



Managing Learning Evaluation Results to Improve Instructional Quality in Elementary Schools: A Literature-Based Analysis of Assessment Processing, Learning Mastery, and Follow-Up Strategies

Pahda*, Keterina Agmayanti, Istiananta Hanggule, Melania Yabar, Narcisus Efendi Nalti, Nur Hidayatul Nahda, Nur Fadillah, Nurul Qalbi, Nur Adhayani, Yulinar Tiara Sari

¹ Universitas Megarezky Makasar, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history :

Received : 14/03/2026

Revised : 17/04/2026

Published : 21/05/2026



Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Volume : 1

No. 1

Halaman : 50-61

Terbitan : Juni 2026

Terakreditasi -
berdasarkan Ristekdikti
No.

ABSTRAK

Learning evaluation in elementary schools should not be limited to recording scores, but should function as a basis for improving instructional quality through evidence-based decision-making. However, evaluation results are often not systematically managed, causing teachers to underuse assessment data for identifying learning mastery, diagnosing student difficulties, and planning instructional follow-up. This study aims to analyze techniques for managing learning evaluation results to improve instructional quality in elementary schools. A qualitative approach with an integrative literature review design was employed. Relevant studies published between 2021 and 2026 were reviewed through structured procedures, including literature identification, selection based on inclusion and exclusion criteria, data extraction, thematic coding, and conceptual synthesis. The analysis focused on four dimensions of evaluation result management: systematic score processing, learning mastery analysis, mapping of students' learning difficulties, and utilization of evaluation results for remedial and enrichment activities. The findings show that systematic score processing helps teachers organize raw assessment data into meaningful instructional information. Learning mastery analysis enables teachers to determine students' achievement status and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. Mapping students' learning difficulties provides diagnostic evidence for identifying specific concepts, indicators, or learning materials requiring further support. The utilization of evaluation results allows teachers to design targeted remedial instruction, enrichment activities, and lesson improvement. This study contributes to the literature by positioning evaluation result management as a practical bridge between assessment evidence, teacher reflection, and instructional improvement. The findings imply that elementary school teachers need stronger assessment literacy and data-use competence to transform evaluation results into responsive, differentiated, and sustainable learning support.

Keywords: Assessment literacy; Elementary education; Evaluation result management; Instructional quality; Learning mastery analysis.

A. Introduction

Learning evaluation has become an essential component of contemporary elementary education because it provides evidence for understanding students' progress, learning barriers, and instructional needs. In classroom practice, evaluation is no longer viewed merely as a mechanism for assigning grades, but as a systematic process for collecting, processing, interpreting, and using learning evidence to improve teaching quality. This shift is closely related to the growing emphasis on formative assessment, assessment literacy, and data-informed instruction in educational research. Teachers are expected to transform evaluation results into meaningful pedagogical decisions, particularly in elementary schools where students' cognitive, emotional, and social development varies considerably. When evaluation results are managed properly, they can help teachers identify mastery levels, diagnose learning difficulties, and design appropriate follow-up actions. Therefore, the management of learning evaluation results is central to improving instructional quality and ensuring that assessment contributes directly to student learning rather than functioning only as an administrative requirement.

Despite its importance, the use of learning evaluation results in elementary schools often remains limited to recording scores and determining whether students have passed or failed. Many teachers still face difficulties in converting raw assessment data into instructional information that can guide lesson planning, remedial learning, enrichment activities, and classroom reflection. This condition indicates a gap between the ideal function of assessment and its actual use in daily teaching practice. Recent studies on teacher assessment literacy show that teachers may understand the importance of assessment conceptually, but they often struggle to apply assessment principles consistently in classroom decision-making (Pastore, 2023; Yan & Pastore, 2022a). Similar concerns have also been identified in formative assessment research, where feedback, questioning, and interpretation of student responses are frequently implemented in fragmented ways rather than as part of a coherent instructional cycle (Shafii & Berger, 2025). Therefore, the problem is not only whether teachers conduct evaluation, but whether they are able to manage and use evaluation results to improve learning.

The urgency of this issue becomes stronger in the context of elementary education because early learning outcomes strongly influence students' academic development in later grades. At this level, students require timely diagnosis, responsive feedback, and differentiated support because learning difficulties that are not identified early may develop into persistent academic problems. Formative assessment studies emphasize that teachers need to clarify learning goals, monitor students' progress, interpret evidence of learning, and provide feedback that helps students move forward (Yan & Pastore, 2022b; Zhan et al., 2026). However, evaluation results will not automatically improve learning if they are not processed systematically and connected to instructional follow-up. Score recapitulation, learning mastery analysis, item or indicator analysis, and mapping of students' learning difficulties are therefore important technical steps in transforming evaluation into pedagogical action. In this sense, evaluation result management is not a separate administrative task, but an integral part of instructional quality assurance.

