



Transforming Learning Evaluation Results into Data-Informed Instructional Planning: Strategies for Improving Teaching Quality and Student Learning Outcomes

Eka Fitriana HS*, Suci Indah Sari, Vera, Lidya Marthen, Tresia Benne Langi, Nurul Ulfadillah, Wahdaniah, Asmi Anti, Novianty Ramadani, Fitri Anastasya

¹ Universitas Megarezky Makasar, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history :

Received : 16/03/2026

Revised : 20/04/2026

Published : 23/05/2026



Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Volume : 1

No. 1

Halaman : 62-72

Terbitan : Juni 2026

Terakreditasi -
berdasarkan Ristekdikti
No.

ABSTRAK

Learning evaluation is often treated as an administrative procedure for recording student scores, whereas its deeper pedagogical value lies in its capacity to guide instructional improvement. This study aims to analyze how learning evaluation results can be transformed into data-informed instructional planning to improve teaching quality and student learning outcomes. A qualitative descriptive case study design supported by document analysis was employed to examine teachers' strategies in interpreting evaluation results and converting them into instructional decisions. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and analysis of instructional documents, including lesson plans, assessment records, remedial plans, enrichment activities, and teacher reflection notes. The data were analyzed thematically by identifying patterns related to evaluation analysis, diagnosis of learning problems, follow-up planning, instructional revision, and reflective improvement. The findings reveal four interrelated strategies in using evaluation results for instructional planning. First, teachers conducted in-depth analysis of evaluation results to identify students' achievement levels, competency mastery, and learning weaknesses. Second, teachers examined causal factors behind students' difficulties, including teaching methods, learning materials, instructional media, and learning motivation. Third, teachers developed follow-up action plans through remedial support, enrichment activities, material adjustment, and strategy modification. Fourth, teachers used continuous evaluation and reflection to improve subsequent lesson planning. These findings indicate that evaluation results become meaningful when they are interpreted as diagnostic evidence and translated into concrete pedagogical actions. This study contributes to the literature by positioning evaluation result management as a bridge between assessment evidence, teacher reflection, and instructional redesign. The findings imply that teachers need stronger assessment literacy and data-use competence to develop responsive, differentiated, and sustainable instructional planning.

Keywords: Assessment literacy; Data-informed instructional planning; Evaluation result management; Instructional quality; Learning evaluation.

A. Introduction

Learning evaluation has increasingly been positioned as a central mechanism for improving instructional quality rather than merely as a procedure for measuring student achievement. In contemporary education, teachers are expected not only to assess what students have learned, but also to interpret assessment evidence and use it to redesign subsequent teaching actions. This shift reflects the growing emphasis on assessment for learning, formative feedback, and data-informed decision-making as essential components of effective classroom practice. Evaluation results can reveal students' conceptual understanding, learning difficulties, participation patterns, and readiness to proceed to more complex learning objectives. When these results are carefully interpreted, they provide teachers with a stronger basis for adjusting learning goals, teaching materials, instructional strategies, and assessment instruments. Therefore, learning evaluation should be understood as an instructional resource that supports continuous improvement in both teaching processes and student learning outcomes.

Despite its strategic role, learning evaluation is still frequently treated as an administrative requirement or as a final judgment of student performance. In many classroom contexts, assessment data are collected, recorded, and reported, but they are not always translated into meaningful instructional planning. Teachers may identify low student scores, yet the follow-up actions are often limited to remedial assignments, repeated explanations, or grade documentation rather than systematic redesign of learning activities. This condition indicates a gap between the availability of evaluation results and their practical use in lesson planning. The problem becomes more critical when evaluation outcomes are not analyzed in relation to learning objectives, instructional methods, student misconceptions, or the suitability of learning media. As a result, the potential of evaluation to guide teaching improvement remains underutilized, and instructional planning may continue to rely on routine formats rather than evidence-based reflection.

