice in education since the 1988 Education Reform Act which has had powerful effects on assessment. Though the statements of policy and all subsequent statements of government policy regarding this policy act have emphasized the importance of formative assessment by teachers in classrooms, most of the available resources and public and political attention have been concentrated ultimately on accountability assessment (Black & William, 2001).

The focus on high-stake assessment while neglecting FCA is a global phenomenon. Authors from Australia, Canada, Ireland, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, and the United States analyzed the emergence of assessment for learning (AfL), its evolution and impact on school systems, and current trends in policy directions for AfL within their respective countries across the globe (Birenbaum, DeLuca, Earl, Heritage, Klenowski, Looney, Smith, Timperley, Volante, and Wyatt-Smith, 2015). They also concluded that although the research base for AfL seems to be well established and accepted in the various countries studied here, education policies have yet to be fully enacted for leading a significant shift in teacher practice. They also found that the ongoing tensions between formative and summative forms of assessments world-wide pose challenges to the practice of authentic and sustained AfL practices in school systems across much of the Western world.

Besides the dominance of high-stake accountability assessment, Black & William (2001) proposed another reason for insufficient policy attention to CA. They think that classroom assessment is seen by policy makers as unproblematic and already in place in the classroom, thus not meriting any attention. Cizek (2009) mentioned that the ways to ensure validity and reliability in classroom assessment is a very recent discussion and has not been researched before. For this reason, it was seen as more as an informal activity in the classroom and was not included as a valid source of data on student achievement. This also outlines another reason for excluding CA from policies.

To explore the reason for the low competencies on assessment in teachers in the United States, DeLuca and Bellara (2013) analyzed the alignment between preservice policies, professional standards, and course curricula aimed at developing teacher competency in educational assessment in the U.S. context. They found points of both alignment and misalignments across data sources. The alignment in data was found as the content was fairly well matched to standards for professional practice at instructional and educational levels with policy documents representing more global educational objectives for teacher competency in assessment. Specifically, this trend was evident for the content themes of assessment processes, assessment fairness, and measurement theory. Across standards and curriculum documents, these themes were highly represented at instructional and educational ranges of knowledge and moderate to high depth of knowledge levels. The authors revealed that these themes represented points of misalignment across data sources. Policies, standards, and curricula differed in their relative representation of these themes with an emphasis on preservice policy documents at global and educational levels of knowledge compared with minimal representation of these themes across standards and curricula documents. This finding implies that teacher education programs may be addressing these concepts more fully in other program components beyond their explicit assessment education courses. Indeed, the duration of required assessment education courses is short, typically one semester (which is 3 hours), leaving little instructional time to provide teacher candidates with a strong theoretical and practical foundation in assessment processes, assessment fairness, and measurement theory, let alone providing adequate coverage of more integrated and complex concepts of assessment for learning, communication of assessment information, and linkages between classroom environment and assessment.

In the United States, teacher education accreditation agencies develop standards for teacher candidate learning. However, they do not prescribe or develop any specific program structure for accreditation. Individual agencies providing teacher education determine the specific structures; therefore, the content of assessment and the methods of teaching the assessment education vary. Moreover, for explicit assessment education courses, setting curriculum for such courses remains unstandardized and falls largely within the purview of individual programs and instructors who teach assessment courses (DeLuca, Klinger, Searle, & Shulha, 2010). These factors can contribute to the misalignment of policies of CA represented in school curricula and teacher preparation curricula. DeLuca and Bellara (2013) suggest that regulations, policies, and student evaluation standards related to assessment should be included in the assessment education curriculum for teachers. CA in the teacher preparation program is explored in the next sections as another factor contributing to the poverty of practice of FCA in classrooms.

Teacher Preparation on Classroom Assessment
This section discusses relevant discussions on concepts, outcome, content, structure, policy, and practice of teacher preparation focusing on CA.
Concept of Teacher Preparation
The concept of preparing teachers encompasses multiple terms, including teachers' professional development, professional learning, teacher education, teacher training, preservice or inservice training, and teacher preparation, depending on the point of the teacher's career when they experience the teacher preparation, nature of the program, and intention of the program. In most of the literature, the term Teacher Professional Development (TPD) has been used to present a comprehensive idea of teacher preparation. Schwille and Dembele (2007) explained professional development as a collection of career-long processes and the related system and policies through which educators, such as teachers, administrators, and supervisors can acquire, broaden, and deepen their knowledge, skill, and commitment. Avalos (2011) defined TPD and professional learning as: teachers' learning, learning how to learn, and transforming their knowledge into practice for the benefit of their students' growth. Teacher professional learning is a complex process, which requires cognitive and emotional involvement of teachers individually and collectively, the capacity and willingness to examine where each one stands in terms of convictions and beliefs, and the perusal and enactment of appropriate alternatives for improvement or change. (p. 10)

Another concept of teachers' learning is presented in Job Embedded Professional Development (JEPD) based on the aspect of teachers' learning situated into their workplace and built with their daily work (Croft, Coggshall, Dolan, Powers, & Killion, 2010). JEPD is built into teachers' day-to-day teaching practice and designed so that teachers can learn about content-specific instructional practices to improve students' learning (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Hirsh, 2009). It works as a cycle of continuous improvement for the teachers in their teaching profession as it is integrated into the teachers' everyday teaching through which teachers can assess their teaching and students' learning to come up with locally rooted (school-based) solutions for the immediate problems and challenges they face (Hawley & Valli, 1999; National Staff Development Council, 2010). Croft, Coggshall, Dolan, Powers and Killion (2010) gave examples of different formats of JEPD, such as action research, case discussions, coaching, critical friends groups, data teams/assessment development, examining student work/tuning protocols, implementing individual professional goals/learning plans, lesson study, mentoring, portfolios, professional learning communities, and study groups.

