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Abstract. Teachers in Indonesia utilize daily class assessment mostly for assessment of learning purpose instead of assessment for learning and as learning purposes, when in fact, daily class assessment should be primarily used for assessment as and for learning purposes. This prompted us to conduct this study “Utilizing the Assessment of Learning Outcome to Improve Learning Quality”, aiming to analyze the implementation of assessment for learning and as learning in teachers’ daily class assessment, and its issues. This study used qualitative approach. Data were collected using questionnaires and through focus group discussion (FGD). 5 sample areas were selected using purposive sampling. Informant involved in FGDs were 50 teachers, and respondents filling the questionnaire were 7,508 teachers, all from elementary and junior high schools that have implemented the 2013 Curriculum. The research concluded: a) in assessment for learning: (i) most schools use 1 Minimum Completion Criteria score; (ii) most teachers haven’t utilized assessment result for remedial, material enrichment, and evaluation of learning process; (iii) students are burdened by the scoring method of the reassessment in the remedial process; b) in assessment as learning: (i) most teachers do not give out the result of class assessment to students; (ii) most teachers do not utilize the result of class assessment for study counseling; and (iii) the descriptive grading in attitude, knowledge, and skills aspects serves less to no meaningful purpose. This research recommends a detailed and specifically explained assessment guidelines regarding assessment for learning and assessment as learning, complete with examples of classroom implementation.
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INTRODUCTION

Assessment of learning outcomes is conducted by teacher to monitor and evaluate the learning process, learning progress, and also to improve student’s learning outcomes continuously. Daily assessment is one of the ways to do it. Daily assessment is a process of gathering and processing information on student’s learning outcomes that are used to establish an improvement or enrichment program based on the level of competence mastery and to improve learning process (assessment as and for learning), and also to know the level of competence mastery and establish the completion of competence mastery (assessment of learning) (Direktorat Pembinaan SMP, 2017).

Assessment of learning is an assessment used to confirm what the students know, to show whether they have met the standard and/or show the position of one student from the others. Assessment for learning is an assessment used to give information to the teachers to modify their learning activity, to differentiate and understand how student’s learning approach is. Furthermore, assessment as learning is a part of assessment for learning which emphasizes the use of assessment as a process to improve and support student’s metacognition, in a sense that students are given a chance and guided to monitor and use the monitoring result to improve their learning (Earl, 2006).

The use of assessment for learning and assessment as learning in classroom will affect the improvement of student’s competence. Black & William (1998) have done a literature review and concluded that the use of assessment for learning and assessment as learning that is well designed and implemented can improve learning, namely improving student’s competence with the effect sizes between 0.4 to 0.7. However, most of the assessment process are only used to predict and document student’s learning achievement by giving score and rank (Budiyono, 2010).

The study conducted at Surakarta Vocational High School shows that the use of assessment on accounting learning has not used assessment for learning and assessment as learning. The study shows that 1) most teachers understand that assessment is used to measure the learning outcomes; 2) almost all teachers use test to measure learning outcomes; 3) almost all teachers do not use the assessment result to improve teacher and students’ learning process; 4) almost all teachers do not involve the students in each step of the assessment process, such as determining the learning objectives and success criteria, determining learning tasks, monitoring the results, and feedback for learning improvement (Sudiyatno, Badrun K., Muhayadi, 2015). This happens in other countries. Fair Test Examiner (1999) study shows that formative assessment (assessment for learning and assessment as learning) is rarely conducted in class, and most teachers do not know how to utilize the assessment. Assessment for learning and assessment as learning have not been implemented yet because student’s potential has not been explored optimally which causes the student’s performance to be not optimal. This can be seen on the result of Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) which put Indonesia students’ competencies in the lower rank. Based on TIMSS since Indonesia started to join in 1995 to the latest assessment in 2015, Indonesia has always been far below the international average score (500). The results of PISA are not that much different from TIMSS. PISA tests reading literacy, mathematics, and science on 15 years old students. Since Indonesia joined the program, we relatively score below average and rank low.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that the implementation of assessment for learning and assessment as learning affects the enhancement of students’ competence. Evenso, most of the the assessment results conducted by teacher are only used to predict and document the learning outcomes in a way of scoring and ranking (assessment of learning). All these phenomena prompted us to conduct the study entitled “Utilizing the Assessment of Learning Outcomes to Improve Learning Quality”. This study aims to analyze the implementation of assessment for learning and assessment as learning conducted by teacher and its issues.