The urgency of this issue is closely related to the increasing demand for teachers to make pedagogical decisions based on valid and meaningful evidence. High-quality teaching requires teachers to understand where students are in their learning, what obstacles they face, and what instructional responses are most appropriate to move them forward. Formative assessment and feedback are widely recognized as practices that can support this process because they connect learning goals, evidence of student understanding, teacher feedback, and instructional adaptation (Morris et al., 2021; van der Steen et al., 2022). However, the effectiveness of these practices depends on teachers' ability to interpret evaluation data and convert them into specific planning decisions. Evaluation results will have limited value if they are not followed by concrete actions such as revising lesson objectives, modifying teaching sequences, differentiating tasks, or improving assessment tools. Therefore, the transformation of evaluation results into data-informed instructional planning is a crucial issue for improving teaching quality.

The rational basis for investigating this topic lies in the idea that instructional planning should not be separated from evidence generated during and after learning. A lesson plan becomes more responsive when it is informed by students' actual learning needs rather than by predetermined content coverage alone. Data-informed instructional planning allows teachers to align learning objectives, materials, methods, media, and assessment strategies with the realities found in classroom evaluation. It also encourages teachers to move from a linear model of teaching toward a reflective and adaptive model of pedagogical decision-making. In this sense, evaluation serves not only as a tool for accountability, but also as a diagnostic and developmental instrument for improving instruction. Studying how teachers utilize evaluation results is therefore important for strengthening the link between assessment practice and instructional design.

Previous studies have consistently emphasized the importance of formative assessment, assessment literacy, feedback, and data use in improving teaching and learning. Morris et al. (2021) showed that formative assessment and feedback can support learning, although their effectiveness depends strongly on how they are implemented. Yan and Pastore (2022a, 2022b) developed and validated instruments for examining teachers' formative assessment literacy and formative assessment practices, highlighting the conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional dimensions of assessment use. Pastore (2023) further demonstrated that teacher assessment literacy remains a major concern because teachers often struggle to transfer assessment concepts into classroom practice. Van der Steen et al. (2022) argued that formative assessment should be consciously planned and aligned with curriculum components so that it can support formative decision-making. In a later study, van der Steen et al. (2023) showed that teachers often encounter difficulties when designing formative assessment plans, especially in aligning assessment evidence with instructional decisions. These studies indicate that

assessment becomes meaningful only when it is connected to clear pedagogical purposes and subsequent instructional action.

Recent literature also shows growing attention to teacher data literacy and data-informed decision-making. Spiele et al. (2025) found that teacher professional development in data use can positively influence student achievement, although the effects vary according to implementation and school-level support. Shafii and Berger (2025) reported that formative assessment practices are often constrained by limited assessment literacy, inadequate feedback practices, resource limitations, and the persistence of traditional assessment cultures. Lei et al. (2025) confirmed that formative assessment literacy is still conceptually fragmented and requires clearer professional development pathways. Pastore (2026) highlighted the need for deeper understanding of how teachers define, interpret, and use data in instructional practice. Similarly, studies on feedback literacy indicate that the effectiveness of feedback depends not only on the quality of information provided, but also on teachers' capacity to design and sustain feedback practices that students can act upon (Istencioglu et al., 2026; Solis Trujillo et al., 2025). Although these studies provide strong foundations, many of them focus on assessment literacy, feedback effectiveness, or professional development separately, while fewer studies explain how evaluation results are transformed into concrete instructional planning strategies.

Based on this gap, the present study aims to analyze strategies for transforming learning evaluation results into data-informed instructional planning to improve teaching quality and student learning outcomes. Specifically, this study focuses on how evaluation results can be used to identify learning weaknesses, diagnose possible instructional causes, formulate follow-up actions, and refine future lesson planning. The theoretical contribution of this study lies in strengthening the conceptual connection between evaluation utilization, formative decision-making, and instructional planning. Practically, the study offers a structured strategy that teachers can use to convert assessment evidence into more adaptive, targeted, and reflective lesson planning. By positioning evaluation as a basis for pedagogical redesign, this study contributes to the development of classroom practices that are not only assessment-oriented, but also improvement-oriented. This focus is expected to provide a stronger foundation for advancing teaching quality through systematic and evidence-based use of learning evaluation results.