Outcomes of Teacher Preparation on Classroom Assessment
Teacher preparation is discussed intensively in the literature for its positive outcomes on education. The outcome of teacher preparation or teachers' learning is explored and explained in three different stages and attributes in the

literature: (1) change in teachers' knowledge, attitude, dispositions, (2) change in teachers' classroom practice, and (3) change in students' academic achievement. Most of the literature focuses on teacher preparation in general and outcomes as teachers' change in general. Limited literature focuses on teacher preparation on CA or outcomes as changes in teachers' assessment practice.

There is plenty of research focusing on the impact of TPD in changing teachers' beliefs, assumptions and attitudes. Villegas-Reimers (2003) in her international literature review argued that TPD has an impact on teachers' beliefs, assumptions, and personal theories (for example, Kallestad and Olweus, 1998; Young, 2001; Wood & Bennett, 2000; Borko and Putnam, 1995). Research also shows that TPD has effects on teacher behavior or teachers' classroom practice (for example, Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon and Birman, 2002; Suporvitz, Mayer, and Kahle, 2000). Many studies have focused on investigating the effect of TPD on students' academic achievement or success. The report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future mentioned that investment in teachers' knowledge and skill development has more impact on students' achievement than other budget expenditures. Villegas-Reimers (2003) presented several research findings supporting the idea that the more TPD teachers have, the higher the level of student achievement (Educational Testing Service, 1998; Falk, 2001; Grosso de Leon, 2001; McGinn & Borden, 1995; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996, 1997; Tatto, 1997; Angrist and Lavy, 1998; Vescio, Ross and Adams, 2008; Cohen and Hill, 1997; Wenglinsky, 2002; Warwick and Reimers, 1995). However, no significant improvement in achievement of the students was seen for religious schools. The small number of these schools and the fact that the training started late in these schools may have accounted for this.

There has been scant research focusing on teacher preparation on CA and changes in teachers' CA knowledge, skills, confidence, and practice. Research suggests that while it is challenging to change prospective teachers' conceptions of assessment toward a more complex and formative orientation, achieving change in their minds and practice is possible (DeLuca, Chavez, & Cao, 2013; DeLuca, Chavez, Bellara & Cao, 2013). Chen (2005) used a standards-linked questionnaire in a sample of 61 students. He found increased confidence in assessment for those teacher candidates at undergraduate and graduate levels who participated in an explicit measurement course. DeLuca and Klinger (2010) also administered a questionnaire to 288 elementary and secondary teacher candidates. The researchers also revealed benefits of preservice measurement courses on teacher candidates' confidence. Koh (2011) examined the effects of professional development on teachers' assessment literacy in two groups of teachers who were teaching grade four and five English, science and mathematics. The groups were: (1) teachers who were involved in ongoing and sustained professional development in designing authentic classroom assessment and rubrics and (2) teachers who were given only short-term, one-shot professional development workshops in authentic assessment. The researcher found that the assessment literacy of teachers who were involved in ongoing, sustained professional development had increased significantly during the second year of study compared to the other group.

Sato, Wei, and Darling-Hammond (2008) compared the classroom assessment practice of two groups of teachers in the framework of formative assessment: one group of teachers were in the process of National Board Certification; the other group was the control group, not enrolled in any certification program. It was a three- year- long longitudinal study. They found though the initial scores of the National Board candidates had lower mean scores than the comparison group on all six assessment dimensions, by the second year they had achieved higher mean scores on all dimensions. More importantly, these candidates continued to demonstrate substantially higher scores in the third year. They demonstrated changes in the variety of assessments used and the way assessment information was used to support student learning.

There is a lot of empirical research evidence showing teacher preparation and training can bring positive changes in teachers' knowledge, attitudes, beliefs; in teachers' practice in classroom; and in students' learning achievements. However, more empirical research is needed to connect teacher preparation on CA with teachers' formative CA practice and its link with students' learning. Research also shows that the effectiveness of teacher education and training regarding the changes in teachers and students depends on the content, policy, and practice of teacher preparation programs.

Classroom Assessment as Pedagogical Knowledge

What teachers should be taught in teacher preparation programs is an old and ongoing issue of discussion. Gimmestad and Hall (1995) presented worldwide learning content for teacher preparation programs. They mentioned four general domains of knowledge for teacher preparation General Education, Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, and Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK). This basic structure is still widely followed worldwide. General education includes knowledge and skills that all college students should acquire as basic learning as an educated citizen, such as communicating in written and oral language, basic skills for computation, use of technology, and general knowledge of history, literature, arts, and science. Content knowledge means the knowledge of the subject matter that the teachers will teach. Pedagogical knowledge entails learning how to teach by acquiring the knowledge and skills necessary to be a teacher. Many of these skills can be more general and independent of specific subject matter teaching, such as learning theories, classroom management, student assessment, multicultural issues in education, and Information & Communication Technology (ICT) in education. The authors described Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) as the

most important and complex in nature among all the four domains of knowledge. Shulman (1986) coined this term PCK, which is not merely the combination of general, content, and pedagogical knowledge but a sophisticated application of all these, which results in additional knowledge and skills possessed by expert teachers can acquire. When a teacher practices PCK, he/she can have knowledge of and ability to draw upon powerful examples, analogies, illustrations, and demonstrations that will make sense to specific students. The concept of PCK has become a crucial piece in designing teacher education. Therefore, FCA can be part of the pedagogical knowledge and PCK for teachers to learn.

