



TEACHERS' USE OF FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT AND ITS IMPACT TO STUDENTS' LEARNING

LESIL G. SORIA

Teacher III

Western Leyte College

Master of Arts in Education

Major in School Administration and Supervision

lesil.soria@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study determines the significant relationship between the extent of teacher's use of formative and summative assessment and its impact to students' learning. This employed descriptive-correlational research design, and the researcher utilized the survey questionnaire formulated by Ole (2020) in her study on, "Development and Validation of Teachers' Practices on Formative Assessment Scale (TPFAS): A Measure Using Feedback Loop Model" and 1st quarter summative assessment result for all learning areas were also gathered. There were eight (8) teachers, and 100 students enrolled in the said locale were involved in the study. The findings of the study revealed that the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences is very high. Simultaneously, the students' performance in quarter 1 found to be very satisfactory. More importantly, statistical analysis indicated a strong positive significant relationship between extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences and level of academic performance of students in quarter 1. This suggests that teachers who purposefully plan and utilize assessment as an integral component of instruction can provide students with timely feedback and targeted learning interventions, leading to improved performance outcomes of the students. This highlights that when teachers are equipped with the knowledge and skills to design and interpret assessments appropriately, they are better positioned to identify learners' strengths and learning gaps,

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



which promotes more responsive and evidence-based teaching strategies and techniques. Therefore, maintaining and enhancing teachers' assessment capabilities should remain a key priority for educational leaders to ensure continuous improvement in instructional quality and student performance.

Keywords: *Teachers' Use of Formative and Summative Assessment, Students' Learning*

INTRODUCTION

Formative assessment is used by teachers to measure the performance of the students' learning to a certain competency in a particular day. It also provide feedback on the teaching strategies of teachers employed during the delivery of the lesson. It serves as a guide for teachers in deciding whether to proceed to the next competency or to provide another activities for the students to have more understanding of the lesson taught. Further, formative assessment is an evaluation technique used in the learning context to track students' progress over time and gauge their grasp of the materials used in teaching.

On the other hand, summative assessment may be seen as assessment of learning which occurs at the end of a particular unit. This form of assessment usually occurs towards the end of the period of learning in order describe the standard reached by the learner. Often, this takes place in order for appropriate decisions about future learning or job suitability to be made (DO No. 08, s. 2015). Judgements derived from summative assessment are usually for the benefit of people other than learner (UNESCO-TLSF).

According to Pramesti (2024), the process of assessment is used to evaluate a person or group's knowledge, skill, attitude, and many other qualities. The primary goal of the assessment is to gather pertinent data and an objective that can be utilized to measure progress, make decisions, or provide feedback in a particular situation. It is a collection of measuring tools used to ascertain, collect, and analyze data about a person or group. It can

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



also be used to establish a student's level and achievement in relation to the learning objectives. Stated differently, assessments can be carried out in a variety of domains, such as business, psychology, education, and health. Assessments in the subject of education can be used to gauge students' knowledge, abilities, and skills as well as the efficacy of the curriculum and teaching strategies. A psychological evaluation seeks to understand a person's mental and emotional state, identify illnesses, or establish if a certain intervention or course of therapy is appropriate. In the business world, assessments can be made to determine what needs to be changed, how well employees are performing, or how effective the organization is.

According to Watson (2022), there are a number of ways to conduct the assessment, such as tests, exams, observations, interviews, surveys, or performance assessments. Insight is gained by analyzing and interpreting the data gathered during assessment. Usually in the classroom, after the teacher delivers the lesson, she immediately conducts formative assessment as a way of evaluating teaching and serves as decision platform in providing remediation, reinforcement and enrichment activities for further learning. This activity also leads in analyzing the assessment tools used for the lesson.

Moreover, formative assessment, sometimes referred to as classroom assessment, is, to put it simply, an evaluation that is carried out while the student is still learning (Dwiyanti & Suwastini, 2021). It is an assessment procedure that is carried out in order to gather data regarding the comprehension, aptitude, and growth of the students. Formative assessment is an essential component of instruction that involves student-teacher interaction to improve student achievement and assist teacher and student reflection. This can be achieved by receiving feedback so that teacher and students can identify and provide effective learning activities (Black & William (1998) and Nicol- Macfarlane-Dick (2006) as cited in Ardiansyah et al., (2018); William (2013) as cited in Mahendra, Dewi & Wahyuni (2021). The term "formative assessment" refers to an evaluation technique used in the learning process to track students' progress and provide insightful comments. The goal of formative assessment is to collect data on a regular basis in order to better understand how pupils are improving as they are learning.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



According to some research, there are few studies about linking the formative assessment to academic performance of the students but many have confirmed its effectiveness in promoting academic performance (Hattie and Timperley, 2007; McCallum and Milner, 2020; Morris et al., 2021); however, some researchers have raised doubts about its effectiveness (e.g., Bennett, 2011; Briggs et al., 2012; Boström and Palm, 2023), indicating that its underlying mechanisms remain unclear. There is still some controversy regarding how formative assessment affects student academic achievement, particularly concerning potential mediating or moderating factors, which require further exploration. The mechanisms through which formative assessment affects student achievement are multifaceted and require further investigation.