The rational basis for studying this topic lies in the relationship between assessment data, teacher decision-making, and learning improvement. Data literacy research has shown that teachers need the capacity to formulate instructional questions, collect relevant evidence, analyze learning data, and make decisions based on that evidence (Pastore, 2025; Sandoval-Ríos et al., 2025). In elementary classrooms, this capacity is especially important because teachers often teach multiple subjects and must respond to diverse student abilities within limited instructional time. Properly managed evaluation results can help teachers determine which students need remedial instruction, which students require enrichment, and which learning indicators should be retaught or strengthened. Conversely, poorly managed evaluation results may lead to inaccurate conclusions about student achievement and ineffective instructional responses. Therefore, the study of evaluation result management is academically and practically relevant because it connects assessment practice with the broader goal of improving learning quality.

Previous literature has extensively discussed formative assessment, teacher assessment literacy, feedback literacy, and data use in education. Yan and Pastore (2022a) developed a formative assessment literacy scale that highlights conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional dimensions of teachers' assessment competence, while Yan and Pastore (2022b) emphasized the importance of teachers' strategies in implementing formative assessment practices. Pastore (2023) further showed that teacher assessment literacy remains a complex construct because teachers often experience difficulties in transferring assessment theories

into classroom realities. In the context of formative assessment implementation, Shafii and Berger (2025) found that ineffective feedback practices and limited assessment literacy can weaken the impact of assessment on student learning. Lau, Lee, and Li (2023) also highlighted the role of formative assessment in supporting student engagement in elementary classrooms, suggesting that assessment becomes meaningful when it actively informs the learning process. More recent studies by Çibukçiu and Koliqi (2026) and Aust et al. (2026) reinforce the argument that formative assessment requires structured implementation and teacher competence rather than isolated assessment activities. Collectively, these studies demonstrate that assessment can improve learning when teachers possess sufficient literacy, feedback competence, and capacity to connect assessment evidence with instructional action.

However, the existing literature still leaves several limitations that justify further conceptual investigation. Many studies focus on teachers' assessment literacy, feedback practices, or formative assessment implementation, but fewer studies specifically examine the technical management of evaluation results as a sequence of score processing, mastery analysis, learning difficulty mapping, and instructional follow-up. Research on teacher data literacy has also emphasized the importance of transforming educational data into actionable knowledge, yet the discussion often remains broad and is not always linked to elementary school evaluation routines (Pastore, 2025; Sandoval-Ríos et al., 2025). Meanwhile, feedback literacy studies tend to focus on how feedback is designed and received, but they do not always explain how evaluation data are processed before feedback and follow-up decisions are made (Carless & Winstone, 2023; Istencioglu et al., 2026; Zhan et al., 2026). This creates a critical research gap: evaluation result management is frequently acknowledged as important, but it has not been sufficiently conceptualized as a practical instructional mechanism for improving learning quality in elementary schools. Therefore, a literature-based analysis is needed to synthesize how evaluation results can be managed systematically and used as the basis for remedial learning, enrichment, lesson improvement, and teacher reflection.

Based on this gap, this study aims to analyze techniques for managing learning evaluation results to improve instructional quality in elementary schools. Specifically, the study focuses on four main aspects: systematic processing of student scores, analysis of learning mastery, mapping of students' learning difficulties, and utilization of evaluation results for instructional follow-up. Theoretically, this study contributes to the discussion of assessment literacy and formative assessment by positioning evaluation result management as a bridge between assessment evidence and instructional decision-making. Practically, the study provides elementary school teachers with a clearer framework for using evaluation results not only to determine student achievement, but also to improve lesson planning, remedial instruction, enrichment activities, and classroom reflection. The novelty of this study lies in its effort to sharpen the technical dimension of evaluation management within the broader discourse of assessment-based instructional improvement. By doing so, this article is expected to support a more meaningful, systematic, and learning-oriented use of evaluation results in elementary education.

B. Method

a. Research Design

This study employed a qualitative approach using an integrative literature review design. This design was selected because the purpose of the study was not to test the effect of an intervention statistically, but to synthesize, interpret, and conceptualize previous findings related to the management of learning evaluation results in elementary schools. An integrative literature review is appropriate for examining a broad educational issue because it enables researchers to combine theoretical, conceptual, and empirical studies in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon. In this study, the phenomenon examined was the way teachers process evaluation results, analyze learning mastery, identify students' learning difficulties, and use evaluation findings as the basis for instructional follow-up. The review design was strengthened by adapting transparent reporting principles from PRISMA 2020 and by applying thematic analysis to organize the findings into coherent conceptual themes (Page et al., 2021; Braun & Clarke, 2021; Byrne, 2022). This design was considered suitable because the original focus of the study was literature-based and aimed to generate a conceptual explanation rather than produce numerical generalization.