Teachers need both pedagogical and content knowledge for teaching in classrooms. Wilson et al. (2001) through their literature review tried to answer: "What kind of pedagogical preparation and how much of it, do prospective teachers need?". The authors described "pedagogical preparation" as the various courses that teachers take in such areas as instructional methods, learning theories, foundations of education, student assessment, and classroom management. The authors conclude that many studies found that pedagogical aspects of teacher preparation matter, both for their effects on teaching practice and for their impact on student achievement (for example, Hawk, Coble, and Swanson, 1985; Felter, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 2000). In contrast to these studies, Goldhaber and Brewer (2000) found no difference between the achievement of the students with certified teachers or uncertified teachers. However, the authors (Wilson et al. 2001) caution that many studies use a weak proxy for pedagogical preparation, which is merely having teaching credentials. Therefore, the results yield little insight into which aspects of pedagogical preparation are most crucial. Moreover, the content and arrangement of such courses in programs of teacher education vary widely from institution to institution.

Classroom Assessment in Teacher Preparation Programs
Content, Structure, and Effectiveness
Teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitude related to CA are important factors in practicing FCA in classrooms. Classroom assessment is perhaps the single most common teacher professional activity, with teachers devoting approximately 33% of their professional time assessing students in their classrooms (Stiggins, 1991a). Classroom assessment literally influences every other aspect of teaching-learning in the classroom. Therefore, it is very important that the teachers know how to conduct valid and reliable classroom assessment that can help teachers make informed decisions. Yet, research has documented that teachers' assessment- related literacy, skills, and often attitudes are generally weak (Brookhart, 2001; Campbell, Murphy, & Holt, 2002; Plake, 1993; Mertler, 1999). Stiggins (2001) also argued that practicing teachers and administrators in the schools have unacceptably low levels of assessment literacy. Brown (2004) explored teachers' conceptions of assessment in terms of their agreement or disagreement with four purposes of assessment; (a) improvement of teaching and learning, (b) school accountability, (c) student accountability, or (d) treating assessment as irrelevant. The Teachers' Conceptions of Assessment (COA-III) questionnaire was administered to 525 New Zealand primary school teachers and managers. On average, participants agreed with the improvement conceptions and the school accountability conception, while rejecting the view that assessment was irrelevant. However, respondents disagreed that assessment was for student accountability. Improvement, school, and student accountability conceptions were positively correlated. Irrelevance conception was inversely related to improvement conception and unrelated to system accountability conception.

Teachers often claim that their lack of preparation is largely due to inadequate preservice training in student assessment (Plake, 1993). Research suggests that despite assessment education efforts, beginning teachers self-reported feeling unprepared to assess student learning and maintained low assessment literacy levels (Campbell & Evans, 2000; MacLellan, 2004; Mertler and Campbell, 2004). This indicates the ineffectiveness of assessment education, too. The ineffectiveness of assessment education is explained in the literature by theory-laden, limited preservice assessment education, disconnection of the assessment education from assessment of teachers in local classroom context, and misalignment of assessment education to current educational assessment standards (DeLuca & Klinger, 2010; Graham, 2005; Stiggins, 1999).

Though there is extensive discussion in the literature regarding teacher education programs in general, there is very little discussion on how CA should be integrated into the teacher education programs, and how it is. Stiggins (1999) listed the following seven competencies for teachers' assessment literacy to be included in teacher preparation programs:
  a) Connecting assessments to clear purposes
  b) Clarifying achievement expectations
  c) Applying proper assessment methods
  d) Developing quality assessment exercises and scoring criteria and sampling appropriately
  e) Avoiding bias in assessment
  f) Communicating effectively about student achievement
  g) Using assessment as an instructional intervention (pp. 25-27)

DeLuca and Bellara (2013) argue that "assessment literacy involves integrating assessment practices, theories, and philosophies to support teaching and learning within a standards-based framework of education". Stiggins (1999) listed several options for including assessment-related necessary content in teacher education programs where none of the options is a stand-alone one:

a) A unit on assessment methods in an educational psychology course
b) A unit on assessment in an introduction to teaching course
c) Multiple units on assessment within the context of various methods courses
d) Units on assessment within curriculum design courses
e) A separate course or set of courses on assessment methods
f) Independent study in assessment
g) Independent study as part of a learning team
h) A program of assessment training taught by professors who model various methods
i) Instruction provided by an assessment-literate master teacher during student teaching (p. 24)