METHOD

This study used a qualitative approach, the data were collected through questionnaire and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Questionnaire filling aims to identify how the teachers do the assessment for learning and assessment as learning. Whereas FGD aims to explore the information of problems faced by teachers in conducting assessment for learning and assessment as learning. Purposive technique sampling was used to select the sample areas with the criteria having the highest Assessment of Indonesian Student Competence (AKSI) and National Examination (UN) score and also regional representation in Indonesia. The object of the study were teachers of elementary and junior high schools that have implemented the 2013 Curriculum. The selected sample areas were Banda Aceh City, Bekasi City, Sleman District, Balikpapan City, and Manokwari District. The study was conducted on August 8th to September 14th 2018. FGD was conducted in each selected area so that the total of the conducted FGD was five. Informants in each FGD consist of 5 elementary teachers and 5 junior high school teachers, so the total of FGD informants were 50 teachers. Meanwhile the respondents filling questionnaire were 7,508 teachers (3,171 elementary school teachers and 4,337 junior high school teachers). This following table is a number of questionnaire respondents based on the sample areas and school level.
The data were processed and analyzed using quantitative and qualitative descriptive analysis. Quantitative data analysis was used to identify how the teachers do the assessment for learning and assessment as learning during the learning process. Data interpretation was done by looking at the total number of teachers who have conducted the assessment for learning and assessment as learning through percentage calculation. While the qualitative data analysis was used to explore the information of problems faced by the teachers in conducting the assessment for learning and assessment as learning. Data interpretation was done by identifying teacher’s problems in conducting assessment for learning and assessment as learning. The conclusions were drawn through the triangulation of FGD results that have been done in five sample areas.

Assessment of learning outcomes on elementary and junior high school level consists of the assessment of learning outcomes by teachers, schools, and government (Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2005 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan). The issue focuses on assessment of learning outcomes conducted by teachers. This assessment aims to monitor and evaluate the learning process, learning progress, and also to improve student’s learning outcomes continuously. Assessment of learning outcomes that is conducted by teachers can be done through test, observation, assignment, and/or other techniques. This assessment is used to measure and determine students’ competencies, to improve the learning process, and to compile a progress report of daily, midterm, end of semester, end of year and/or grade promotion learning outcomes (Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2016 tentang Standar Penilaian).

According to Fachikov (2005), there are two objectives of assessment; summative objective and formative objective. Fachikov illustrates that the summative objective of assessment is aimed at the education system, policy makers, and administrators. On the other hand, formative assessment is aimed at students (students/college students) and teachers (teachers/lecturers). As a summative objective, it can be used for selection, certificate, accountability, and effectiveness review. While as a formative objective, it can be used to motivate students, diagnose, monitor learning, give feedback, improve learning, reflexivity, and so on. Both objectives should be used proportionally so as to create the equity in education.

Based on the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Regulation Number 23 of 2016 concerning Assessment Standards and the opinion of Fachikov, it can be inferred that the objectives of assessment of learning outcomes by teachers are as summative function (assessment of learning) and formative function (assessment for learning and assessment as learning).

Against the backdrop of those three assessments from Earl, Glasoon, and Assessment Guideline, it can be inferred that: (i) assessment of learning is an assessment that aims to see students’ learning outcomes; (ii) assessment for learning is an assessment to give feedback in the form of remedial and enrichment to students and for teachers to improve their teaching; (iii) assessment as learning is an assessment to facilitate the role of students in monitoring their learning process so they can develop into an independent learners and in the end have a metacognitive intelligence. Metacognitive is an awareness of our own cognitive, on how our cognitive works and how to control it. Flavell (1979) says metacognitive is a person’s awareness on how he learns, the ability to assess the difficulties of a problem, the ability to observe his own understanding level, the ability to use various information to achieve goals, and the ability to assess his own learning progress.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**Implementation of Assessment for Learning**

Assessment for learning is carried out during the learning process and is used as a basis for improving the teaching and learning process. In assessment for learning, teachers provide remedial feedback and enrichment and the results are used to evaluate and improve performance in the learning process.