Hence, this study was conceptualized to determine the relationship between the extent of teacher's use of formative and summative assessment and its impact to student learning. The researcher who is a classroom teacher conducts this study because as a result of the quarterly program implementation review, the data revealed issues in terms of the percentage score of the students for most of them did not reach the required mastery level. The thought that before the formulation of the assessment tool, teachers have to look into their lesson plans to check the competencies taught and the achieved or mastered ones to be included in the tool. Further, as a teacher, the researcher have to refer to the formative assessment previously conducted and provide parallel test questions to be used in assessing the students' learning for the quarter. As this belief of being an assessor of learning, questions on why teachers usually cannot achieve the desired learning outcomes of the students in terms of quarterly summative assessment popped up every time submission of results is done. The how's and why's had been the guiding principle why this study was conducted. A proposed instructional supervision plan which focused on assessment will be formulated based on the findings of the study.

This study determines the extent of teacher's use of formative and summative assessment and its impact to students' learning in Hibunawan Elementary School, Baybay City

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



District 1, Baybay City Division. The findings of the study were basis for the proposed instructional supervision plan.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of teacher's use of formative and summative assessment in terms of the following:

- 1.1 setting goals,
- 1.2 designing, selecting and adapting tools,
- 1.3 collecting data, and
- 1.4 making inferences?

2. What is the level of performance of the students in quarter 1?

3. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of teacher's use of formative and summative assessment and level of academic performance of students in quarter 1?

4. What instructional supervision plan can be proposed based on the findings of this study?

METHODOLOGY

Design. This study adopted a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the extent of teacher's use of formative and summative assessment and its impact to students' learning. This study is descriptive because it describes the variables- teacher's use of formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences and performance of students in quarter 1. Further, this is also correlational because it finds the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. This study was conducted in Hibunawan Elementary School, Baybay City District 1, Baybay City Division. The eight (8) teachers, and 100 randomly selected students were involved in the study. To determine the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



assessment, the researcher utilizes the survey questionnaire formulated by Ole (2020) in her study on, "Development and Validation of Teachers' Practices on Formative Assessment Scale (TPFAS): A Measure Using Feedback Loop Model". A 34-item questionnaire which describes the extent of teachers' use of formative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences. Further, to measure the level of academic performance of the students, the researcher gathers the 1st quarter summative assessment result for all learning areas. The score of the students for the subject will be translated based on the proficiency level as stated in DepEd Order No. 08, s. 2015, "Policy Guidelines on Classroom Assessment for the K to 12 Basic Education Program".

Sampling. The eight (8) teachers, and 100 students enrolled in the said locale were involved in the study. Complete enumeration was employed in choosing the teacher-respondents while random sampling was used in choosing the student-respondents of the study.

Research Procedure. Upon securing a research permit, data gathering was initiated. Application letters for study permits were personally submitted to concerned offices. A request letter was first submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent for approval to gather data from targeted respondents. After securing the approval of SDS, letters of permission were also submitted to the Public Schools District Supervisor and School Principals of the identified schools in the district. After getting the approvals, the researcher conducted data-gathering activities. An orientation was also held for the respondents, and their agreement through permits was to participate in the research. Then, survey questionnaires were handed out, and the researcher accompanied the respondents as they filled out the questionnaires. Researcher gathered the result of the first quarterly assessment and grades of the students. Once the survey was done, data were gathered, counted, and handed over for statistical processing.

Ethical Issues. The researcher obtained the necessary written permission from the authorities to conduct the study. While developing and checking the survey used in the study, the use of offending, discriminatory, or other undesirable terminology was eschewed. The names of the respondents and other personal information were not included in this study to

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



ensure confidentiality. The respondents were also voluntarily participating. Orientation was done for the respondents. During orientation, concerns and issues were clarified, and consent to be part of the study was signed. The researcher-maintained objectivity in discussing and analyzing the results. All authors whose works were cited in this study were correctly quoted and were acknowledged in the reference. Keeping of responses from the respondents were given to the researcher and kept under her care.

Treatment of Data. The quantitative responses underwent tallying and tabulation. Statistical treatment involved using specific tools: Simple Percentage and Weighted Mean assessed to evaluate the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences and academic performance of the students in quarter 1. Pearson r was utilized to ascertain the significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1
Extent of Teachers' Use of Formative and Summative Assessment

Dimension	Statement	Weighted Mean	Description	Interpretation
A. Setting Goals	1. Clearly communicates to the students the intended learning or goals for the lesson.	4.88	Always	Very High
	2. Ensures that the learning goals are specific, measurable and easy to understand.	4.88	Always	Very High
	3. Believes that constructing clear learning goals can increase students' learning.	4.88	Always	Very High
	4. Uses well-defined learning goals to help students take more control of their learning.	4.75	Always	Very High