CA- related learning can be provided to teachers in different approaches in teacher preparation programs. DeLuca and Klinger (2010) described three approaches to incorporate assessment literacy in teacher preparation programs: (1) explicit, (2) integrated, and (3) blended assessment education. Explicit preservice assessment education includes discrete course(s) in student assessment. In an integrated approach, assessment issues are integrated into broader curriculum and professional studies courses. A blended approach combines both explicit and integrated for assessment education. Researchers have also found that although an explicit assessment course helps to facilitate greater confidence and skills in beginning teachers (Campbell et al., 2002; Chen, 2005; Greenberg & Walsh, 2012; Mertler & Campbell, 2004), current mandatory assessment education is too minimal to allow significant changes in candidates' conceptions and practices of assessment (MacLellan, 2004; Volante & Fazio, 2007) or engage in deep and complex learning about linkages between assessment, teaching, and learning (DeLuca & Klinger, 2010; Graham, 2005).

There is little literature suggesting what content should be included to teach teachers about FCA. Stiggins (1999) presented comprehensive criteria for teacher education institutions or programs to self-evaluate their programs to understand if they are including the content needed to prepare teachers to address the day-to-day challenges of CA. The self-evaluation framed by Stiggins focuses on the questions- 'Do teachers have the scope to develop the ability to use the assessment process and its results to enhance student learning?" (Stiggins, 1999). For this, he includes 7 competencies on CA: connecting assessments to clear purposes, clarifying achievement expectations, applying proper assessment methods, developing quality assessment exercises and scoring criteria and sampling appropriately, avoiding bias in assessment, communicating effectively about student achievement, using assessment as an instructional intervention. For each competence, the questions for teacher education faculty to ask are the following: "Do we teach it? Do we model it? Do we certify it? And do our graduates feel confident that they have mastered it?" (Stiggins, 1999, p. 25).

Teacher Preparation on CA Policy
Teacher preparation policies focusing on the requirement of teacher preparation on CA can promote or suppress FCA practices in classrooms. Stiggins (1999) addressed the issue of states' requirements not including much on CA. Therefore, teacher preparation programs also do not focus on CA competencies for teachers adequately in the U.S. context. He mentioned that as teacher preparation programs are not preparing all teachers adequately to meet the day-to-day assessment challenges of teachers, a lot is spent for teachers' CA inservice training. One of the surveys of NCME for state teacher licensing standards found that only 25 of the 50 states require that teachers either meet specific assessment competence standards or at least complete assessment coursework during their preparation. Though this is a better picture of the number of states requiring CA- related requirements compared to the survey results from 1993, 1988, and 1991 (O'Sullivan & Chalnick, 1991; Wolmut, 1988), it is time that more states require CA standards in licensing teachers. There is very little research documenting the content, effectiveness and nature of in service teacher preparation programs for CA.

Scholars and researchers are advocating for FCA to be included in policy and practice. For example, Stiggins (1999) argued that though the National Council on Measurement in education (NCME) of the United States works for improving the quality of high-stake tests, the time has come for them to advocate for improving the quality and rigor of classroom assessment. He thinks that concentrating only on high stake tests will corner the most important piece of assessment that happens in the classroom and covers 99.9% of the assessment happening in a student's life.

School Based Teaching Practice
Practice teaching or practicum is a vital part of any pre service teacher preparation program (Wilson et al., 2001). White (1989) explained the practicum experience as a rite of passage, which helps the new or prospective teachers gain cultural knowledge about teaching. In many countries, practice teaching is most favorably viewed of all the parts

of the curriculum (Ben-Peretz, 1990; Wilson et, al., 2001). To acquire CA- related skills, practice teaching can give prospective teachers experience using CA in a real classroom setting, helping them understand the issues and challenges of practicing CA. Wilson et al. (2001) concluded from their extensive literature review on a U.S. context that if the teacher candidate can work under close supervision in a real classroom situation, this experience can shift their attitude. However, whether that actually impacts the quality of teachers' preparation depends on the purpose and quality of the field experience. The purpose of the field experience can include showing what the job of teaching entails, helping teachers learn about classroom management, and giving practical opportunities to apply concepts learned in coursework.

Researchers critique the quality of practice teaching experience received by student teachers. From their literature review, Wilson et al. (2001) mentioned several issues regarding field experience, such as its disconnect from the theoretical studies of teacher education or poor coordination with the university-based components of teacher education. They also found from their review that it becomes an issue when field experience covers only the mechanical aspects of teaching. They further revealed that teacher education institutions find it challenging to find suitable placements for their students and to identify schools that share educational perspectives with teacher education programs. Another factor that affects how the student teachers' experience will be shaped is the norms of the schools in which prospective teachers are placed.

Research identifies promising practices for improving the quality of practicum. Tom (1987) thought that in the teacher education curriculum, pedagogical knowledge should be replaced with pedagogical questions that the students can use at the starting point, using both ethics and crafts of teaching. Pearce and Pickard (1987) argued that the practicum should not be rooted to predetermined issues and concerns about classroom teaching; rather, it should evolve from the practice. They argued that we cannot confine the complex experience of a new teacher to a fixed checklist, for example. Cooperating teachers can influence the nature of the student teaching experience very effectively. Clandinin, Davis, Hogan and Kennan (1992) described an innovative teacher education approach by which prospective teachers have scope to reflect on their personal practical knowledge perspective. In this program, a group of 28 prospective teachers, 6 university teachers, and 28 school teachers collaborated together. Through sharing and responding to each other's stories, a new opportunity of learning was created for the prospective/new teachers. Innovative tools and techniques, such as a dialogue journal, response group, and renegotiated assignments, constituted the central component of the curriculum.