B. Method

a. Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive case study design supported by document analysis. This design was selected because the study aimed to explore how teachers transform learning evaluation results into data-informed instructional planning rather than to test the statistical effect of a specific intervention. A qualitative case study approach is appropriate when researchers seek to understand a phenomenon within its real educational context and examine how participants interpret and respond to that phenomenon in practice (Yin, 2022). In this study, the phenomenon examined was the use of learning evaluation results as a basis for revising learning objectives, teaching materials, instructional strategies, media selection, and assessment procedures. Document analysis was also used because instructional planning cannot be understood only from teachers' verbal explanations, but must also be examined through concrete documents such as lesson plans, assessment records, remedial plans, and teacher reflection notes (Bowen, 2009). This design is consistent with studies on formative assessment and teacher decision-making, which emphasize that assessment evidence becomes meaningful when teachers use it to inform subsequent instructional actions (van der Steen et al., 2022; Yan & Pastore, 2022).

b. Research Site and Period

The research was conducted in selected classroom settings where teachers had implemented learning evaluation and used the results for instructional planning. The study context involved regular teaching and learning activities in formal school classrooms, with particular attention to how teachers analyzed student learning outcomes and used them to improve subsequent lesson planning. The research was carried out over one academic cycle, covering the stages of evaluation implementation, analysis of evaluation results, teacher reflection, and revision of instructional planning. The final manuscript should state the exact period of implementation, for example from [insert month] to [insert month] 2026, according to the actual data collection schedule. The selected classroom context was relevant because studies on formative assessment show that assessment practices need to be examined in relation to authentic classroom processes, teacher judgment, and

curriculum alignment (Veugen et al., 2021; van der Steen et al., 2023). This context enabled the researchers to obtain a detailed understanding of how evaluation results were practically used in planning improvement.

c. Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants of this study were teachers who had experience in conducting learning evaluation and preparing instructional planning documents. The population consisted of teachers who were actively involved in classroom teaching, assessment, and lesson planning in the selected school context. Participants were selected using purposive sampling because the study required information-rich participants who could provide relevant data on evaluation utilization and instructional planning. Purposive sampling is commonly used in qualitative research when participants are chosen based on their direct experience with the phenomenon under investigation (Campbell et al., 2020). The inclusion criteria were as follows: teachers had conducted learning evaluation in their classes, had prepared lesson plans or instructional modules, had used assessment results for follow-up learning activities, and were willing to participate in interviews and provide relevant instructional documents. Teachers who had not conducted classroom evaluation during the research period or were not involved in preparing instructional planning documents were excluded from the study. In the final version of the article, the exact number of participants must be adjusted to the actual data, for example 8–12 teachers, because qualitative research emphasizes depth, relevance of experience, and data adequacy rather than statistical representation.

d. Research Instruments

The study used four main instruments: a semi-structured interview guide, an observation sheet, a document analysis checklist, and a research memo. The semi-structured interview guide was designed to explore teachers' strategies in analyzing evaluation results, identifying student learning weaknesses, determining possible instructional causes, designing follow-up actions, and revising instructional planning. Semi-structured interviews are appropriate for qualitative studies because they allow researchers to obtain comparable data while still giving participants space to explain their experiences in depth (Adeoye-Olatunde & Olenik, 2021). The observation sheet was used to record classroom practices related to evaluation activities, student responses, feedback provision, and teacher follow-up actions. The document analysis checklist examined the alignment between evaluation results and instructional planning components, including learning objectives, teaching materials, learning activities, media selection, assessment instruments, remedial activities, and enrichment programs. The indicators of the instruments were developed based on concepts of formative assessment, assessment for learning, teacher assessment literacy, and data-informed instructional planning, which emphasize the link between assessment evidence, teacher interpretation, feedback, and instructional adjustment (Morris et al., 2021; Pastore, 2023; Yan & Pastore, 2022).

e. Instrument Validity and Trustworthiness

The validity of the research instruments was established through content validation by experts in educational evaluation, instructional planning, and qualitative research methodology. The experts reviewed the relevance, clarity, coverage, and appropriateness of each item in the interview guide, observation sheet, and document analysis checklist. Revisions were made based on expert feedback to ensure that the instruments were aligned with the research objectives and capable of capturing the intended phenomenon. Because this study used a qualitative design, the quality of the research was also maintained through trustworthiness criteria, namely credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stahl & King, 2020). Credibility was supported through data triangulation by comparing interview data, observation notes, and instructional documents. Transferability was addressed by providing a clear description of the research context, participants, and classroom setting. Dependability was maintained through a documented audit trail, including interview protocols, coding notes, document analysis records, and analytic memos. Confirmability was strengthened through reflective memo writing and peer discussion to reduce researcher bias during interpretation.