b. Research Context and Time

This study did not involve a field site because it was conducted as a literature-based investigation. The

research context was elementary education, particularly classroom assessment practices related to the management and utilization of learning evaluation results. The review focused on studies discussing assessment management, formative assessment, teacher assessment literacy, learning mastery analysis, feedback practices, remedial instruction, enrichment learning, and data-informed instructional decision-making. The literature search and document selection were designed to be conducted during May 2026, with the reviewed literature prioritized from 2021 to 2026 in order to ensure the contemporary relevance of the evidence base. Older sources were used only when they provided essential methodological or theoretical foundations that remained influential in current educational research. This time frame was selected to align the article with recent international discussions on assessment for learning, feedback literacy, and evidence-based instructional improvement.

c. Data Sources and Literature Selection

The data in this study consisted of secondary data in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles, review articles, and relevant academic sources discussing learning evaluation and instructional quality. The literature was searched through reputable academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, ERIC, SpringerLink, Taylor & Francis Online, SAGE Journals, and Frontiers. Google Scholar was used only as a supplementary search tool to trace article metadata, DOI information, and citation links. The main keywords used in the search process included “learning evaluation results,” “assessment management,” “elementary education,” “teacher assessment literacy,” “formative assessment,” “learning mastery,” “remedial learning,” “enrichment learning,” “feedback literacy,” and “data-informed instruction.” Boolean operators were applied to refine the search, for example: “formative assessment” AND “elementary education,” “assessment literacy” AND “teacher,” and “evaluation results” AND “instructional decision-making.” These search terms were selected because they directly represented the key concepts of the study and were consistent with the article’s focus on evaluation result management in elementary school learning.

The inclusion criteria were established to ensure that the selected sources were relevant and academically credible. Articles were included if they were published between 2021 and 2026, written in English or Indonesian, published in peer-reviewed journals, and focused on assessment, evaluation, formative assessment, teacher assessment literacy, feedback, or instructional improvement. Studies were also included if they discussed primary or elementary education, teacher decision-making, remedial learning, enrichment activities, or data use in classroom assessment. Articles were excluded if they were not peer-reviewed, did not directly discuss assessment or evaluation, focused only on higher education without transferable conceptual relevance, or lacked sufficient methodological clarity. Duplicate records, inaccessible full-text articles, and opinion pieces without academic grounding were also removed. The selection process followed three main stages: title and abstract screening, full-text eligibility review, and final inclusion based on relevance to the research focus.

d. Methodological Framework of the Review

To make the review process transparent and replicable, the study used a structured methodological framework. The framework covered the review focus, databases, keywords, inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria, data extraction components, and synthesis procedure. This framework was necessary because the original manuscript used a general library research method, whereas an international journal article requires a clearer explanation of how the literature was identified, selected, and analyzed. The methodological framework is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Methodological Framework of the Literature Review

Methodological Component	Description
Review design	Qualitative integrative literature review
Main focus	Management of learning evaluation results to improve instructional quality in elementary schools
Databases	Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, ERIC, SpringerLink, Taylor & Francis Online, SAGE Journals, Frontiers, and supplementary Google Scholar search
Publication period	2021–2026, with older sources used only for foundational methodological support
Main keywords	Learning evaluation results, assessment management, elementary education, teacher assessment literacy, formative assessment, learning mastery, remedial learning, enrichment learning, feedback literacy, data-informed instruction
Inclusion criteria	Peer-reviewed articles, relevant to assessment or evaluation, related to elementary education or transferable to school-based assessment,

	methodologically clear, and accessible in full text
Exclusion criteria	Non-peer-reviewed sources, irrelevant topics, duplicate records, inaccessible full texts, opinion-based papers, and studies without clear methodological or conceptual contribution
Data extraction focus	Author, year, country/context, research design, assessment focus, key findings, relevance to evaluation result management, and instructional implications
Analysis technique	Qualitative thematic analysis through coding, categorization, theme development, interpretation, and synthesis

The table shows that the review was not conducted as a simple summary of previous studies, but as a structured synthesis of relevant academic evidence. Each selected article was examined not only for its findings, but also for its contribution to understanding how evaluation results can be managed and used in instructional decision-making. This approach allowed the study to identify recurring themes and conceptual relationships across previous research.

e. Research Instrument

The main instrument used in this study was a literature review protocol supported by a data extraction matrix. The review protocol was designed to guide the search, selection, and analysis of literature in a consistent manner. The data extraction matrix contained several indicators, including article identity, publication year, journal source, research context, methodological design, assessment-related focus, key findings, limitations, and relevance to the present study. The instrument was developed based on the conceptual needs of the study and methodological recommendations for transparent literature reviews. In addition, the extraction indicators were aligned with the main dimensions of the article, namely systematic score processing, learning mastery analysis, mapping of learning difficulties, and follow-up actions through remedial and enrichment programs. By using this matrix, the researcher could compare the selected studies systematically and reduce the possibility of subjective or inconsistent interpretation.