Hidden and Null Curriculum
A hidden curriculum acts as a message transmitted to students through institutional context and program structure and process. Ginsburg and Clift (1990) identified different themes through which these messages are transmitted. First, the idea that teachers lack power is transmitted through coursework, practicum, and the little or no involvement of teachers in curriculum development. Through course work, new/prospective teachers get the idea that teachers hold power only with students and are "subordinate to administration, university professors and politicians" (Parsons & Beauchamp, 1985, p. 55). This lack of power is further reinforced by a teacher's having very little or no control over the curriculum development and curricular decision making. Second, the hidden curriculum of teacher education presents a fragmented view of knowledge, both in coursework and field experience. The notion that knowledge is given and unproblematic is also transferred through teacher education programs and becomes problematic to teachers when they start teaching and gain experience. This concept of a hidden curriculum is quite relevant for teacher preparation programs in Bangladesh where CA is presented as non-problematic in nature. When teachers emerge themselves in the real classroom situation they reveal issues in practicing CA formatively.

Null curriculum is a message transmitted to students by what is not included in a curriculum (Ben Peretz, 1990). Katz and Raths (1985) gave examples that when the teacher education curriculum does not include the ethics of teaching, the biological root of human beings, the development of professional dispositions (for example, the disposition to suspend judgment about children; the consideration of alternative explanations for a situation) as goals of teacher education programs, this restricts the scope for developing certain faculties of a teacher. Therefore, while analyzing what is included regarding CA in the teacher preparation curriculum, it is just as important to identify what is not included.

Theoretical Framework
I used the Critical Socio-cultural Approach to Policy as Practice (Levinson, Sutton, &Winstead, 2009) as a framework for analyzing my data. Sutton and Levinson (2001) first explained the foundational postulates of a critical practice approach to the study of education policy. Then, they expanded and deepened many concepts in 2009 as their Critical Socio-cultural Approach to Policy as Practice. Levinson, Winstead, and Sutton (2018) have drawn particularly from sociology, anthropology, and political science, especially from political and legal anthropology, to situate this theoretical perspective in the Anthropology of Education Policy in 2018.

Policy and its practice are social phenomena and thus can be well explained using a socio-cultural perspective. Policies can attribute strong meaning to different norms of society by codifying social norms and values. They can build fundamental organizing principles of the society. Sometimes policies even manifest implicit or explicit models of society and thus guide the behavior and actions of individuals in society. By studying policy, we can decode many aspects of a society, such as economic, legal, cultural, historical, and moral implications, as it encapsulates total social phenomena (Shore and Wright, 1997). It can "create whole new sets of relationship between individuals, groups, and objects" (Shore and Wright, 1997, p.7).

Levinson, Sutton, &Winstead (2009) argue that their approach, Critical Socio-cultural Approach to Policy as Practice, to see, explain, analyze and critique policy-practice is an alternative approach to the normative sense of policy, where policy is described as a set of laws or guidelines to follow by actors or stakeholders. Such typical policy talk, as they argue, aims to examine the success and failure of policies in ordering or reordering behavior as prescribed in the policy text. However, they described the policy process as "a complex set of interdependent socio-cultural practices" (p. 768), especially as "a practice of power" (p. 767) and aim to focus the promise of fuller democratic participation of mass people in policy-practice process. They aim to discover the social and cultural logic of power to negotiate and appropriate policies that usually remain hidden. In these ways their perspective to analyze and see policy differs from many other traditional studies of policy.

The Critical Socio-cultural Approach to Policy as Practice focuses on five concepts or groups of concepts to explain the Critical Socio-cultural Approach to Policy as Practice which are particularly relevant for making sense of my research data: (1) authorized or formal policy versus unauthorized or informal policy, (2) policy formation, negotiation, and appropriation, (3) community of practice (CoP) and, (4) power as an overarching influence in policy-practice process. They explained how authorized policies are produced and then negotiated and appropriated in different settings as informal or unauthorized policies by actors of different CoP where power plays a vital role in deciding who can do policy and what can policy do. Later in 2018, the authors clarified that negotiation and appropriation can also happen in the process of developing formal authorized policies. In the following section I will explain each of the concepts, give examples, and explain how I use these lenses to make sense of my data.

Authorized and Unauthorized Policies

Authorized policies are policies that are formulated through a formal and authorized process usually by government and authorized policy actors. These formal policies usually take the form of texts and documents. Informal or unauthorized policies are those that are re-formulated and/or negotiated in a local setting by local actors and can differ in a variety of forms from the authorized policies (Levinson, Sutton, &Winstead, 2009). They make a distinction between these two types of policies and argue that non-authorized policy actors, such as teachers, students and or parents appropriate the authorized policies as a CoP in situated locate. By doing so, these actors are, in effect, creating new policies which the authors refer to as unauthorized or informal policies. Shore and Wright (1997) believe that these authorized policies are political in nature but are disguised by objective, neutral, legal-rational idioms.