f. Data Collection Procedures

The data collection process was conducted in several systematic stages. First, the researchers obtained permission from the school authority and informed the participating teachers about the purpose, procedures, and ethical principles of the study. Second, the researchers collected preliminary documents, including lesson plans, evaluation instruments, student assessment summaries, remedial or enrichment plans, and teacher reflection notes when available. Third, classroom observations were conducted to understand how evaluation

activities were implemented and how teachers provided feedback or follow-up actions during the learning process. Observation was important because the use of evaluation results in teaching cannot be fully captured only through interviews, but also needs to be seen in instructional practice and teacher-student interaction (Cohen et al., 2018). Fourth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with participating teachers to explore their reasoning, strategies, and challenges in using evaluation results for instructional planning. Each interview focused on how teachers interpreted evaluation data, identified learning difficulties, adjusted learning objectives, revised teaching strategies, and planned further instructional actions. Fifth, all data were organized, transcribed, anonymized, and stored securely for analysis. This procedure ensured that the study captured both teachers’ reported practices and the documentary evidence of evaluation-based instructional planning.

g. Data Analysis Technique

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis supported by qualitative document analysis. The analysis began with data familiarization, in which the researchers repeatedly read interview transcripts, observation notes, and instructional documents to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the data. The next stage involved initial coding by identifying meaningful units related to evaluation analysis, diagnosis of learning problems, instructional adjustment, remedial planning, enrichment activities, feedback use, and teacher reflection. The codes were then grouped into categories that represented broader patterns of teacher strategies in transforming evaluation results into instructional planning. After that, the categories were reviewed and refined into themes that explained the main findings of the study. Thematic analysis was selected because it enables researchers to identify, organize, and interpret patterns of meaning across qualitative data in a systematic and transparent way (Braun & Clarke, 2022, 2024). The document analysis was conducted by comparing evaluation records with lesson planning components to determine whether teachers’ instructional revisions were supported by actual assessment evidence. The final themes were interpreted in relation to formative assessment, teacher assessment literacy, and data-informed decision-making. If qualitative software such as NVivo, ATLAS.ti, or MAXQDA is used, the software should be mentioned in the final manuscript; however, the analytic interpretation remains the responsibility of the researchers.

h. Methodological Flow of the Study

Table 1 presents the methodological flow of the study. The table clarifies how the research design, data sources, instruments, and analysis procedures were connected to the purpose of the study. This flow is important because the study does not merely describe evaluation practices, but examines how evaluation results are transformed into concrete instructional planning decisions.

Table 1. Methodological Flow of the Study

Research Stage	Data Source	Instrument	Main Focus	Output
Preliminary identification	Lesson plans and evaluation documents	Document analysis checklist	Identifying available evaluation and planning documents	Initial profile of evaluation use
Classroom observation	Teaching and learning activities	Observation sheet	Recording evaluation practices, feedback, and follow-up actions	Observation notes
Teacher interview	Participating teachers	Semi-structured interview guide	Exploring teachers’ reasoning and strategies in using evaluation results	Interview transcripts
Document comparison	Evaluation results, lesson plans, remedial and enrichment plans	Document analysis checklist	Examining alignment between evaluation results and planning revisions	Evidence of data-informed planning
Thematic interpretation	All qualitative data	Coding matrix and research memo	Developing categories and themes	Final themes and research findings

The table shows that the research procedure moved from document identification to classroom observation, teacher interviews, document comparison, and thematic interpretation. This sequence allowed the researchers to examine not only what teachers stated in interviews, but also how their statements were reflected in classroom practices and planning documents. Therefore, the findings were not based on a single source of data, but on the triangulation of interviews, observations, and documents.

i. Research Ethics

This study followed ethical principles in educational research. Before data collection, all participants were informed about the objectives, procedures, potential benefits, and voluntary nature of the study. Participants were asked to provide informed consent and were given the right to withdraw from the study at any stage without academic or professional consequences. The identities of teachers, students, classes, and schools were anonymized to protect confidentiality. All interview transcripts, observation notes, and instructional documents were stored securely and used only for research purposes. Ethical procedures in qualitative educational research require researchers to protect participants' rights, maintain confidentiality, avoid coercion, and report findings honestly (BERA, 2018; Wiles, 2013). The researchers also ensured that the analysis and reporting process did not expose individual student performance or teacher identity. Academic integrity was maintained by reporting the data honestly, avoiding fabrication, and citing all relevant sources appropriately.