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Dimension	Statement	Weighted Mean	Description	Interpretation
	5. Informs students before the start of the lesson on what they need to learn, demonstrate and be able to do.	4.50	Always	Very High
	6. Discusses the learning goals many times during the lesson.	4.38	Always	Very High
	7. Explores students' thinking through common ideas, prior knowledge and/or misconceptions.	4.63	Always	Very High
	8. Redirects students' attention on what needs to be focused on.	4.63	Always	Very High
Average Weighted Mean for Dimension A		4.63	Always	Very High
B. Designing, Selecting and Adapting Tools	9. Uses activities based on "observable events" (e.g., earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, cooling of coffee).	4.00	Frequently	High
	10. Designs learning tasks (e.g., scenarios, mind maps) to capture students' understanding.	4.63	Always	Very High
	11. Selects and adapts tools easily to assess students' thinking.	4.63	Always	Very High
	12. Involves students by listening and asking their ideas when developing assessment tasks.	4.88	Always	Very High
	13. Asks questions with follow-up probing questions to deepen understanding.	4.63	Always	Very High
	14. Develops discussion tools (whole-class or group discussions) that elicit ideas.	4.50	Always	Very High

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Dimension	Statement	Weighted Mean	Description	Interpretation
Average Weighted Mean for Dimension B		4.52	Always	Very High
C. Collecting Data	15. Engages students in small group discussions.	4.50	Always	Very High
	16. Listens to students' responses and conversations in their groups.	5.00	Always	Very High
	17. Actively engages students in generating data by listening and responding.	4.75	Always	Very High
	18. Pays attention to students' expressions when working on tasks.	5.00	Always	Very High
	19. Monitors students' participation, tone of voice, and facial expressions to track progress.	4.88	Always	Very High
	20. Correctly interprets students' ideas from varied forms of data.	4.13	Frequently	High
	21. Utilizes students' assessment data to adjust teaching.	4.75	Always	Very High
	22. Provides support through thought-provoking questions rather than direct instruction.	4.38	Always	Very High
	23. Identifies learning patterns from collected student data.	4.38	Always	Very High
	24. Plans activities requiring short/simple responses to yield information.	4.63	Always	Very High
	25. Develops activities that make students discuss in groups and share answers.	4.88	Always	Very High
Average Weighted Mean for Dimension C		4.60	Always	Very High

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Dimension	Statement	Weighted Mean	Description	Interpretation
D. Making Inferences	26. Encourages students to write feedback to help peers improve their tasks.	3.75	Frequently	High
	27. Engages students in peer assessment.	3.75	Frequently	High
	28. Let students evaluate the quality of their peers' work objectively.	3.50	Frequently	High
	29. Asks students to do self-assessment after activities.	3.75	Frequently	High
	30. Involves students in formulating criteria for peer/self-assessment rubrics.	2.75	Sometimes	Average
	31. Analyzes recorded student ideas and identifies themes.	4.13	Frequently	High
	32. Let students create a written record of what they know and can do.	3.38	Sometimes	High
	33. Uses rubrics for both peer and self-assessments.	4.50	Always	Very High
	34. Captures students' thinking by collecting written work or jotting ideas.	4.13	Frequently	High
Average Weighted Mean for Dimension D		3.77	Frequently	High
Overall Weighted Mean		4.33	Always	Very High

Legend:

RANGES

4.21-5.00

3.21-4.20

2.61-3.40

1.81-2.60

1.00-1.80

DESCRIPTION

Always

Frequently

Sometimes

Rare

Never

INTERPRETATION

Very High

High

Average

Low

Very Low

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 1 assesses the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences. It was revealed on the study that the extent of teachers' uses formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals received an average weighted mean of 4.63 which is interpreted as "Very High". This means that teachers always set goals in conducting formative and summative assessment. This suggests teachers consistently set and communicate learning intentions which is the foundational component of assessment-for-learning. This clearly supports students understanding of success indicators and aligns with findings for improved learning outcomes with all the indicators listed shows very high extent.

Further, this study shows the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of designing, selecting and adapting tools. It was revealed on the table that the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of designing, selecting and adapting tools received an average mean of 4.52 which is interpreted as "Very High". This means that teachers are routinely gathering formative evidence of student thinking, a practice linked to gains in achievement when it informs immediate instructional adjustments. The indicator where teachers involve students through listening and asking their ideas when developing assessment tasks got the highest rating of 4.88. This shows that teachers listen to the understanding of the students on the lessons taught.

Moreover, the data revealed that the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of collecting data dimensions received an average weighted mean of 4.60 which is interpreted as "Very High". Further, based on the result, it shows that teachers reported frequent listening to group responses, monitoring expressions and participation, and using assessment data to adjust teaching. This indicates that teachers are consistent in gathering sufficient evidence to make learning to happen in the classroom. The formative and summative assessment provided to the students show that understanding of the lessons taught is evident.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Finally, the data shows the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of making inferences received an average weighted mean of 3.77 which is interpreted as "High". This indicator receives the lowest mean which means that teachers frequently receive feedback from students regarding their ideas and self-assessment of their feelings towards their peers. This indicates that teachers often employ assessment practices that help them infer students' understanding, learning progress and areas for improvement.

Overall, the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences received an average weighted mean of 4.33 (Always, Very High), implying that teachers in general demonstrate a strong commitment to the use of formative and summative assessments to improve instruction and learning outcomes. According to Black and William (2018), involving students in defining assessment criteria promotes ownership and a deeper understanding of quality work standards.