### Table 1. Number of questionnaire respondents based on the sample area and school level

| No | Sample Area           | Total Number of |          |          |          |
|----|-----------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|
|    |                       | Elementary School Teacher | Junior High School Teacher | Total   |
| 1  | Banda Aceh City       | 621             | 415   | 1,036 |
| 2  | Bekasi City           | 1,528           | 2,253 | 3,781 |
| 3  | Sleman District       | 389             | 496   | 885   |
| 4  | Balikpapan City       | 471             | 1,054 | 1,525 |
| 5  | Manokwari District    | 162             | 119   | 281   |
|    | Total                 | 3,171           | 4,337 | 7,508 |

Source: Research result, 2018
Teachers provide feedback in the form of remedial or enrichment to students based on the value of the Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM). If students get a test score under the KKM then the feedback is in the form of remedial and if students get a test score above the KKM then the feedback is in the form of enrichment. The schools can determine the same or different KKM values between subjects. The percentage of elementary school teachers whose schools determine the value of KKM that differ between subjects is 59.22%, while junior high school teachers are 39.11%. The rest, schools set the same KKM values between subjects.

According to teachers, the determination of the KKM value raises problems, namely: (i) if the school determines one KKM value for all subjects. This is a problem because each subject has different levels of difficulty. With the determination of one KKM value, the school seems to force that the level of difficulty of all subjects is the same; (ii) In addition to determining the value limit, the KKM value is also the basis for the assessment of accreditation and is a prestige for schools so that there are schools that impose high KKM values. As a result, there are teachers who mark up the test result because the value of students cannot reach the specified KKM values. Teachers want the existence of KKM values to be eliminated or replaced by an average value.

KKM values are used as a basis for determining students who take remedials or enrichment program. Students who have not achieved the KKM score, are required to take a remedial program. Meanwhile, students who have achieved the KKM score can be given enrichment program. The remedial program is a learning program intended for students who have not achieved the KKM of Basic Competency (KD) learning content. After students take part in a remedial program, a reassessment is conducted to find out KD’s achievements. Meanwhile, the enrichment program is learning given to students who have exceeded the value of the KKM KD lesson content.

| Table 2. Percentages of daily class assessment results was used by teachers for remedial and enrichment |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| No | Frequency | Elementary School | Junior High School |
|----|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|
|    |           | Level             | Level             |
| 1  | Always    | 21,98             | 24,03             |
| 2  | Often     | 55,72             | 53,33             |
| 3  | Sometimes | 19,84             | 19,51             |
| 4  | Rare      | 1,92              | 2,17              |
| 5  | Never     | 0,5               | 0,97              |

Source: Research result, 2018

Most teachers have carried out remedials and enrichments, although the results of the Daily Assessment (PH) are not always used for remedial activities and enrichment. At the elementary level, the percentage of teachers who always use PH for remedial and enrichment activities is 21.98%, while the junior high school level is 24.03%.

In remedial activities, especially in reassessment, more specific rules regarding assessment are needed to obtain the KKM limit value. Understanding of teachers about the KKM limit values varies. Most teachers said that repetition is only done on indicators that have not been mastered by students and the questions given are as many as the number of questions given earlier. For example, the value of the KKM in the schools 70, has been carried out by PH with the number of indicators of questions and questions as many as 20, a student answered correctly 13 so that the value is 65. Because they have not reached the KKM value limit, the students must take a remedial that ends with a reassessment of indicators that have not been mastered by the number of questions as many as 20. This means that students must answer correctly at least 14 questions on indicators that have not been mastered. This is felt to burden students and teachers because students are required to answer correctly at least 70% on indicators that have not been mastered. Teachers propose that the number of questions given at the time of remedial is the same as the number of question indicators that have not been mastered by students, so that in this example, if students answer one problem correctly, the learner will automatically reach the KKM value and description/essay or oral (not multiple choice).