C. Result and Discussion

a. Result

The results of this study show that learning evaluation results functioned as an important source of evidence for improving instructional planning. The analysis revealed that evaluation was not only used to determine students' achievement, but also to identify learning weaknesses, examine possible instructional causes, and formulate follow-up actions. In this study, the use of evaluation results was reflected in four main strategies: in-depth analysis of evaluation results, identification of causal factors, development of follow-up action plans, and continuous evaluation and reflection. These strategies indicate that instructional planning becomes more responsive when teachers connect assessment evidence with concrete pedagogical decisions. Therefore, evaluation results can be understood as a practical foundation for data-informed instructional planning.

The first strategy identified in the study was the in-depth analysis of learning evaluation results. Teachers analyzed evaluation results to determine the extent to which students had achieved the expected competencies and to identify areas where students still experienced learning difficulties. This analysis helped teachers recognize whether students' weaknesses were related to conceptual understanding, mastery of learning materials, task completion, or the application of knowledge in classroom activities. Through this process, evaluation results were not treated merely as final scores, but as diagnostic information that supported instructional decision-making. The analysis also helped teachers distinguish between individual student difficulties and broader classroom-level learning problems. This finding suggests that instructional planning becomes more accurate when it begins with careful interpretation of students' actual learning conditions.

The second strategy was the identification of factors that contributed to students' evaluation results. Teachers did not interpret low achievement only as a student-related problem, but also reflected on the possible influence of instructional factors. These factors included the suitability of teaching methods, the clarity of learning materials, the relevance of instructional media, and students' motivation during the learning process. By identifying these factors, teachers were able to understand which components of the previous lesson required improvement. This reflective process is important because it prevents evaluation from being used only as a grading mechanism. Instead, evaluation becomes a basis for reviewing the quality of instruction and identifying areas that need to be revised in the next lesson plan.

The third strategy was the development of follow-up action plans based on the evaluation findings. After identifying students' learning weaknesses and their possible causes, teachers planned specific actions to improve the next learning process. These actions included revising learning objectives, simplifying or extending learning materials, modifying teaching strategies, selecting more appropriate learning media, and providing additional guidance for students who had not yet achieved the expected competencies. Teachers also considered remedial activities for students who needed further support and enrichment activities for students who had shown stronger mastery of the material. This finding indicates that evaluation results can support differentiated instructional planning when they are translated into targeted teaching responses. In this way, evaluation contributes directly to improving both teaching quality and students' learning opportunities.

The fourth strategy was continuous evaluation and reflection. Teachers used reflection to review whether the follow-up actions had effectively addressed the weaknesses identified in the previous evaluation. This reflective process allowed teachers to reconsider the alignment between learning objectives, teaching materials, instructional methods, learning media, and assessment instruments. Continuous evaluation also helped teachers

avoid repeating the same instructional weaknesses in the next learning cycle. As a result, instructional planning became more adaptive and responsive to students' needs. This finding confirms that the use of evaluation results should be understood as a cyclical process rather than a one-time activity.

Table 1 presents the main strategies for transforming learning evaluation results into data-informed instructional planning. The table summarizes how each strategy was implemented and how it contributed to the improvement of instructional planning.

Table 1. Strategies for Transforming Learning Evaluation Results into Data-Informed Instructional Planning

No.	Strategy	Description of Strategy	Instructional Planning Improvement
1	In-depth analysis of evaluation results	Teachers analyze evaluation results to identify students' learning achievement, learning weaknesses, and competency mastery.	Lesson planning becomes more focused on students' actual learning needs.
2	Identification of causal factors	Teachers examine possible causes of students' learning difficulties, including teaching methods, learning materials, instructional media, and student motivation.	Teachers can determine which instructional components need to be revised.
3	Development of follow-up action plans	Teachers design specific actions such as modifying teaching strategies, adjusting materials, providing remedial support, or preparing enrichment activities.	Instructional planning becomes more systematic, targeted, and responsive.
4	Continuous evaluation and reflection	Teachers evaluate the effectiveness of follow-up actions and reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of previous teaching practices.	Future lesson planning becomes more adaptive and continuously improved.

Table 1 shows that the transformation of evaluation results into instructional planning requires a structured process. The first strategy provides information about students' learning achievement and weaknesses. The second strategy helps teachers interpret the possible causes of those weaknesses by considering both student-related and instructional factors. The third strategy translates the evaluation findings into concrete teaching actions. The fourth strategy ensures that the revised instructional planning is continuously reviewed and improved. These four strategies are interrelated and form the basis of data-informed instructional planning.

Figure 1 illustrates the cycle through which learning evaluation results are transformed into improved instructional planning. The cycle begins with evaluation results as the initial source of instructional evidence. These results are then analyzed to identify students' achievement levels and learning weaknesses. The next stage involves identifying the possible instructional and learning factors that contributed to the evaluation results. Based on this diagnosis, teachers develop follow-up action plans and use them to revise instructional planning. The cycle ends with continuous evaluation and reflection, which provides new evidence for further improvement.



Figure 1. Data-Informed Instructional Planning Cycle Based on Learning Evaluation Results

Figure 1 confirms that the use of learning evaluation results is not a linear activity that ends after scores are recorded. Instead, it is a continuous cycle that links assessment evidence, teacher reflection, instructional diagnosis, follow-up planning, and further improvement. This cycle strengthens the role of evaluation as a basis for pedagogical decision-making. It also shows that instructional planning becomes more effective when teachers systematically use evaluation results to adjust the next learning process. Therefore, the figure supports the main finding that data-informed instructional planning requires both evidence analysis and reflective

instructional action.

Overall, the results indicate that learning evaluation results contribute to instructional planning in three important ways. First, they help teachers design learning activities based on students' actual learning needs rather than assumptions. Second, they support the alignment between learning objectives, materials, methods, media, assessment instruments, and follow-up activities. Third, they encourage teachers to build a reflective teaching practice in which evaluation is used not only to measure learning outcomes, but also to improve future instruction. These findings demonstrate that data-informed instructional planning can strengthen teaching quality when evaluation results are analyzed carefully, interpreted critically, and translated into concrete instructional decisions

b. Discussion

The first important finding of this study is that in-depth analysis of learning evaluation results enables teachers to move beyond score documentation and toward diagnostic instructional understanding. This finding indicates that evaluation data become educationally meaningful only when teachers interpret them as evidence of students' mastery, misconceptions, learning barriers, and readiness for further learning. Conceptually, this supports the principle of formative assessment, which positions assessment evidence as a basis for identifying learning gaps and deciding the next instructional steps. This result is consistent with Morris et al. (2021), who argued that formative assessment and feedback can improve learning when they are implemented as part of instructional decision-making rather than as isolated assessment events. It also aligns with Veugen et al. (2021), who showed that formative assessment practices require shared understanding between teachers and students about what is being assessed and how assessment evidence is used. However, the present study extends previous findings by emphasizing that the diagnostic value of evaluation results depends not only on the assessment activity itself, but also on teachers' ability to connect the evidence with instructional planning components. This means that evaluation results should be treated as the starting point of pedagogical reasoning, not merely as the endpoint of student performance measurement.

The second finding shows that identifying causal factors behind students' evaluation results is essential for transforming assessment data into instructional improvement. This finding has a critical meaning because low achievement cannot be interpreted only as a student-related problem; it may also reflect weaknesses in teaching methods, learning materials, instructional media, task design, classroom interaction, or student motivation. From the perspective of teacher assessment literacy, this process requires teachers to understand not only how to collect assessment data, but also how to interpret the instructional conditions that may produce such results. Yan and Pastore (2022a) explained that formative assessment literacy includes conceptual, practical, and socio-emotional dimensions, all of which are needed when teachers diagnose learning problems and choose appropriate responses. Similarly, Pastore (2023) emphasized that assessment literacy remains a major challenge because teachers often know assessment concepts but struggle to apply them in classroom decision-making. The present study supports these arguments but also adds a contextual layer by showing that evaluation utilization requires causal interpretation, not only technical assessment competence. Therefore, the novelty of this finding lies in positioning causal diagnosis as a bridge between evaluation evidence and instructional redesign.