Table 2
Frequency Distribution of Students' Performance in Quarter 1

Performance Level	Range	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Outstanding	90–100	23	23.0
Very Satisfactory	85–89	39	39.0
Satisfactory	80–84	30	30.0
Fairly Satisfactory	75–79	8	8.0
Did Not Meet Expectations	Below 75	0	0.0
Total		100	100.0
Average Mean		85.85	Very Satisfactory

Table 2 presents the evaluation of the students' performance across all learning areas for Quarter 1. The data reveal that out of 100 students, a total of 23 learners (23%) achieved

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



a rating of 90-100, which is categorized as "Outstanding". Additionally, 39 students (39%) earned a rating of 85-89, classified as "Very Satisfactory." Meanwhile, 30 students (30%) received a rating of 80-84 ("Satisfactory"), and 8 students (8%) were rated within 75-79, falling under the "Fairly Satisfactory" category. A combined 62% of students (Very Satisfactory and Outstanding) demonstrate high academic performance suggesting effective teaching strategies and learner engagement. While 38% of the students were in the Satisfactory and Fairly Satisfactory range, still meets the minimum expectations but may signal areas for additional support or intervention. An average mean of 85.85% falls within the Very Satisfactory range. This data implies that the instructional strategies and assessment practices employed by teachers were generally effective in facilitating students learning and comprehension. This reflects that teachers' consistent use of formative and summative assessment which help monitor student progress and provide timely feedback. As Black and William (2018) emphasized formative and summative assessment play key role in improving learning outcomes by identifying learning gaps and informing instructional adjustments. Moreover, the students' commendable performance supports the findings of Hattie and Timperley (2017), who highlighted that feedback, self-assessment, and teacher clarity significantly contribute to students' academic performance.

Table 3
Test of Relationship Between Teachers' Use of Formative and Summative Assessment and Students' Performance in Quarter 1

Variables Correlated	Computed r-value	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Overall, Teachers' Assessment Practices vs. Students' Average Performance	0.850	0.001	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Strong Positive Correlation)

Table 3 shows the outcomes of tests, checking the correlations between the degree and difficulties on the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences and level of academic performance of students in quarter 1 got a computed p-value (0.001) which is less than the 0.05 level of significance. The computed r-value of 0.850 revealed a strong positive correlation. This means that the null hypothesis (there is no significant relationship between teachers' use of formative and summative assessment and students' performance in Quarter 1) is rejected. The strong positive correlation aligns with the study of Hattie and Timperley (2017), who found that feedback and assessment clarity are among the most influential factors affecting student achievement. The teachers' frequent use of assessment for learning (formative) and assessment of learning (summative) allows them to draw valid inferences about student progress and adjust their strategies to meet diverse learning needs. This indicates that the school have effectively implemented assessment practices that are aligned with the principles of the Department of Education's Policy on Classroom Assessment (DepEd Order No. 8, s. 2015), which emphasizes assessment as an integral part of the teaching and learning process.

Conclusion

The findings of the study revealed that the extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences is very high. Simultaneously, the students' performance in quarter 1 found to be very satisfactory. More importantly, statistical analysis indicated a strong positive significant relationship between extent of teachers' use of formative and summative assessment in terms of setting goals, designing, selecting and adapting tools, collecting data and making inferences and level of academic performance of students in quarter 1. This suggests that teachers who purposefully plan and utilize assessment as an integral component of instruction can provide students with timely feedback and targeted learning interventions, leading to improved performance outcomes of the students. This highlights that when teachers are equipped with the knowledge and skills to design and

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



interpret assessments appropriately, they are better positioned to identify learners' strengths and learning gaps, which promotes more responsive and evidence-based teaching strategies and techniques. Therefore, maintaining and enhancing teachers' assessment capabilities should remain a key priority for educational leaders to ensure continuous improvement in instructional quality and student performance.

