

Korneyko Iryna,
Ovsiannikova Hanna,
Petrova Olga,
Kharkiv National Medical University, Kharkiv, Ukraine

STUDENT-CENTERED APPROACH TO LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSMENT

The contemporary student-centered education paradigm views the student as a responsible and proactive participant in academic activities. This attitude ensures comprehensive development of the student's personality, takes into account his individual characteristics, abilities, educational needs. The learning process is aimed at forming a worldview, professional skills, and self-development of the student. Establishing the educational environment that ensures high learning outcomes and formation of modern competencies, creates conditions for free choice of educational trajectory and development of the student's personality in accordance with his/her abilities, interests, opportunities, and supports creative activity. Under such conditions, improving the diagnosis of the results of students' learning activities becomes urgent to facilitate the quality of the educational process. The role of the diagnostic tool in the contemporary classroom is played by assessment, which, depending on its primary goal, can be distinguished as formative and summative.

N. Glazer defines formative assessment as tasks that allow students to receive feedback on their performance during the course; this assessment is used as a diagnostic tool when a unit or module is completed or the lesson is over, while, according to the author, summative assessment is generally applied to give the student a numerical score and is commonly used to measure learning and is rarely used for learning [1].

The advantages of formative assessment are described in detail. This ongoing process performed during learning reveals strengths and weaknesses of the student's learning. The feedback received can help the students to improve their learning or

skills, allows correction, providing better learning outcome. It directs and orients the students in the process of learning as well as allows the teachers to make adjustments and corrections in the program and direct the student. Formative assessment is gradual, as it deals with portions of the program; its results reflect the progress made by the students. Formative assessment refers to frequent, interactive assessments of students' development and adjustment of teaching appropriately. As it is a regular practice and does not give a score or grade, it is not associated with test anxiety or low self-esteem of the students [2]. Formative assessment is concerned with helping students to develop their learning and is not accidentally called "assessment for learning" [3].

Summative assessment is necessary as it allows scoring or grading of the students, it typically takes place after the completion of the course. With summative assessment the teachers can understand how the student is performing, analyze the students' achievements, and rate them. It is considered that as well as formative assessment it can identify weaknesses of the teaching/learning process, measure the educator performance, meanwhile it can be demotivating because being a final assessment it does not allow corrections or improvement of the outcome, it is associated with stress anxiety, while the problems of instruction are identified at the stage when they have become crucial and nothing can be changed. It is mentioned that summative assessment decreases self-esteem of the students, whereas the teachers "work for the exam" not for intended learning outcome [4, 5].

In publications related to medical education, summative assessment is regarded as "not being student centric", as well as one that «is often seen as embodying all the negative social aspects of assessment», meanwhile formative assessment is described as "historically neglected". The authors suggest not to rely entirely on summative assessment alone emphasizing the necessity to investigate which assessment type can also adequately predict future performance [6].

A group of authors who studied the attitude of medical students to formative assessment reported that, according to the students, it serves as a guide to learning, shows their weaknesses and allows understanding what the final assessment will be

like. The authors state that 90% of the students who underwent formative assessment improved their performance [7].

In contrast to the above authors Alkhateeb N.E. et al. [8] do not consider optimal the use of only formative assessment. They doubt that only formative assessment necessarily provides high final assessment results and conclude that it is necessary to combine the two types.

The assessment practice at KhNMU differs from that described in modern literature, since the type of assessment we use cannot be fully related to either of the described: on the one hand, ongoing control used at every practical class assesses acquisition of the content for the purpose of feedback, correction and adjustment in the teaching process, and is intended to stimulate the learning activity of the students, which is definitely an attribute of formative evaluation. On the other hand, the grades given in each practical class will always be taken into account during the final assessment and influence the final grade, which is a feature of summative assessment and, thus, carries all its disadvantages. We have noticed that at regular grading, students do not often show interest in and do not initiate the analysis of errors or shortcomings of their answers, because the grade has already been given and has already influenced the final grading of the course. Daily summative assessment of 2-3 subjects multiplies test anxiety by the number of practical classes. This constant stress leads to apathy, reduces motivation, is frequently associated with manifestations of academic integrity violation. We even observed the cases when the students intentionally failed the test because the unsatisfactory grade can be reworked. The students, asking to see the assessed work, are more frequently interested if it has been evaluated by the criteria, while the requests to analyze the mistakes and explain why the particular answer is correct or not, are rare. If the grade for the class or content unit is given, the feedback is not interesting to them even despite the fact that they will have a final assessment of the discipline on the exam or grading test. In our opinion, in such circumstances, in addition to assessment by the teacher, self-assessment can have a high potential, but the issues of developing a culture of self-assessment deserves separate consideration.

We cannot but agree with Seyed M. Ismail et al. [9] that formative and summative assessment complement each other and their combined use can be reasonable: ongoing monitoring of students' learning achievements and changes in the teaching process can ensure continuous progress and make final assessment results more predictable. This makes the students a part of the learning environment and can stimulate self-assessment. This opinion is consistent with Mukhtar B. et al. [10]: since both types of assessment have their advantages, both should be used in higher medical education, and, according to the authors, can improve learning outcomes.

It can be concluded that assessment plays a central role in a modern learning and teaching as it allows not only to rate, but also to adjust the program to the learning needs of the student, motivates learning, can stimulate self-assessment, plays a role in personality development. Assessment is a permanently developing concept, thus the effectiveness of assessment types practiced by a higher school should be constantly monitored and the assessment system should be revised and updated in accordance with the new trends in the science of education and social demand.

References:

1. Glazer, N. (2014). Formative plus summative assessment in large undergraduate courses: Why both? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 26(2), 276–286.
2. Alahmadi, N., Alrahaili, M., & Alshraideh, D. (2019). The impact of the formative assessment in speaking test on Saudi students' performance. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(1), 259–270.
3. Buyukkarci, K., & Sahinkarakas, S. (2021). The impact of formative assessment on students' assessment preferences. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 21(1), 142–161.
4. Kashif Ishaq, Abdul Majid Khan Rana & Nor Azan Mat Zin (2020) Exploring Summative Assessment and Effects: Primary to Higher Education. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, Vol. 42, No. 3 pp. 23-50.
5. Reddy K. Summative Evaluation Advantages and Disadvantages.

<https://content.wisestep.com/advantages-disadvantages-summative-evaluation/> -

retrieved on February 28, 2024.

6. O'Shaughnessy, S.M. & Joyce, P. (2015) Summative and formative assessment in medicine: the experience of an anaesthesia trainee. *Int J High Educ* 4: 198-206.

7. Labarca, J., Figueroa, C., Huidobro, B., Wright, A.C., Riquelme, A., et al. (2014). Perception of medical students about formative assessments during clinical courses. *Rev Med Chil* 142: 1193-1199. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0034-98872014000900014>.

8. Alkhateeb, N.E., Al-Dabbagh, A., Ibrahim, M., Al-Tawil, N.G. (2019). Effect of a formative objective structured clinical examination on the clinical performance of undergraduate medical students in a summative examination: a randomized controlled trial. *Indian Pediatr* 56:745-748. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-019-1641-0>.

9. Seyed M. Ismail, D. R. Rahul, Indrajit Patra & Ehsan Rezvani Ismail *et al.* (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>.

10. Mukhtar, B., Khan, M., Alattar, K.A., et al. (2020). A Comparative Study of Formative and Summative Assessment Pattern of Clinical Skills for Undergraduate Students in College of Medicine, Dar Al Uloom University, Riyadh. *Prensa Med Argent*, Volume 106:5. 241. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47275/0032-745X-241>.