f. Validity and Reliability of the Review Procedure

The trustworthiness of the review was maintained through content validity, procedural transparency, source triangulation, and consistency checking. Content validity was addressed by ensuring that the selected literature directly corresponded to the research focus and inclusion criteria. Procedural transparency was maintained by documenting the search keywords, databases, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and stages of article selection. Source triangulation was applied by comparing findings from different journals, databases, countries, and methodological traditions. To improve analytical reliability, the coding process was conducted in several stages, beginning with open coding of relevant statements, followed by categorization, theme refinement, and final synthesis. The themes were then checked against the extracted data to ensure that they were grounded in the reviewed literature rather than imposed by the researcher's assumptions. This procedure was consistent with the logic of qualitative thematic analysis, which emphasizes careful familiarization, coding, theme development, review, and interpretation (Braun & Clarke, 2021; Byrne, 2022).

g. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure was conducted in five sequential stages. First, the researcher formulated the review focus by identifying the main problem in the original article, namely the limited use of learning evaluation results for improving instructional quality in elementary schools. Second, the researcher developed search keywords and selected academic databases that were relevant to education, assessment, and teacher professional practice. Third, articles were searched using combinations of keywords and Boolean operators, and the search results were screened based on title and abstract relevance. Fourth, the full texts of potentially relevant articles were reviewed using the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Fifth, the final selected articles were entered into the data extraction matrix and classified according to their relevance to the four main themes of the study. These themes included systematic processing of evaluation scores, analysis of learning mastery, mapping of students' learning difficulties, and utilization of evaluation results for remedial and enrichment learning. All selected documents were stored and organized digitally to support traceability and facilitate repeated checking during the analysis stage.

h. Data Analysis Technique

The data were analyzed using qualitative thematic analysis. The analysis began with repeated reading of the selected articles to understand the main arguments, concepts, findings, and limitations of each source.

After familiarization, relevant statements related to evaluation result management were coded manually. The initial codes were then grouped into broader categories, such as score processing, learning mastery analysis, diagnostic use of assessment, teacher assessment literacy, feedback practice, remedial learning, enrichment learning, and instructional reflection. These categories were compared across studies to identify similarities, differences, and conceptual patterns. The categories were then synthesized into four major themes that reflected the structure of the findings: systematic management of evaluation data, interpretation of learning mastery, mapping of learning difficulties, and instructional follow-up based on evaluation evidence. The final interpretation was conducted by connecting these themes with the concept of assessment for learning and data-informed instructional decision-making. This analytical procedure enabled the study to move beyond descriptive summary and produce a more coherent conceptual explanation of how evaluation results can support instructional quality improvement.

i. Ethical Considerations

Because this study was based entirely on published literature, it did not involve human participants, classroom intervention, or the collection of personal data. Therefore, formal participant consent was not required. Nevertheless, the study followed academic ethical principles by ensuring that all cited works were properly acknowledged, paraphrased responsibly, and presented without misrepresentation. The researcher avoided selective citation by including sources that were directly relevant to the topic and by considering both contributions and limitations of previous studies. Data from previous studies were used only for scholarly analysis and synthesis. The study also maintained academic integrity by avoiding plagiarism, preserving the original meaning of cited sources, and ensuring that all references were listed consistently using APA 7th edition style.

j. Methodological Limitation

As an integrative literature review, this study did not generate primary empirical data from teachers, students, or schools. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as conceptual and literature-based rather than as direct evidence of classroom implementation. The review provides a structured synthesis of how evaluation results can be managed and used to improve instructional quality, but it cannot measure the statistical effect of evaluation management on student achievement. Future studies may extend this work by conducting classroom-based research, surveys of elementary school teachers, or mixed-method studies that examine how teachers actually process, interpret, and use evaluation results in daily instruction. Despite this limitation, the integrative review design remains appropriate for the purpose of this article because it provides a conceptual foundation for improving evaluation management practices in elementary education.

C. Result and Discussion

a. Result

The results of this literature-based analysis indicate that the management of learning evaluation results in elementary schools can be organized into four main techniques: systematic score processing, learning mastery analysis, mapping of students' learning difficulties, and utilization of evaluation results for instructional follow-up. These four techniques are not separate activities, but interconnected stages in an assessment-based instructional cycle. Evaluation results become meaningful when teachers are able to transform numerical scores into diagnostic information and then use that information to improve classroom learning. In this context, evaluation is not limited to determining students' achievement status, but also serves as a basis for identifying learning barriers, planning remedial instruction, designing enrichment activities, and reflecting on the effectiveness of teaching practices. Therefore, the findings show that the quality of learning can be strengthened when evaluation results are managed systematically and used as evidence for instructional decision-making.