Recommendations

1. Apply the recommended instructional supervision plan to attain the research goal.
2. Teachers should continue integrating both formative and summative assessments into daily instruction. Regular goal setting, appropriate tool selection, and meaningful data interpretation should remain key components of classroom assessment practices.
3. Teachers are encouraged to analyze assessment results to identify learning gaps and tailor remediation or enrichment activities accordingly. This data-driven approach ensures that instruction meets students' diverse learning needs.
4. School heads should monitor and provide technical assistance to teachers in the use of formative and summative assessments. Observation tools and post-conference discussions may focus on how teachers utilize assessment results to inform instruction.
5. Schools should establish systems that encourage collaboration among teachers in designing assessment tools, analyzing results, and sharing best practices through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions.
6. Assessment strategies should be embedded in curriculum planning and policy guidelines to ensure alignment between instructional goals and performance indicators. and
7. Future researchers are encouraged to replicate this study to incorporate other locales and other variables beyond the ones identified in this study.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to all those who have supported and guided me throughout the journey of completing this thesis. First and foremost, Praises and Thanks to the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, for His presence, provision, protection, and preservation. To Dr. Jasmine B. Misa, my thesis adviser, she is deeply thankful for those whose unwavering support, invaluable insights, and mentorship have been instrumental in shaping this research. Her dedication to excellence and your patience in guiding me through the complexities of this project have been truly remarkable. She extends her appreciation to the faculty members of the Graduate Department of Western Leyte College for their wisdom, encouragement, and commitment to fostering an environment of academic growth. She is grateful to the members of my Thesis Committee and Panel Examiners headed by Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Chairman and Scribe of the Pre and Oral Examination panel, together with Dr. Annabelle A. Wenceslao and Dr. Elvin H. Wenceslao for their constructive feedback and valuable suggestions. To her DepEd Baybay City Division Family headed by Manuel P. Albaño Phd, CESO V for allowing her to conduct this study in my school. To Hibunawan Elementary School family, headed by eloquent and warm-hearted School Principal II, Cecilio Gucela Villamor Jr., for having been instrumental in the realization of this endeavor. She wanted to acknowledge the contributions of Hibunawan Elementary School family who have provided valuable discussions, assistance, and moral support during this research journey. Their camaraderie has made this experience both educational and enjoyable. "To her family- my parents, Rogelio and Herminia; sons, Louigie, John Ahron, and Ibarra Jr.; and my only daughter, Kris Charity - your unconditional love, understanding, and encouragement have been the pillars of strength of the researcher. Their unwavering belief in her abilities has been a constant source of motivation. This is for you." Lastly, she dedicated this work to her late husband, Ibarra T. Soria your memory gives me strength and perseverance, even in moments of struggle. This thesis would not have been possible without the collective support and guidance of all these wonderful individuals. She is truly grateful for the opportunities and

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



resources provided to her throughout this academic endeavor. Thank you for being a part of this journey and for helping her reach this milestone.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agirdag, O., & Muijs, D. (2023). School leadership development and academic achievement: Effectiveness of the High Performing Schools programme. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 122, Article 102248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102248>
- [2] Andersson, C. (2017). Formative assessment- and the component of adjusted teacher instruction. <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-163255>
- [3] Andersson, C., & Palm, T. (2017a). Characteristics of improved formative assessment practice. *Education Inquiry*, 8(2), 104–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2016.1275185>
- [4] Andersson, C., & Palm, T. (2017b). The impact of formative assessment on student achievement: A study of the effects of changes to classroom practice after a comprehensive professional development programme. *Learning and Instruction*, 49, 92–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.12.006>
- [5] Andrade, H.L. & Brookhart, S.M. (2020). *Classroom Assessment as the Intersection of Teaching and Learning*. Teachers College Press.
- [6] Anijovich, R., & Cappelletti, G. (2020). La retroalimentación formativa: Una oportunidad para mejorar los aprendizajes y la enseñanza [Formative feedback: An opportunity to improve learning and teaching]. *Revista Docencia Universitaria [University Teaching Magazine]*, 21(1), 81-96.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [7] Ardiansyah, W., Ujihanti, M., Aryanti, N., & Meirani, W. (2018). Formative Assessment. *Holistics Journal*, 10(19), 19–27. Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. (n.d.). Assessment for Learning Formative Assessment.
- [8] Babinčáková, M., Ganajová, M., Sotáková, I., & Bernard, P. (2020). The implementation of formative assessment into chemistry education at secondary school. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 19(1), 36-49. <https://doi.org/10.33225/jbse/20.19.36>
- [9] Beekman, K., Joosten, D., & Boshuizen, E. (2021). Sustainability of developed self-regulation by means of formative assessment among young adolescents: A longitudinal study. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.746819>
- [10] Beriche, M., & Medina, P. (2021). Formative evaluation: Implementation and main challenges present on schools or higher education. *Educación [Education]*, 27(2), 201-208. <https://doi.org/10.33539/educacion.2021.v27n2.2433>
- [11] Black, P. and William, D (2018). Developing a Theory of Formative Assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5-31.
- [12] Bostrom, E., & Palm, T. (2023). The effect of a formative assessment practice on student achievement in mathematics [Original Research]. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1101192>
- [13] Broadbent, J., Sharman, S., Panadero, E., & Fuller, M. (2021). How does self-regulated learning influence formative assessment and summative grade? Comparing online and blended learners. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 50, 100805. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2021.100805>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [14] Brookhart, S.M. (2018). How to Create and Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment and Grading. ASCD.
- [15] Cañadas, L. (2020). Contribution of formative assessment for developing teaching competences in teacher education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(3), 516-532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2021.1950684>
- [16] Cerón-Urzuá, C., Cossío, M., Pezoa, P., & Gómez, R. (2020). Diseño y validación de un cuestionario para evaluar desempeño docente asociado a las prácticas evaluativas formativas [Design and validation of a questionnaire to evaluate teaching performance associated with formative evaluation practices]. *Revista Complutense de Educación [Complutense Education Magazine]*, 31(4), 463-472. <https://doi.org/10.5209/rced.65512>
- [17] Cito. (2017a). *Primair en speciaal onderwijs. Cito Volgsysteem. Rekenen-Wiskunde 3.0. Groep 7*, Arnhem: Cito.
- [18] Cito. (2017b). *Primair en speciaal onderwijs. Cito Volgsysteem. Rekenen-Wiskunde 3.0. Groep 6*, Arnhem: Cito.
- [19] Connolly, P., Keenan, C., & Urbanska, K. (2018). The trials of evidence-based practice in education: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials in education research 1980–2016. *Educational Research*, 60(3), 276–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2018.1493353>
- [20] Creswell, J., & Creswell, D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE.
- [21] DeLuca, C., Chapman-Chin, A., & Klinger, D. A. (2019). Toward a teacher professional learning continuum in assessment for learning. *Educational Assessment*, 24(4), 267–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2019.1670056>
- *****