Policy Formation, Negotiation, and Appropriation

Focusing on policy formation is what Critical Socio-cultural Approach to Policy as Practice has in common with other traditional policy studies that focus mainly on policy implementation. However, Levinson, Sutton, and Winstead (2009) state that the critical approach that analyzes practice does not take problem identification of the policy formulation process for granted. Rather, they scrutinize the social context "where the interests and languages comprising a normative policy discourse get negotiated into some politically and culturally viable form" (p. 778).

Policy can get negotiated between opposing parties and interests. Levinson, Sutton, &Winstead (2009) use the term *negotiation* in a socio-cultural sense to account for the process of meaning making. They argue that policymakers negotiate a complex field of meanings and understandings of different concepts, ideas, and discourses. From an anthropological perspective, meaning making is always negotiated in social life and thus is vital to social action. "Values are never fixed but rather are contingent on the mobilization of meaning in specific situations" (p.779). The authors argue that whether actual political negotiation is involved or not, the negotiation of meaning is a vital part of policy formation. They further explain that the negotiation of meaning happens not only in the policy formation process but also across and within different "institutional and micro institutional sites where policy flows and takes shape" (p.779).

Instead of discussing implementation of policy, Levinson, Sutton, &Winstead (2009) shift their focus to the appropriation of policy. According to the authors, appropriation happens later, after policy formation, when an authorized policy signal circulates in different related settings via different means. "Appropriation refers to the ways that creative agents interpret and take in elements of policy, thereby incorporating these discursive resources into their own schemes of interest, motivation, and action, their own figured world" (p. 779). The authors clarified that the process of appropriation is more than the sense making of local policy actors referred to by Spillane, Reiser, and Reimer (2002). "It points to the possible recursive influence of local actors on the formation of authorized policy, even

as it recognizes and valorizes rather more local, unofficial types of policy formation than are the outcome of these actors' encounter with authorized policy" (p. 779). They also explained that through the appropriation process ideas, norms, and values developed in a particular social group of CoP become more generalized in the public domain and part of a different social group's or CoP's cultural repertoire.

Levinson, Sutton, &Winstead (2009) present an example of this appropriation and negotiation from the study of Street (2001). Street (2001) studied teachers' union politics in Mexico. She found that though the authorized state policy for administrative decentralization presented a narrow vision of autonomy as a way of giving responsibility to regional bureaucracies, teachers in a democratic resistance movement appropriated the term in their own way to advance an agenda related to much deeper local democratization. Here, the meaning of autonomy got negotiated as a part of appropriation. The teachers advocated local school autonomy using a democratic process, in which consensus would be built between teachers, parents, and students. They used the rhetoric of autonomy to explain the reason for resistance to the state's evaluation of material responsibility for public school.

Community of Practice

The concept of CoP was first presented in Lave and Wenger's (1991) work on situated learning. Later, Wenger (1998) elaborated the concept in his book. Levinson, Sutton, &Winstead (2009) state that they focus on the concept of CoP as an analytic term to illuminate what happens when policy is formulated and when it gets appropriated. Lave and Wenger's (1991) highlighted three constitutive dimensions for CoP while defining its properties: (1) mutual engagement, (2) joint enterprise, and (3) shared repertoire. These dimensions cannot exist in isolation to each other. First, CoP consists of mutual engagement. This means that the members of a CoP do things together on a daily basis. They negotiate the key meanings of what they are doing as a group. Here, the authors clarify that the engagement of a CoP need not be a face-to-face interaction at a local site. Nowadays, in an ever-increasing technology-based social space, CoP can mutually engage across multiple sites and spaces. The mutual engagement of a CoP is directed towards a joint enterprise. This enterprise has been developed historically by and for the members of the community. This enterprise fulfills some existential and material needs of the members of that CoP. It is not necessary to have agreement among the members; rather, disagreement can be a productive part of the enterprise. Joint enterprise does not mean that all the members in a CoP believe the same thing. It means that the meaning is communally negotiated. Finally, a CoP will have a shared repertoire. It means that the CoP will develop or adopt a common body or system of shared "routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, or concepts" (Wenger, 1998, p. 78). Etiene and Wenger (1998) discussed the relationship between local, self- defining communities and the broader social forces that define their practice in the communities. They argue that CoP is shaped by factors outside the community over which the members have no control. However, the community of practice responds to outside mandates and as the members respond to these mandates, the practice of the community evolves. The broader factors that influence the CoP are referred to as global and the CoP as local. Wenger (1998) argues that although a CoP is more and more influenced by the global flows of ideas, discourses, power, and meaning, the locality of engagement still resides within the CoP.

How a CoP gets involved in policy production, negotiation and appropriation is also explained in the study of Levinson, Blackwood, and Cross (2013) regarding lower secondary education reform policy in Mexico. A new education policy established new pedagogical, school administrative, and school culture guidelines along with forms of evaluation. The researchers explained the policy negotiation and appropriation process in schools using the concept of CoP. Their findings reveal that different categories and sub-categories of actors at school, such as different subject teachers, supervisors as communities of practice influenced the interpretation and appropriations of the policy. For example, the supervisors as a community of practice appropriated the policy in earnest. The reasons are: they themselves were teachers in the past, they have close contact with teachers, and they possess an autonomous space within the administrative structure of the state education system. However, as they have pedagogical experience from an earlier generation, they tended to reproduce certain hierarchical relationships and non-dialogical forms in the training of the teachers (their students). On the other hand, for teachers, the appropriation varied. Some teachers rejected the reform as an imposition of neoliberal state in cahoots with powerful international interests. Most of the teachers tried to implement the policy in earnest. However, their life histories, ideological formation, and professional experience affected the way they interpreted the policy.