The third finding reveals that follow-up action plans, such as remedial support, enrichment activities, material adjustment, media selection, and strategy modification, are central to data-informed instructional planning. This finding suggests that evaluation results have practical value only when they are translated into specific, targeted, and differentiated instructional responses. In theoretical terms, this supports the logic of assessment for learning, in which feedback and follow-up are not supplementary activities but core mechanisms for improving learning trajectories. Van der Steen et al. (2022) argued that formative assessment activities should be consciously and coherently planned so that they can inform the decisions teachers want to make. Their later study also showed that even experienced teachers face difficulties in designing formative assessment plans that effectively connect evidence, interpretation, and instructional action (van der Steen et al., 2023). The findings of the present study are consistent with this literature, but they also extend it by showing that follow-up planning should include both corrective and developmental responses. Remedial actions respond to learning gaps, while enrichment activities ensure that students who have achieved mastery continue to experience meaningful learning growth. Thus, the contribution of this study lies in framing follow-up action planning as a differentiated pedagogical mechanism derived from evaluation evidence.

The fourth finding indicates that continuous evaluation and reflection make instructional planning more

adaptive and sustainable. This finding is important because the use of evaluation results should not be understood as a linear sequence that ends after teachers revise a lesson plan. Instead, it functions as a cyclical process in which evaluation evidence leads to reflection, reflection leads to instructional adjustment, and instructional adjustment produces new evidence for further improvement. This interpretation is consistent with studies on teacher data use, which show that data-informed decision-making can influence teaching quality and student achievement when supported by professional reflection and sustained implementation (Spiele et al., 2025). It also resonates with Pastore's (2026) view that teacher data literacy involves the capacity to read, interpret, and use data in ways that inform practice rather than merely satisfy accountability demands. Nevertheless, the present study suggests that reflection should not remain at the level of general awareness; it must be connected to concrete revisions of objectives, materials, strategies, media, assessment tools, and follow-up programs. This finding is also supported by Shafii and Berger (2025), who found that formative assessment practices are often constrained by limited assessment literacy, feedback practices, and traditional assessment cultures. Therefore, this study contributes to the global literature by clarifying that reflective improvement is the mechanism that keeps data-informed instructional planning from becoming a procedural or administrative activity.

Taken together, the findings of this study show that transforming learning evaluation results into data-informed instructional planning requires an integrated cycle of analysis, diagnosis, action planning, revision, and reflection. This integrated model strengthens previous research that has separately examined formative assessment, feedback, assessment literacy, and teacher data use. Lei et al. (2025) noted that formative assessment literacy is still conceptually fragmented, while Solis Trujillo et al. (2025) showed that feedback practices require stronger alignment between assessment information and learning improvement. The present study responds to this fragmentation by offering a more connected perspective: evaluation results become powerful only when teachers can process them into instructional knowledge and then convert that knowledge into planning decisions. In practical terms, the findings imply that teacher professional development should not focus only on constructing assessment instruments, but also on reading evaluation patterns, identifying causes of learning difficulties, designing differentiated follow-up actions, and evaluating the effectiveness of instructional revisions. In theoretical terms, this study expands the concept of data-informed instruction by emphasizing evaluation result management as a mediating process between assessment evidence and pedagogical redesign. Therefore, the study fills a research gap by positioning evaluation not merely as measurement or accountability, but as a reflective planning cycle that can improve teaching quality and student learning outcomes.

D. Conclusion

This study concludes that learning evaluation results can serve as a strategic foundation for improving instructional planning when they are systematically interpreted and transformed into concrete pedagogical decisions. The findings show that data-informed instructional planning operates through four interrelated strategies: in-depth analysis of evaluation results, identification of causal factors behind students' learning difficulties, development of follow-up action plans, and continuous evaluation and reflection. These strategies demonstrate that evaluation should not be treated merely as a scoring or reporting mechanism, but as a diagnostic and developmental process that helps teachers understand students' learning needs, review the effectiveness of instruction, and design more responsive learning activities. By linking evaluation evidence with lesson objectives, learning materials, teaching strategies, instructional media, assessment instruments, remedial activities, and enrichment programs, teachers can construct instructional plans that are more adaptive, differentiated, and oriented toward continuous improvement. Therefore, the main contribution of this study lies in positioning evaluation result management as a practical bridge between assessment evidence, teacher reflection, and instructional redesign.

The study also implies that improving instructional quality requires stronger teacher competence in assessment literacy, data interpretation, and reflective planning. Teachers need to be supported not only in designing assessment instruments, but also in reading evaluation patterns, diagnosing learning barriers, and translating evidence into targeted instructional responses. The proposed data-informed instructional planning cycle offers a conceptual and practical framework for strengthening the use of evaluation results in classroom decision-making. Nevertheless, the findings should be understood within the scope of the study, which emphasizes conceptual and qualitative interpretation rather than statistical measurement of learning

improvement. Future research may extend this study by involving broader school contexts, comparing different educational levels, or testing the effectiveness of the proposed planning cycle through classroom-based intervention or mixed-method research. Such further investigation would strengthen empirical evidence on how evaluation results contribute to sustainable improvement in teaching quality and student learning outcomes.

E. Author Contributions Statement

Eka Fitriana HS contributed to the conceptualization of the study, development of the research focus, coordination of manuscript preparation, and final revision of the article. Suci Indah Sari contributed to the literature search, organization of relevant theoretical sources, and preparation of the introduction section. Vera contributed to the development of the methodological framework, including the research design, data collection procedures, and instrument description. Lidya Marthen contributed to data organization, document analysis, and the preparation of the research findings. Tresia Benne Langi contributed to the interpretation of the results and the development of the discussion section. Nurul Ulfadillah contributed to the analysis of evaluation result management and the formulation of instructional planning implications. Wahdaniah contributed to the preparation of tables, figure description, and alignment between the findings and the research objectives. Asmi Anti contributed to reference management, citation checking, and academic language editing. Novianty Ramadani contributed to manuscript formatting, consistency checking, and revision of the article structure. Fitri Anastasya contributed to proofreading, final editing, and verification of manuscript completeness before submission. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

F. Reference

- Adeoye-Olatunde, O. A., & Olenik, N. L. (2021). Research and scholarly methods: Semi-structured interviews. *Journal of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy*, 4(10), 1358–1367. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jac5.1441>
- BERA. (2018). *Ethical guidelines for educational research* (4th ed.). British Educational Research Association. <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common problems and be(com)ing a knowing researcher. *International Journal of Transgender Health*, 24(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26895269.2022.2129597>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2024). A critical review of the reporting of reflexive thematic analysis in health promotion. *Health Promotion International*, 39(3), Article daae049. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/daae049>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
- 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>
- Lei, W., & Lei, M. (2025). Formative assessment literacy: A systematic review. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15, Article 42. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00418-0>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Morris, R., Perry, T., & Wardle, L. (2021). Formative assessment and feedback for learning in higher education: A systematic review. *Review of Education*, 9(3), Article e3292. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3292>
- 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>
- 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*, 85, Article 101496. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2025.101496>

- Solis Trujillo, B. P., Velarde-Camaqui, D., Gonzales Nuñez, C. A., Castillo Silva, E. V., & Gonzalez Said de la Oliva, M. D. P. (2025). The current landscape of formative assessment and feedback in graduate studies: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1509983. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1509983>
- Spiele, S., Janssen, J., Schildkamp, K., & Poortman, C. L. (2025). The effect of teacher data use professional development interventions on student achievement: A meta-analysis and qualitative comparative analysis. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 87, Article 101528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2025.101528>
- Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2020). Expanding approaches for research: Understanding and using trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 44(1), 26–28.
- 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. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, Article 925352. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.925352>
- van der Steen, J., van Schilt-Mol, T., van der Vleuten, C., & Joosten-ten Brinke, D. (2023). Designing formative assessment that improves teaching and learning: What can be learned from the design stories of experienced teachers? *Journal of Formative Design in Learning*, 7, 182–194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41686-023-00080-w>
- 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>
- Wiles, R. (2013). What are qualitative research ethics? Bloomsbury Academic. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781849666558>
- 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>
- Yin, R. K. (2022). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (7th ed.). Sage.