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [22] Denessen, E. J. P. G. (2017). Verantwoord omgaan met verschillen: sociale-culturele achtergronden en differentiatie in het onderwijs Leiden].
- [23] Deunk, M. I., Smale-Jacobse, A. E., de Boer, H., Doolaard, S., & Bosker, R. J. (2018). Effective differentiation Practices: A systematic review and meta-analysis of studies on the cognitive effects of differentiation practices in primary education. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.002>
- [24] Duro, E. (2022). Evaluación formativa para mejorar la educación [Formative assessment to improve education]. *Propuesta Educativa [Educational Proposal]*, 31(58), 49-62.
- [25] Dwiyantri, K. E., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2021). Assessment For Writing Skills In Online Learning. *Lingua Scientia*, 28(1), 8–19.
- [26] Education, I.o. (2022). De staat van het onderwijs 2022. Evers, A., Sijtsma, K., Lucassen, W., & Meijer, R. (2010). Het COTAN-beoordelingssysteem voor de kwaliteit van tests herzien. *Psycholoog*, 45, 48–55.
- [27] Heritage, M. (2019). *Formative Assessment: Making It Happen in the Classroom*. Corwin Press.
- [28] Fernández-Río, J., Cecchini, J., Lopes, L., Silva, H., & Leite, A. (2023). Self-efficacy, self-regulation and cooperative learning in secondary education Spanish and Portuguese students. *Education* XX1, 26(1), 117-139. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.33339>
- [29] Fernández, D., Banay, W., De la Cruz, L., & Alegre, J. (2022). Learning achievement and competences development through formative assessment. *Revista de Investigación en Ciencias de la Educación [Journal of Research in Educational Sciences]*, 6(23), 418-428. <https://doi.org/10.33996/revista horizontes.v6i23.344>
- *****

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [30] Fraile, J., Gil, M., Zamorano, D., & Sánchez, I. (2020). Autorregulación del aprendizaje y procesos de evaluación formativa en los trabajos en grupo [Self-regulation of learning and formative evaluation processes in group work]. RELIEVE, 26(1), M5. <http://doi.org/10.7203/relieve.26.1.17402>
- [31] Fraile, J., Ruiz, P., Zamorano, D., & Orgaz, D. (2021). Evaluación formativa, autorregulación, feedback y herramientas digitales: Uso de Socrative en educación superior [Formative evaluation, self-regulation, feedback and digital tools: Use of Socrative in higher education]. Retos, 42, 724-734. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v42i0.87067>
- [32] Gedikli, H., & Buldur, S. (2022). The effects of formative assessment practices in science education on students' metacognitive knowledge and regulation skills. Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 37(4), 1393-1415. <https://doi.org/10.16986/huje.2022.454>
- [33] Gloria, R. Y., Sudarmin, S., Wiyanto, & Indriyanti, D. R. (2018). The effectiveness of formative assessment with understanding by design (UbD) stages in forming habits of mind in prospective teachers. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 983(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/983/1/012158>
- [34] Goertzen, L., Schils, T., & Heeneman, S. (2023). Co-designing formative assessment practices: A collaboration between elementary school teachers and researchers to conceptualize and implement formative assessment as a unified practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 134, 104306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104306>
- [35] Gotwals, A. W., & Cisterna, D. (2022). Formative assessment practice progressions for teacher preparation: A framework and illustrative case. Teaching and Teacher Education, 110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103601>
- *****

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [36] Granberg, C., Palm, T., & Palmberg, B. (2021). A case study of a formative assessment practice and the effects on students' self-regulated learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 28, 109-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100955>
- [37] Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2017). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- [38] Hera Adinda, A., Siahaan, H. E., Raihani, I. F., Aprida, N., Salwiah, N. F., & Suryanda, A. (2021). Article Review Penilaian Sumatif dan Penilaian Formatif Pembelajaran Online (Vol. 2, Issue 1).
- [39] Hop, M., & Engelen, R. (2017). Wetenschappelijke verantwoording rekenen-wiskunde 3.0 voor groep 6. Cito.
- [40] Hop, M., Janssen, J., & Engelen, R. (2017). Wetenschappelijke verantwoording Rekenen-Wiskunde 3.0 voor groep 7. Cito.
- [41] Ismail, S., Rahui, D., Patra, I., & Rezvani, E. (2022). Formative vs. summative assessment: Impacts on academic motivation, attitude toward learning, test anxiety, and self-regulation skill. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12, 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00191-4>
- [42] Jaya, A., Hermansyah, & Rosmiyati, E. (2019b). Redefining Project Based Learning In English Class. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 2 (<https://jurnal.univpgripalembang.ac.id/index.php/esteem/issue/view/304>). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v2i2.2423>
- [43] Ke, L., Friedrichsen, P., Rawson, R., & Sadler, T. D. (2023). Teacher learning through collaborative curriculum design in the midst of a pandemic: A cultural historical activity theory investigation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 122, Article 103957. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103957>
- *****