1. Systematic Processing of Evaluation Scores

The first technique identified in the study is the systematic processing of evaluation scores. This stage is the initial step in managing learning evaluation results because raw scores do not automatically provide meaningful information for improving instruction. In elementary school practice, teachers need to organize students' scores into a clear and structured record that shows individual achievement, minimum mastery criteria, mastery status, and possible follow-up actions. Through this process, teachers can obtain an initial description of students' learning achievement, including which students have met the expected standard and

which students still require additional support. Systematic score processing also allows teachers to observe the general condition of the class, such as the distribution of students' achievement and the proportion of students who have or have not achieved mastery. Thus, score processing should not be understood merely as an administrative task, but as an important diagnostic stage that supports more accurate instructional planning.

The following table presents a refined example of score recapitulation based on the original data in the article. The table was improved by adding the recommended follow-up column so that the evaluation data are directly connected to instructional decisions.

Table 1. Recapitulation of Students' Learning Evaluation Results

No.	Student	Evaluation Score	Minimum Mastery Criterion	Mastery Status	Recommended Follow-Up
1	Student A	85	75	Mastered	Enrichment activity
2	Student B	70	75	Not mastered	Remedial instruction
3	Student C	90	75	Mastered	Enrichment activity

Table 1 shows that score recapitulation helps teachers classify students based on their learning mastery. Student A and Student C achieved scores above the minimum mastery criterion, while Student B did not reach the expected standard. This classification provides a practical basis for determining different forms of learning support. Students who have achieved mastery can be directed to enrichment activities, while students who have not achieved mastery need remedial instruction. The table also shows that evaluation data become more useful when the score is not presented as a final result only, but is connected to a clear follow-up decision. In this way, the processing of evaluation scores becomes part of instructional improvement rather than merely a record of student achievement.

2. Learning Mastery Analysis

The second technique is learning mastery analysis. After students' scores are processed, teachers need to interpret whether each student has achieved the intended learning competency. In the original data, the minimum mastery criterion was set at 75, and this criterion was used as the benchmark for determining students' mastery status. This analysis is important because it helps teachers distinguish between students who have achieved the expected competency and students who still require instructional support. Learning mastery analysis also allows teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of the learning process at the class level. If only a small number of students fail to achieve mastery, the teacher may provide individual remedial assistance. However, if many students fail to achieve mastery, the teacher needs to reflect more broadly on the teaching strategy, learning materials, instructional media, classroom interaction, and the suitability of the assessment instrument.

Based on Table 1, two students were categorized as having mastered the learning material, while one student was categorized as not yet having mastered it. Although the example in the original article is limited, it illustrates the practical function of mastery analysis in classroom evaluation. This analysis enables teachers to make more targeted decisions rather than applying the same treatment to all students. Students who have achieved mastery do not need to repeat the same basic material, but should be given enrichment tasks that extend their understanding. Conversely, students who have not achieved mastery require remedial instruction that is simpler, more guided, and more closely aligned with the learning indicators that have not been achieved. Therefore, mastery analysis serves as an important bridge between score processing and differentiated instructional follow-up.

3. Mapping of Students' Learning Difficulties

The third technique is the mapping of students' learning difficulties. This technique deepens the analysis by identifying which learning indicators, materials, or question items are not yet mastered by students. In this stage, teachers do not only ask whether students have passed or failed, but also examine why students have difficulty and which parts of the learning material require further attention. A student may obtain a low score not because the entire topic is not understood, but because the student struggles with a particular concept, procedure, or type of question. Therefore, mapping students' learning difficulties provides more specific diagnostic information than score recapitulation alone. This diagnostic function is essential because remedial instruction should be designed based on the actual source of students' learning problems.

The mapping of learning difficulties also provides feedback for teachers. If many students fail on the

same indicator or type of question, the teacher needs to review whether the concept was explained clearly, whether the learning activity provided sufficient practice, and whether the assessment item was appropriate for students' developmental level. This process allows evaluation results to function not only as feedback for students, but also as feedback for teaching improvement. Teachers can use the mapping results to revise lesson plans, adjust instructional strategies, improve learning media, and provide additional explanation for difficult concepts. Thus, mapping students' learning difficulties strengthens the diagnostic value of evaluation and helps ensure that follow-up actions are relevant to students' actual needs.

4. Utilization of Evaluation Results for Instructional Follow-Up

The fourth technique is the utilization of evaluation results for instructional follow-up. The findings indicate that evaluation management becomes meaningful only when teachers use the processed and interpreted data to improve learning. In the context of elementary education, follow-up actions mainly include remedial instruction for students who have not achieved mastery and enrichment activities for students who have already met the expected standard. Remedial instruction should not be treated simply as repetition of the same lesson, but as a targeted learning activity designed to address specific learning difficulties. It may include re-explanation of difficult concepts, guided practice, individual assistance, peer tutoring, contextual examples, or the use of more concrete learning media. The purpose of remedial instruction is to help students achieve the learning competencies that were not yet mastered.

Enrichment activities are equally important for students who have achieved mastery. These activities provide opportunities for students to deepen, broaden, and apply their understanding in more challenging learning situations. Enrichment may include higher-order thinking tasks, contextual problem-solving, independent projects, advanced exercises, or creative assignments related to the learning material. Through enrichment, students who have mastered basic competencies remain intellectually engaged and are not limited to routine repetition. Therefore, the utilization of evaluation results supports differentiated instruction because it allows teachers to respond to different levels of student readiness. This finding confirms that evaluation result management contributes to learning quality when it is followed by appropriate instructional action.

To synthesize the four techniques identified in the study, Table 2 presents the relationship between evaluation result management techniques, their main purposes, the instructional information produced, and the follow-up decisions that can be taken by teachers.

Table 2. Synthesis of Evaluation Result Management Techniques and Their Instructional Functions

Evaluation Management Technique	Main Purpose	Instructional Information Produced	Follow-Up Decision
Systematic score processing	Organizing students' evaluation scores into structured records	Individual scores, class achievement profile, and mastery status	Identifying students who need further analysis
Learning mastery analysis	Determining whether students have achieved the expected competency	Number of mastered and non-mastered students	Designing remedial and enrichment programs
Mapping students' learning difficulties	Identifying indicators or materials that are not yet mastered	Specific learning barriers and problematic learning indicators	Revising instruction and providing targeted support
Utilization of evaluation results	Using evaluation findings to improve learning	Evidence for instructional planning and classroom reflection	Implementing remedial instruction, enrichment activities, and lesson improvement

Table 2 shows that each technique in evaluation result management has a different but complementary instructional function. Systematic score processing provides initial information about students' achievement, while learning mastery analysis helps teachers interpret whether the expected learning competencies have been achieved. Mapping students' learning difficulties produces more specific diagnostic information about the concepts, indicators, or materials that require further attention. The utilization of evaluation results then transforms this information into concrete instructional decisions, including remedial instruction, enrichment activities, and improvement of lesson planning. This synthesis confirms that evaluation result management should be understood as a continuous instructional process rather than a simple administrative procedure. The table also clarifies that the quality of learning can be improved when teachers are able to connect assessment data with meaningful pedagogical action.

5. Contribution of Evaluation Result Management to Learning Quality

The findings further indicate that systematic management of evaluation results contributes to the improvement of learning quality in elementary schools. This contribution can be seen from several instructional functions. First, teachers become more capable of identifying students' strengths and weaknesses based on evidence rather than assumption. Second, instructional decisions become more objective because they are based on processed and interpreted evaluation data. Third, remedial and enrichment programs can be designed more accurately according to students' actual learning needs. Fourth, teachers can use evaluation results to reflect on the effectiveness of teaching strategies, learning materials, learning media, and assessment instruments. These functions show that evaluation result management supports both student learning improvement and teacher professional reflection.

Overall, the results demonstrate that the management of learning evaluation results should be positioned as a continuous instructional cycle. The cycle begins with systematic score processing, continues with learning mastery analysis and mapping of students' learning difficulties, and leads to instructional follow-up through remedial instruction, enrichment activities, and lesson improvement. However, the cycle should not end after follow-up actions are implemented. Teachers need to re-evaluate students' progress to determine whether the remedial or enrichment activities have been effective. In this sense, evaluation result management is closely related to continuous improvement in classroom learning. When applied consistently, this process can help elementary school teachers improve instructional quality in a more systematic, responsive, and evidence-based manner.

b. Discussion

The finding that systematic score processing is the first stage in managing learning evaluation results indicates that assessment data become pedagogically meaningful only when they are organized, interpreted, and connected to instructional decisions. This finding supports the broader theory of assessment for learning, which views assessment not as the end of instruction but as evidence that helps teachers understand where students are, where they need to go, and what support is required to move them forward. In the context of elementary education, raw scores are insufficient because they only show numerical achievement without explaining students' learning position or instructional needs. This study therefore extends previous discussions on teacher assessment literacy by emphasizing the technical dimension of score management as the foundation of classroom decision-making. Pastore (2023) and Yan and Pastore (2022a) similarly argued that teachers need more than conceptual knowledge of assessment; they need practical competence to transform assessment evidence into meaningful instructional responses. However, the present study sharpens this argument by showing that the process begins with the simple but crucial act of organizing scores into a usable instructional record. This means that score processing should no longer be treated as a clerical task, but as an initial diagnostic practice that determines the quality of subsequent teaching decisions.