Policy as a Practice of Power

Discourse of power is central to the Critical Socio-cultural Approach to Policy as Practice. Power plays a role in every step of policy-practice process- formulation, negotiation, appropriation, and reification. According to Levinson, Sutton, &Winstead (2009) policy defines reality, orders behavior, and allocates resources accordingly. Like for most other critical approaches, they believe that policy making, and implementation process happens in a social structure which is historically dominated by elites. These approaches aim to find out how policies serve to reproduce existing structures of domination and inequalities. They argue that policies codify and extend the interests of who has more power in society. They refer to Bhola (2000) who defines policy as the manifest intentions of power elites. Power elites use policy to distribute social goods. The extent to which this practice of power is democratic depends on the

ways the power elites are formed and legitimized or the ways that other social groups may participate in policy formulation. Along with that, the authors in their Critical Socio-cultural Approach to Policy as Practice added the aim of democratizing policy making.

How I Used Theoretical Perspective for My Study

I used this critical socio-cultural approach to policy as practice while making sense of the data and trying to answer questions such as: (1) why certain policy related to CA works in a certain way in a specific context like TTC? (2) What socio-cultural factors influence the formulation, negotiation and appropriation of that policy? (3) How do different communities of practice negotiate and appropriate authorized policies as locally influenced by broader context- related global factors? How I used this framework is described in the methodology chapter in details.

Besides this theoretical perspective, I also utilized two concepts used in the anthropology of policy to explain and examine policy. The concepts are: (1) the fragmented nature of policy and (2) policy as a tool to (re)define social and cultural identity and position. These concepts helped me synthesize my analyzed data within a broader framework. I took these concepts from the field anthropology of policy as "Policies are inherently and unequivocally anthropological phenomena" (Shore and Wright, 1997, p. 7).

Shore and Wright (1997) addressed the fragmented nature of policy that makes it hard to understand the constituents of policy. The policy manifesto can take various forms.

Is it found in the language, rhetoric and concepts of political speeches and party manifestos? Is it the written document produced by government or company officials? Is it embedded in the institutional mechanisms of decision-making and service deliver? Or is it … whatever people experience in their interactions with street-level bureaucrats? (p. 5)

This fragmentation is very relevant for my research, as the policy pieces I analyzed regarding teacher preparation and assessment are created at different times for different reasons, having no real connections among the different policies. This cannot give us a comprehensive outlook for policy guidelines on how teachers should be prepared for CA and how the CA would work in a school context.

Policy can shape individuals' way of thinking about their self-identity and position in society, influence them to redefine their social and cultural status and positions, structure the way they exercise power in the society, determine the way of doing things, and influence indigenous norms of conduct. Shore and Wright (1997) give an example of Stanely's study (1991), which shows how policy can influence people's own definition of their identity. When policies are designed to expose the legal profession to market forces, we can see changes in how lawyers define themselves. It is worth noticing that they are increasingly defining themselves as entrepreneurs or suppliers in a market who supply specific commodities in the market, rather than other alternative identities, such as an instrument of justice. I tried to see how policy in Bangladesh can define CA and related concepts in different settings, such as in a TTC, in school, or in a policy network which then influence different CoPs to specifically identify themselves with specific position and identity.

REFERENCES

1. Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher Professional Development in Teaching and Teacher Education over Ten Years. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 10-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007
2. Banta, T.W. (2007). Can assessment for accountability complement assessment for improvement?. *Peer Review. Spring 2007*, 9-12.*accountability* (pp. 20–49). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
3. Bennett, R.E. (2011). Formative assessment: a critical review. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 18*(1), 5-25, DOI: 10.1080/0969594X.2010.513678
4. Ben-Peretz, M. (1995). Curriculum of teacher education programs. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of teacher education* (pp. 543-547). Oxford, England: Elsevier Science/Pergamon.
5. Birenbaum, M., DeLuca, C., Lorna, E., Heritage, M., Klenowski, V., Looney, A., Smith,
6. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education, 5*(1), 71– 74. doi: 10.1080/0969595980050102.
7. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2004). The formative purpose: assessment must first promote learning. In M. Wilson *(Ed), towards coherence between classroom assessment and accountability* (pp. 20–49). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
8. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *21*(1), pp.5-31.
9. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2010). Inside the black box: Raising standard through classroom assessment. *Kappan, 92*(1). doi: 10.1177/003172171009200119.
10. Black, P., & William, D. (2001). Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment. *Phi, Delta, Kappan. 80(2).* 139-148.

11. Brookhart, S. M. (2001, March). *The standards and classroom assessment research*. Paper presented at The Symposium on Role of the Standards for Teacher Competence in Educational Assessment Of Students in Developing Quality Teacher Assessors, Dallas, Texas. Retrieved from https://archive.org/stream/ERIC_ED451189/ERIC_ED451189_djvu.txt.

12. Brown, G.T.L. (2004). Teachers' conceptions of assessment: implications for policy and professional development. *Assessment in Education, 11*(3). 301-318, DOI:10.1080/0969594042000304609.

13. Campbell, C., Murphy, J.A., & Holt, J.K. (2002, October). *Psychometric analysis of an assessment literacy instrument: Applicability to preservice teachers.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Columbus, *OH.* doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.404

14. Chen, P. (2005). Teacher candidates' assessment literacy. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 62*, 62-66.

15. Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative Research, 6*(3), 319-340. doi: 10.1177/1468794106065006.

16. Cizek, G.J. (2009). Reliability and Validity of Information About Student Achievement: Comparing Large-Scale and Classroom Testing Contexts, *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 63-71.

17. Croft, A., Coggshall, J.G., Dolan, M., Powers, E., & Killion, J. (2010). *Job-Embedded Professional Development: What It Is, Who Is Responsible, and How to Get It Done Well.* USA: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

18. Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *8*, retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/.

19. Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M.W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi delta kappan, 76* (8), 597-604.

20. DeLuca, C., & Bellara, A. (2013). The Current State of Assessment Education: Aligning Policy, Standards, and Teacher Education Curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 356-372, DOI: 10.1177/0022487113488144.

21. Desimone, L.M., Porter, A.C., Garet, M.S., Yoon, K.S., & Birman, B.F. (2002). Effects of Professional Development on Teachers' Instruction: Results from a Three-year Longitudinal Study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24* (2), 81–112.

22. Dunn, K.E., & Mulvenon, S.W. (2009). A Critical Review of Research on Formative Assessment: The Limited Scientific Evidence of the Impact of Formative Assessment in Education. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation. 14*(7). 1-11.

23. Falk, B. (2001). Professional learning through assessment. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Ed), *Teachers caught in the action: Professional development that matters*, New York: Teachers College Press.

24. Felter, M. (1999). High school staff characteristics and mathematics test results. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *7*, retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v7n9.html.

25. Fontana, D., & Fernandes, M. (1994). Improvements in mathematics performance as a consequence of self-assessment in Portuguese primary school pupils. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 63(3), 407-417, Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1994.tb01112.x

26. Fuchs, L.S., & Fuchs, D. (1986). Effects of systemic formative evaluation: A meta- analysis, *Exceptional Children, 53*, 199-208.

27. Garrison, C., & Ehringhaus, M (2011). *Formative and Summative Assessments in the Classroom*. Retrieved from http://ccti.colfinder.org/sites/default/files/formative and summative assessment in the classroom.pdf

28. Gimmestad, M.J., & Hall, G.E. (1994). Teacher education programs: Structure. In T. Husen and T.N. Postlethwaite (Ed), *The international encyclopedia of education* (2nd Ed), Oxford: Pergamon.

29. Ginsburg, M.B., & Clift, R.T. (1990). The hidden curriculum of preservice teacher education. In W.R. Houston, M. Habberman, and G. Sikula (Ed), *Handbook of research on teacher education*, (pp. 405-465), New York: Macmillan.

30. Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *22*, 129-145.

31. Greenberg, J., & Walsh, K. (2012). *What teacher preparation programs teach about K-12 assessment: A review*. Washington D.C.: National Council on Teacher Quality.

32. Grosso de Leon, A. (2001). *Higher Education's Challenge: New teacher education models for a new century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

33. Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi: 10.1007/s11159-011-9198-8.

34. Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. London: Routledge.

35. Hattie, J. (2013). *Understanding Learning: Lessons for learning, teaching and research*. Research Conference, 24-39.

36. Hattie, J. A. C., Brown, G. T., & Keegan, P. (2005). A national teacher-managed, curriculum-based assessment system: Assessment tools for teaching & learning. *International Journal of Learning,10*, 770–778.

37. Hawk, P., Coble, C., & Swanson, M. (1985). Certification: It does matter. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(3), 12-16.
38. Hawley, W. D., & Valli, L. (1999). The essentials of effective professional development: A new consensus. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 127–150). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
39. K., Timperley, H., Volante, L., & Wyatt-Smith, C. (2015). Policy international trends in the implementation of assessment for learning: Implications for policy and practice. *Policy Futures in Education, 13*(1) 117–140.
40. Kamens, D.H., & McNeely, C.L. (2010). Globalization and the growth of international educational testing and national assessment. *Comparative Education Review. 54 (1).* 5-25. doi: 10.1086/648471.
41. Katz, L.G., & Raths, J.D. (1985). Dispositions as goals for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher education, 1*(4), 301-307.
42. Levinson, B.A.U., & Sutton, M. (2001). Introduction: Policy as/in practice: A socio-cultural approach to the study of educational policy. In M. Sutton & B.A.U. Levinson (Ed.), *Policy as practice: Towards a comparative socio-cultural analysis of educational policy* (pp. 1-24). Westport, CT: Ablex.
43. Maclellan, E. (2004) Initial knowledge states about assessment. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20* (5). pp. 523-535, DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2004.04.008.
44. Martler, C.A. (1999). Assessing student performance: A descriptive study of the classroom assessment practices of Ohio teachers, *Education, 120*(2), 285-296.
45. McGinn, N., & Borden, A. (1995). *Framing questions, constructing answers: Linking research with education policy for developing countries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.