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [44] Kippers, W. B., Wolterinck, C. H. D., Schildkamp, K., Poortman, C. L., & Visscher, A. J. (2018). Teachers' views on the use of assessment for learning and data-based decision making in classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 199–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.06.015>
- [45] Klute, M., Apthorp, H., Harlacher, J., & Reale, M. (2017). Formative assessment and elementary school student academic achievement: A review of the evidence (REL 2017–259). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.
- [46] Kültür, Z., & Kutlu, M. (2021). The effect of formative assessment on high school students' mathematics achievement and attitudes. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 5(4), 155-171. <https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.2021474302>
- [47] Kyza, E. A., & Agesilaou, A. (2022). Investigating the processes of teacher and researcher empowerment and learning in Co-design settings. *Cognition and Instruction*, 40(1), 100–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370008.2021.2010213>
- [48] Llece-Unesco (2021). Evaluación formativa: Una oportunidad para transformar la educación en tiempos de pandemia [Formative assessment: An opportunity to transform education in times of pandemic]. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000378045>
- [49] López-Vázquez, R., Tobón-Tobón, S., Veytia-Bucheli, G., & Juárez-Hernández, G. (2021). Mediación didáctica e inclusión educativa en la educación básica desde el enfoque socioformativo [Didactic mediation and educational inclusion in basic education from the socio-formative approach]. *Revista de Investigación Educativa [Educational Research Magazine]*, 39(2), 527-552. <https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.443301>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [50] Mahendra, A., Dewi, N. L., & Wahyuni, L. (2021). Analysis of The Formative Assessment Planning During Online Learning: A Case Study. JINOTEP (Jurnal Inovasi Dan Teknologi Pembelajaran): Kajian Dan Riset Dalam Teknologi Pembelajaran, 8(2), 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um031v8i22021p157>
- [51] Meldia, P., & Melani, M. (2022). An Analysis Of Formative Assessment In Teaching English Used By Teacher. Panyonara: Journal of English Education, 4(2), 190–204. <https://doi.org/10.19105/panyonara.v4i2.6806>
- [52] Minedu. (2020). Resolución viceministerial N° 00094-2020-MINEDU. Norma que regula la evaluación de las competencias de los estudiantes de la educación básica [Vice-ministerial resolution No. 00094-2020-MINEDU. Standard that regulates the evaluation of the competencies of basic education students].Ministerio de Educación del Perú [Ministry of Education of Peru]. https://www.grade.org.pe/creer/archivos/RVM_N__094-2020-MINEDU.pdf
- [53] Minedu. (2023). El valor de la evaluación formativa [The value of formative evaluation]. Ministerio de Educación del Perú [Ministry of Education of Peru].<https://www.gob.pe/institucion/minedu/informes-publicaciones/4114709-el-valor-de-la-evaluacion-formativa>
- [54] Mollo, M., & Medina, P. (2020). Formative evaluation: Towards a comprehensive pedagogical proposal in times of pandemic. Maestro y Sociedad [Master and Society], 17(4), 635-651.
- [55] Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: Sampling, data collection and analysis. The European Journal of General Practice, 24(1), 9–18.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [56] Msosa, A., Bruce, J., & Crouch, R. (2021). Effect of a formative assessment intervention of nursing skills laboratory learning in a resource constrained country. *Nurse Education Today*, 97, 104677. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2020.104677>
- [57] Offerdahl, E. G., McConnell, M., & Boyer, J. (2018). Can I have your recipe? Using a fidelity of implementation (FOI) framework to identify the key ingredients of formative assessment for learning. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, 17(4), es16. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.18-02-0029>
- [58] Ozan, C., & Kincal, R. (2018). The effects of formative assessment on academic achievement, attitudes toward the lesson, and self-regulation skills. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(1), 85-118. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.1.0216>
- [59] Pallares, J., Parra, H., Garcidueñas, A., López, J., Cervantes, C., & Navarro, K. (2022). The socio-formative rubrics in the OSCE to assess the level of achievement of the competences comprising the profile of the physician graduate. *Educación Médica [Medical Education]*, 23(3), 100740. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edumed.2022.100740>
- [60] Panadero, E., & Broadbent, J. (2018). Developing evaluative judgement: A self-regulated learning perspective. In D. Boud, R. Ajjawi, P. Dawson, & J. Tai (Eds.), *Developing evaluative judgement in higher education: Assessment for knowing and producing quality work* (pp. 81-89). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315109251>
- [61] Panadero, E., Andrade, H., & Brookhart, S. (2018). Fusing self-regulated learning and formative assessment: A roadmap of where we are, how we got here, and where we are going. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 45, 13-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-018-0258-y>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [62] Pérez-Pino, M., Enrique-Clavero, J., Carbó, J., & González, M. (2017). La evaluación formativa en el proceso enseñanza aprendizaje [Formative evaluation in the teaching-learning process]. *Edumecentro*, 9(3), 263-283.
- [63] Putri, A. D., Jaya, A., & Marleni, M. (2023). Exploring the Students' Speaking Ability Based on Their Different Personalities. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 6(1), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v6i1.10203>
- [64] Sanmartí, N. (2020). *Evaluar y aprender: Un único proceso* [Evaluate and learn: A single process]. Octaedro Editorial.
- [65] Sanmartí, N. (2021). ¿Qué sabemos de la importancia del valor del error y de su gestión para el aprendizaje? [What do we know about the importance of the value of errors and their management for learning?]. https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/caplli/2020/257885/ensciecie_a2020-24-38.pdf
- [66] Sanmartí, N., Flores, E., & Quintanilla, M. (2020). Memorias primer foro virtual de evaluación formativa por una evaluación diferenciada en tiempos de crisis, para profesores en formación inicial y continua [Reports first virtual formative evaluation forum for a differentiated evaluation in times of crisis, for teachers in initial and continuing training]. <https://repositorio.unicordoba.edu.co/handle/ucordoba/2976>
- [67] Sari, A., Jaya, A., Hermansyah, H., & Mortini, A. V. (2022). Using Mixidea Online Debating Strategy To Promote the Students' Speaking Ability. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, 5(2), 298–303. <https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v5i2.8591>
- [68] Simon, B. (2019). The effect of formative assessment on student motivation and self-regulation [PhD thesis, Concordia University St. Paul].
- *****