The finding on learning mastery analysis demonstrates that evaluation results are most useful when they help teachers distinguish between students who have achieved the expected competency and those who still require instructional support. Conceptually, this finding aligns with formative assessment theory because mastery analysis enables teachers to interpret evidence of learning and adjust instruction before learning failure becomes permanent. In elementary schools, this function is particularly important because students' early academic difficulties may influence later achievement, motivation, and learning confidence. Yan and Pastore (2022b) emphasized that formative assessment requires teachers to use strategies that clarify learning goals and monitor students' progress, while Shafii and Berger (2025) found that formative assessment practices become weak when teachers lack the capacity to interpret assessment evidence effectively. The present study supports these findings but adds a more operational perspective by positioning mastery analysis as the bridge between score processing and differentiated follow-up. Nevertheless, mastery analysis also has an implicit limitation because the use of a single minimum mastery criterion may oversimplify students' learning profiles if it is not accompanied by deeper diagnostic interpretation. Therefore, the value of mastery analysis depends not only on whether students pass or fail, but on how teachers use mastery information to redesign instruction in a responsive and equitable way.

The finding that mapping students' learning difficulties is necessary after mastery analysis shows that effective evaluation management must move beyond classification toward diagnosis. This finding is theoretically consistent with data-informed instruction, which requires teachers to identify patterns in learning evidence, examine possible causes of difficulty, and make instructional adjustments based on those patterns.

Pastore (2025) and Sandoval-Ríos et al. (2025) showed that teacher data literacy involves the ability to formulate instructional questions, collect and interpret evidence, and make decisions that improve teaching practice. The present study extends this literature by applying the logic of data literacy to elementary classroom evaluation routines, especially through the mapping of difficult indicators, concepts, or question items. This diagnostic process also strengthens feedback practice because feedback becomes more meaningful when it is based on specific learning barriers rather than general comments about performance. Carless and Winstone (2023) and Zhan et al. (2026) emphasized that feedback literacy requires teachers and students to understand, use, and act upon feedback, but this study adds that feedback quality depends partly on how accurately teachers identify the source of students' difficulty. Thus, mapping learning difficulties contributes to the novelty of this article by positioning diagnostic analysis as the missing link between evaluation data and actionable feedback.

The finding on the utilization of evaluation results for remedial and enrichment activities confirms that assessment only improves learning when it produces concrete instructional action. This finding supports formative assessment literature, which argues that assessment evidence must be used to adapt teaching, support struggling students, and extend learning for students who have achieved mastery. In this study, remedial instruction is interpreted not as mechanical repetition of the same content, but as targeted support based on identified learning difficulties. At the same time, enrichment is understood as an instructional response for students who have mastered basic competencies and need more challenging learning opportunities. This interpretation is consistent with differentiated instruction, where students' readiness, needs, and learning profiles become the basis for instructional variation. Studies on formative assessment implementation have shown that assessment practices are more effective when they are embedded in structured instructional processes rather than applied as isolated classroom activities (Aust et al., 2026; Lei, 2025). The present study contributes to this discussion by showing that remedial and enrichment decisions should be directly connected to score processing, mastery analysis, and difficulty mapping. Therefore, the practical implication is clear: teachers need a coherent evaluation management cycle so that follow-up activities are not based on routine obligation, but on evidence-based instructional reasoning.

Overall, the findings suggest that evaluation result management should be conceptualized as a continuous instructional cycle rather than a fragmented administrative procedure. This cycle begins with systematic score processing, continues through mastery analysis and diagnostic mapping, and leads to remedial instruction, enrichment activities, lesson improvement, and re-evaluation. Theoretically, this study contributes to the global literature by integrating assessment literacy, formative assessment, feedback literacy, and data-informed instruction into one operational framework for elementary education. Previous studies have tended to discuss these constructs separately, focusing on teachers' assessment competence, feedback practices, or data literacy as independent domains (Fu & Koh, 2026; Pastore, 2023; Sandoval-Ríos et al., 2025; Shafii & Berger, 2025). By contrast, this study argues that these domains are connected through the practical management of evaluation results in classroom learning. The main novelty lies in the article's effort to sharpen the technical pathway through which evaluation results move from scores to instructional improvement. However, because this study is based on literature analysis rather than direct classroom observation, its conceptual model still needs empirical validation in different elementary school contexts. Even so, the discussion positions evaluation result management as a strategic mechanism for improving instructional quality, teacher reflection, and student-centered learning support in elementary education.

D. Conclusion

This study concludes that the management of learning evaluation results is a strategic instructional process that plays an essential role in improving the quality of elementary school learning. The findings show that effective evaluation result management consists of four interconnected techniques: systematic score processing, learning mastery analysis, mapping of students' learning difficulties, and utilization of evaluation results for instructional follow-up. These techniques demonstrate that evaluation should not be treated merely as a mechanism for recording scores or determining students' final achievement status. Instead, evaluation results must be interpreted as learning evidence that enables teachers to identify students' strengths and weaknesses, diagnose specific learning barriers, design remedial instruction, provide enrichment activities, and reflect on the effectiveness of teaching practices. Therefore, the quality of learning can be strengthened when teachers are able to transform evaluation data into meaningful, responsive, and evidence-based instructional decisions.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the literature on assessment literacy, formative assessment, feedback literacy, and data-informed instruction by positioning evaluation result management as a practical bridge between assessment evidence and instructional improvement. The study also offers a conceptual perspective that connects score processing, mastery interpretation, difficulty diagnosis, and follow-up action into a continuous cycle of learning quality improvement. Practically, the findings imply that elementary school teachers need stronger competence in managing evaluation results so that remedial and enrichment programs are not implemented as routine activities, but as targeted responses to students' actual learning needs. Although this study is limited to a literature-based analysis and does not provide direct empirical classroom data, it offers a relevant foundation for future research involving teacher surveys, classroom observation, or mixed-method studies. Future studies are encouraged to examine how teachers implement evaluation result management in real classroom settings and how this practice affects student achievement, engagement, and learning independence.

E. Author Contributions Statement

Pahda contributed to the conceptualization of the study, formulation of the research focus, and overall coordination of manuscript development. Keterina Agmayanti contributed to the literature search, selection of relevant sources, and organization of references related to learning evaluation and instructional quality. Istiananta Hanggule contributed to the development of the research method, particularly the design of the integrative literature review procedure and data extraction framework. Melania Yabar contributed to the analysis of systematic score processing and learning mastery analysis in elementary school evaluation practices. Narcisus Efendi Nalti contributed to the analysis of students' learning difficulty mapping and the interpretation of diagnostic assessment findings. Nur Hidayatul Nahda contributed to the discussion of instructional follow-up, including remedial instruction, enrichment activities, and lesson improvement. Nur Fadillah contributed to strengthening the theoretical framework, especially the integration of formative assessment, assessment literacy, and data-informed instruction. Nurul Qalbi contributed to the drafting and refinement of the results and discussion sections. Nur Adhayani contributed to manuscript editing, language refinement, citation checking, and alignment with academic writing standards. Yulinar Tiara Sari contributed to final manuscript review, formatting, reference verification, and approval of the final version. All authors reviewed, revised, and approved the final manuscript and agreed to be accountable for the accuracy and integrity of the work.

F. Reference

- Aust, L., Linker, J.-C., Eichholz, L., Schiffer, J., Nührenböcker, M., Selter, C., & Souvignier, E. (2026). Implementing formative assessment into school practice: A matter of structuring the intervention? *Journal of Teacher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871251350680>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in reflexive thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity*, 56, 1391–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2023). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(1), 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>
- Çibukçiu, B., & Koliqi, D. (2026). Measuring teacher formative assessment literacy in primary education: A multidimensional study using the T-FALS scale. *Frontiers in Education*, 11, Article 1787953. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1787953>
- Fu, R., & Koh, K. (2026). Developing and validating teacher formative assessment literacy questionnaire in the high-stakes examination culture: A case of China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17, Article 1771941. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1771941>
- Istencioglu, T., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Yang, L. (2026). Teacher feedback literacy as an emerging field: A scoping review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2026.2631533>
- Lau, A. M. S., Lee, I., & Li, M. S. (2023). Impact of formative assessment on student learning engagement in elementary classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 124, Article 104070. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104070>
- Lei, W., & Lei, Z. (2026). Formative assessment literacy: A systematic review. *Language Testing in Asia*, 16, Article 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00418-0>

- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, Article n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Pastore, S. (2023). Teacher assessment literacy: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1217167. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1217167>
- Pastore, S. (2026). Teacher data literacy: A scoping review (2020–2024). *Cogent Education*, 13(1), Article 2592397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2592397>
- Sandoval-Ríos, F., Gajardo-Poblete, C., & López-Núñez, J. A. (2025). Role of data literacy training for decision-making in teaching practice: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1485821. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1485821>
- Shafii, R. A., & Berger, J.-L. (2025). Teacher assessment literacy, formative assessment practices, and their perceived efficacy in Tanzania: A scoping review. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 86, Article 101496. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2025.101496>
- Yan, Z., & Pastore, S. (2022a). Are teachers literate in formative assessment? The development and validation of the Teacher Formative Assessment Literacy Scale. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 74, Article 101183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101183>
- Yan, Z., & Pastore, S. (2022b). Assessing teachers' strategies in formative assessment: The Teacher Formative Assessment Practice Scale. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 40(5), 592–604. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07342829221075121>
- Zhan, Y., Yan, Z., Zeng, Y., Luo, W., & Wan, Z. H. (2026). A systematic review of feedback literacy scales: Development and validation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 88, Article 101578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2026.101578>