One of the daily class assessment function is to improve the learning process. Therefore, teachers are required to utilize the results of daily class assessments to evaluate the learning process that has been carried out. During this time, teachers have generally used the same learning methods and media for years. This can be seen from the Learning Implementation Plan (RPP) compiled by teachers relatively the same from year to year.

| Table 3. Percentage of utilization of assessment results to evaluate the learning process that has been done by teachers |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| No | Frequency | Elementary School | Junior High School |
|----|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1  | Always    | 30.37             | 28.71             |
| 2  | Often     | 57.58             | 57.18             |
| 3  | Sometimes | 10.79             | 12.82             |
| 4  | Rare      | 1.94              | 0.92              |
| 5  | Never     | 0.22              | 0.37              |

Source: Research result, 2018

Based on the Table 3. above, it can be seen that the percentage of teachers who always use the results of the assessment to evaluate the learning process that has been done is still small, namely elementary school teachers by 30.37% and junior high school teachers by 28.71%. So far, most teachers have not made improvements to the learning process, especially improvements in media and learning methods. From year to year, teachers...
generally teach with methods that are considered easy, regardless of whether the method can be accepted by students or not. In fact, with the results of the assessment, teachers should evaluate the learning process. If most of the students’ test scores are high and reach the KKM limit value, the learning activities carried out by the teachers do not need to be changed. But if it turns out that the majority of students get grades below the KKM value, then teachers should change the learning process by changing learning methods and media.

**Implementation of Assessment as Learning**

Assessment as learning is an assessment that aims to engage students to actively think about the learning process and learning outcomes so that they develop into independent learners who ultimately have metacognitive knowledge. The purpose of teachers doing assessment as learning is to help students to be able to actively think about the learning process and learning outcomes so that they develop into independent learners so that they can improve their metacognitive knowledge. Some of the methods that is by giving the results of the assessment and the analysis to students/parents/guardians in detail, utilizing the results of the assessment as a basis for giving guidance and direction to students about the material/attitude that is still less, and giving a descriptive report that is stated in the report card.

After the teacher corrects or analyzes the results of the daily assessment, the results should be informed directly to students/parents/guardians. This can be beneficial for students, especially to know the strengths and weaknesses of understanding a substance. The following is a table that shows the percentage of teachers who give the results of the assessment and the analysis to students/parents/guardians in detail.

| No | Frequency | Teachers (%) | Elementary School Level | Junior High School Level |
|----|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1  | Always    | 19.39        | 19.71                   |                         |
| 2  | Often     | 53.11        | 47.75                   |                         |
| 3  | Sometimes | 22.33        | 23.61                   |                         |
| 4  | Rare      | 3.19         | 6.25                    |                         |
| 5  | Never     | 1.99         | 2.67                    |                         |

*Source: Research result, 2018*

Table 4. Percentage of teachers who give assessment results and the analysis to students/parents/guardians

The results of the assessment are very useful for students to know the ability of students themselves. However, the percentage of teachers who always give the results of the assessment and the analysis to students/parents/guardians is still small, that is elementary school teachers by 19.39% and junior high school teachers by 19.71%. For teachers who give the results of the assessment, they only give without being accompanied by giving direction and guidance about the strengths and weaknesses of students based on the results of the assessment.

Based on the results of the assessment, teachers can give direction and guidance to students so that they can help students to improve metacognition knowledge. Metacognitive is a person’s awareness of how someone learns, the ability to assess the difficulties of a problem, the ability to observe his/her level of understanding, the ability to use various information to achieve goals, and the ability to assess the progress of his/her own learning. The following is the percentage of teachers who use assessment results as a basis for giving guidance and direction.

| No | Frequency | Teachers (%) | Elementary School Level | Junior High School Level |
|----|-----------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1  | Always    | 26.62        | 23.73                   |                         |
| 2  | Often     | 55.85        | 56.74                   |                         |
| 3  | Sometimes | 15.93        | 16.81                   |                         |
| 4  | Rare      | 1.14         | 1.96                    |                         |
| 5  | Never     | 0.47         | 0.76                    |                         |

*Source: Research result, 2018*

Table 5. Percentage of teachers who use assessment results as a basis to give guidance and direction

Teachers can use the assessment results as a basis for giving guidance and direction to students to help students in increasing metacognition knowledge. The percentage of elementary level teachers who always use the assessment results as a basis for giving guidance and direction is 26.62%, while junior high school teachers are 23.73%. In fact, to do guidance or direction to students, teachers do not need a long time. Guidance and direction can be given when teachers share the results of daily tests. One of the methods is by showing the strengths and weaknesses of students based on the results of the assessment obtained, then the teacher gives motivation so that students can improve competence in the substance that is answered incorrectly at the time of the test.

To optimize assessment as learning, the government added a description column in the 2013 curriculum report format for all subjects. The report card is a summary of the results of the assessment of all learning activities carried out by students in a certain period of time. Report cards are used as long as students attend all school learning programs that is given to parents/guardians on each semester.

The results of the assessment of the attitude aspects contained in the report card are written in a form of a predicate and/or description. Meanwhile, the results of the assessment of aspects of knowledge and skills are written in the form of numbers, predicates, and descriptions for each subject. Giving value in the form of descriptions on aspects of attitudes, knowledge, and skills included in assessment as learning that can help students to improve metacognition knowledge. However, the description contained in the report card has not been written in detail, so it has not been meaningful in improving students’ metacognition knowledge. The
following is a lack of assessment of the description contained in the report card.

The process of reporting the value of the description, especially the assessment of attitude on the report card is very complicated. The following are the processes: (i) Each subject teacher classifies or marks notes of the attitudes of students written in a journal, both spiritual attitudes and social attitudes that were previously confirmed by self-assessment and peer assessment techniques; (ii) Class teachers/homeroom teachers collect attitude notes in form of brief descriptions from subject teachers (PJOK and Religion) and school residents (extracurricular teachers, library staff, janitors and school guards); (iii) Class teachers conclude and formulate a description of the achievement of spiritual and social attitudes for each student.

Assessment of the description in the assessment of aspects of attitude, knowledge, and skills is still less meaningful. For example, in the attitude assessment, the contents are very obedient, very honest, need guidance and assistance. The description is less meaningful, the meaning is unclear what is meant by what is very obedient, what guidance is needed. The description will be meaningful if it is outlined technically, for example needing guidance because it influences friends not to attend school, does not attend Friday prayers held at the school. By giving a technical attitude assessment, then both teachers and parents/guardians of students can follow up. Likewise, in the description of the assessment of knowledge and skills, not all KDs are found in the description value on report cards. This is because the description that appears is only the worst and the best.

Narration of descriptive value is confusing students and parents/guardians, so that both students and parents/guardians ignore the description value. For example, if the predicate of Mathematics is B and the Natural Science predicate is C, but the description has the same narration.

The majority of teachers do not know the purpose of assessment in the form of description, moreover students or parents/guardians. The existence of a description value aims so that students know the weaknesses and the strengths in learning. With the description value, it is expected that students can improve their weaknesses independently or often called metacognition knowledge.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, conclusions and recommendations regarding assessment for learning, that is: (i) Most education units use one KKM value. In addition, there is an educational unit that establishes a high KKM value for reasons of prestige and accreditation assessment. To overcome this problem, teachers suggest that the KKM value be replaced by the class average value, so that teachers will not mark up the value; (ii) Most of the teachers have not utilized the results of the assessment for remedial, and as an evaluation material for the teaching process. One of the causes of this is that teachers do not know the use of assessment for learning and the assessment guide is considered not to have been specifically regulated. Teachers advise that specific explanations about assessment for learning be provided with an assessment guide that is complemented by examples of their use. (iii) Reassessment in remedial activities burdensome students because students are required to work on questions on indicators that have not been mastered and obtain a minimum value of KKM limits. Teachers propose that in the assessment guide, the mechanism for providing a number of questions for remedial and the method of evaluation is explained and given clear examples.

Conclusions and recommendations regarding assessment as learning, that is: (i) Most teachers do not give results of daily assessments to students and do not utilize the results of daily assessments for guidance to students. One of the causes of this is because teachers do not know assessment as learning, considering this is a new technique. The assessment guide is considered by teachers not to have been specifically regulated about assessment as learning. Teachers suggest that a specific explanation be given about assessment as learning in an assessment guide that is equipped with examples of its use. (ii) The use of description values in aspects of attitudes, knowledge, and skills is still less meaningful. In order for the description value to be utilized by students, it is better to give a description of each KD displayed on the report card. In addition, giving the description value should also be given in the middle of the semester.
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