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



- *****
- [69] Sotaková, I., Ganajová, M., & Babincaková, M. (2020). Inquiry-based science education as a revision strategy. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 19(3),499-513. <https://doi.org/10.33225/jbse/20.19.499>
- [70] van der Steen, J., van Schilt-Mol, T., van der Vleuten, C., & Joosten-ten Brinke, D. (2022). Supporting teachers in improving formative decision-making: Design principles for formative assessment plans [original research]. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.925352>
- [71] van Merriënboer, J. (2023). Learning in simulated and real environments.
- [72] Vangrieken, K., Meredith, C., Packer, T., & Kyndt, E. (2017). Teacher communities as a context for professional development: A systematic review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 61, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.10.001>
- [73] Vargas-Quispe, G., Sito-Justiniano, L., Toledo, S., Toledo-Espinoza, M., & Mendoza, M. (2022). Evaluación formativa y las tecnologías del aprendizaje y conocimiento [Formative evaluation and learning and knowledge technologies]. *Universidad y Sociedad [University and Society]*, 14(1),339-348.
- [74] Veugen, M. J., Gulikers, J. T. M., & den Brok, P. (2021). We agree on what we see: Teacher and student perceptions of formative assessment practice. *Studies In Educational Evaluation*, 70, Article 101027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101027>
- [75] Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- [76] Wafubwa, R., & Csikos. C. (2022). Formative assessment as a predictor of mathematics teachers' levels of metacognitive regulation. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(1), 983-998. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14158a>
- *****

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



[77] Watson, E. (2022). Defining Assessment. Yambi, T. de A. C. (2018). Assessment And Evaluation In Education. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342918149>

[78] Zhang, Y., Liu, G., Zhang, L., Xu, S., & Cheung, M. W.-L. (2021). Psychological ownership: A meta-analysis and comparison of multiple forms of attachment in the workplace. *Journal of Management*, 47(3), 745–770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206320917195>



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



AUTHOR'S PROFILE



MS. LESIL G. SORIA

Lesil G. Soria, born on October 16, 1975, in Brgy San Isidro, Baybay City, Leyte, is a dedicated educator known for her commitment to nurturing continuous learning and empowerment among her students. Her journey in education began at Candadam Elementary School, followed by her secondary education at Baybay National School, and was deployed for her practice teaching in Gaas Elementary School Division of Baybay City.

Lesil's journey is a testament to resilience and self-determination. Born into a fractured family dynamic, she learned early to carve her own path, transforming adversity into fuel for ambition. From her teenage years, she shouldered financial independence, tutoring kindergarten and elementary students to fund her allowances and college aspirations. This grind was not just about resourcefulness, empathy and leadership

Lesil continued her academic journey at Visayas State College of Agriculture (VisCA), recently known as Visayas State University - Baybay City, where she earned her Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Education, major in Teaching agriculture in Elementary Schools (TAES), in 1998. That same year, she passed the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET), marking the official start of her teaching career.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Despite the demands of being a full-time mom and a single parent to her 4 children, Lougie, John Ahron, Kris Charity and Ibarra Jr., Lesil has consistently pursued professional growth. Her commitment to lifelong learning led her to enroll in a Master of Arts in Education (MAEd) program, majoring in School Administration and Supervision. She successfully completed the academic requirements for her MAEd in December 2025, driven by her diverse experiences and the support of different groups she encountered through her sports and academic journey.

Currently, Lesil is an esteemed Grade 2 -Matapat teacher at Hibunawan Elementary School of Baybay City. Her dedication to education, combined with her rich background in community involvement, continues to inspire her students and peers, highlighting her unwavering commitment to making a meaningful impact in the educational landscape.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza
