

Classroom assessment model suggestion for community service practices course: PROFESS T

Kudret AYKIRI^{1*} 

¹Social Studies Education, Education Faculty, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Türkiye.

Article Info

Keywords

Community service practices
Classroom assessment
Formative evaluation
Service-learning
Processfolio
Self-assessment
Pre-service social studies teachers

Article History

Received on 30.04.2023
Received in revised form
19.06.2023
Accepted 20.06.2023

Article Type

Research Article



Abstract

Community service practices course is a compulsory course aims to provide pre-service teachers with a sense of social responsibility theoretically and practically, and aims to develop cooperation, collaboration, effective communication and self-assessment skills during practice. In the context of current studies, the assessment and evaluation system of the course should include process evaluation, the introduction of the assessment system at the beginning of the lesson, presenting a standard assessment tool example, individual assessment as well as group assessment, use of alternative assessment tools. This study aims to examine the opinions of social studies pre-service teachers regarding an exemplary classroom assessment model developed for the community service practices course. In this context, the action research method, one of the qualitative research methods, was used in the research. Fifteen social studies pre-service teachers participated in the study. The data were collected through a semi-structured interview form and analyzed with the descriptive analysis technique. As a result of the study, an example of a classroom assessment model, in which each one is a significant component, has emerged for pre-service social studies teachers within the scope of the CSP course. The name of this model is PROFESS T. PROFESS T is a classroom assessment tool derived from the words processfolio (PRO), formative evaluation (FE), service-learning (S), self-assessment (S), and transparency (T). It also means professional transparency. In evaluations, it means 'we are not transparent; we must be transparent.'

1 Introduction

Community service practices (CSP) course is 'a compulsory course aims to provide pre-service teachers with a sense of social responsibility theoretically and practically, and aims to develop cooperation, collaboration, effective communication and self-assessment skills during practice.' [Council of Higher Education (CHE, 2011)]. This course was added to undergraduate programs on educational faculties in 2006. A National Workshop on Community Service Practices was held in 2009. In this workshop, the application principles, stages, and main frame of the CSP course were established and a directive including these was revealed. On February 17, 2011, CHE prepared a new CSP directive (CHE, 2011) and sent it to all educational faculties by making changes to the directive that emerged in the workshop held. Information about the course was

Cite: Aykırı, K. (2023). Classroom assessment model suggestion for community service practices course: PROFESS T. *Pedagogical Perspective*, 2(1), 75-90. <https://doi.org/10.29329/pedper.2023.559.5>

included in the instructions. In summary, information on the assessment and evaluation system of the course in this workshop (CHE, 2011) is as follows:

- The advisor should give information about the evaluation criteria of the course at the beginning of the semester.
- Written or oral exams should not be made.
- A pre-service teacher's portfolio should also be prepared. Event and group reports and individual reports should be included in this file. Templates were provided in the directive to prepare these reports. Apart from these, it is emphasized that document forms should be in the selection file. However, what they are not specified is not specified. A tool called the selection file evaluation form was used to evaluate the selection files. The weight ratio of the selected files in the assessment and evaluation was 75%.
- In addition to the selection file, the project proposal form was also evaluated. A tool called the project proposal evaluation form was used to evaluate the form. The weight ratio of the project proposal in the assessment and evaluation is 25%.
- The sum of the two weighted scores provides the overall score for the CSP course. In addition to these, it is emphasized that self-assessments will also be taken into account. However, detailed information regarding this is not provided.
- As a result of the criteria and evaluation, it was decided whether the pre-service teacher was adequate or inadequate. A pre-service teacher with a general score of 70 or above was evaluated as adequate, and a pre-service teacher below 70 was considered inadequate.
- It was emphasized that the evaluation result should not be taken into account in the calculation of pre-service teachers' end-of-term and general academic achievement averages. However, the ECTS of these courses is included in the undergraduate programs of the faculty of education sent by the CHE and affects the general evaluation.

In the context of CHE's (2011) directive, the following should be in the course's assessment and evaluation system: process evaluation, using the portfolio for this evaluation, and introducing the evaluation system at the beginning of the lesson. However, there are different situations in the studies related to the course. When the studies that have results on the assessment and evaluation of the CSP course are examined, the following inferences are reached (Uçan et al., 2009; Gürol & Özercan, 2010; Küçüköğlü et al., 2010; Hoş-Ercin, 2011; Özdemir & Tokcan, 2011; YÖK, 2011; Ekşi & Cinoğlu, 2012; Kesten, 2012; Kaf-Hasırcı & Sarı, 2013; Kuran, 2013; Seban, 2013; Community Volunteers Foundation, 2013; Korkmaz, 2015; Kop, 2017; Gelmez-Burakgazi, 2018; Yanık, 2019; Aykırı, 2022):

- The lack of an effective evaluation reduces the efficiency of projects carried out within the scope of the course.
- Advisors have no experience evaluating such courses.
- There is no information provided about the evaluation system of the course, and it is recommended that this information be provided in the first week of the course.
- Within the course scope, different assessment and evaluation approaches are applied between branches, departments, and universities. Standard and objective tools are not used.
- Some advisors perceived the course as a volunteer activity. Based on this perception, they recommend three assessments: (a) no assessment should be made, (b) minimal effort is sufficient, and therefore everyone should be given the same score, and (c) only the pass-fail model should be applied. It is not meant to evaluate the CSP course in this way, which is a compulsory, important, and credit course,

- Generally, the project proposal form and project result reports were evaluated. In other words, a result-oriented evaluation was conducted.
- Most of the time, only group evaluations were performed. Individual evaluations were requested.
- Students want the effort to be given importance, the degree of difficulty of projects to be taken into account, and quality to be considered rather than quantity.
- Alternative assessment tools are recommended.

In the context of current studies, the assessment and evaluation system of the course should include process evaluation, the introduction of the assessment system at the beginning of the lesson, presenting a standard assessment tool example, individual assessment as well as group assessment, and use of alternative assessment tools.

As a result, in the context of the problems and suggestions in the related literature, this study aims to develop a meaningful exemplary classroom assessment model (PROFESS T) for pre-service social studies teachers within the scope of the community service practice course. This study focused on the benefits of this model for pre-service teachers.

This study aims to examine the opinions of social studies pre-service teachers regarding an exemplary classroom assessment model developed for the community service practices course. The research questions in this context are as follows.

- What are the opinions of pre-service social studies teachers regarding the use of process folio in CSP courses?
- What are the opinions of pre-service social studies teachers regarding formative assessment in THU courses?
- What are the opinions of pre-service social studies teachers regarding the evaluation of each stage of the service learning-based CPS course?
- What are the opinions of pre-service social studies teachers regarding their self-assessments in the THU course?
- What are the opinions of pre-service social studies teachers regarding the transparency of THU course assessment and evaluation?
- What are the opinions of pre-service social studies teachers about using a similar classroom assessment model in their professional life?
- What are the opinions of pre-service social studies teachers regarding the PROFESS T model in general?

2 Material and Method

2.1 Material: PROFESS T

Assessment and evaluation are among the most important components of the curriculum. For this reason, it is important to develop a model example for the CSP course based on existing guidelines and problems and suggestions in related studies. In this context, the name of the model that emerged as a result of action research is PROFESS T. PROFESS T is a classroom assessment tool derived from the words processfolio (PRO), formative evaluation (FE), service-learning (S), self-assessment (S) and transparency (T). PROFESS T also indicates profess transparency. In other words, PROFESS T means 'we are not transparent; we must be transparent' in evaluations.

2.1.1 Processfolio

There are many reasons for including a processfolio in the assessment model, primarily because of the importance of process evaluation and portfolios in this context in the CSP course. The name/idea of processfolio emerged in the 1980s in a project called Arts Propel conducted by Howard Gardner and his teammates (Wolfe, 2013). There are two views on the processfolio. First, a processfolio is a portfolio type, and its other name is process-portfolio (Miller, undated, as cited in Robinson, 1995). Second, the best work of the person is collected in the portfolio, and many works of the person are collected in the process portfolio (Seidel, undated, as cited in Wolfe, 2013). Whether it is considered a kind of portfolio or slightly different from the portfolio, the processfolio is the file that contains almost all of the students' work. Review, re-evaluation, and improvement are provided with the processfolio (Miller, undated, as cited in Robinson, 1995). In other words, the processfolio is also associated with formative evaluation, which is one of the components of PROFESS T. This is the second reason for including the processfolio in the model. The third reason is the relationship between another component, SL, and the processfolio. Reflection is one of the important stages of SL, and there is a study (Silveira, Beaugard & Bull, 2017) showing that processfolio is effective for reflection. The fourth reason is related to another component of PROFESS T (individual assessment and related self-assessment). Processfolio is an effective tool for self-assessment (Nicolaidou, 2012). The fifth reason is the need to pay attention to the difficulties of the projects and the efforts of students. Processfolio is a tool that can enable us to see progress (Nicolaidou, 2012; Wolfe, 2013). Finally, it is desirable to use it as an alternative assessment tool for CSP. A Processfolio is also an alternative assessment tool (Robinson, 1995). The studies included in the processfolio during the CSP course were as follows: draft project proposal form, original project proposal form, draft planning and preparation form, original planning and preparation form, weekly activity report, makeup activity report, draft poster, original poster, and reflective diary.

2.1.2 Formative evaluation

In formative evaluation, the student receives feedback, sees his/her sufficient and insufficient aspects in this feedback, and draws a path for himself/herself accordingly; In addition, the teacher shapes the lesson accordingly (Bell & Bronwen, 2001; Brookhart, 2001). In formative evaluation, students are given feedback to correct their mistakes and complete their deficiencies (Assessment for Learning Assessment Reform Group, 2002). Formative evaluation, also known as process evaluation, determines the faults and deficiencies of the ongoing activity and evaluates how to solve them (Erkuş, 2012). The activities performed by pre-service teachers in the CSP course were not scored directly. Scoring was not the primary goal of this study. Instead, deficiencies and faults in the activities were determined together. Subsequently, these pre-service teachers were guided to overcome these deficiencies and faults.

2.1.3 Service-learning

Service-learning is 'an opportunity for students to connect theory and practice, to apply classroom learning outcomes to real-life situations, and to provide students with a deeper understanding of course content, that engages students in service opportunities in the community as an integral part of a course, and the type of experiential learning that gives promise and promises more than traditional learning' (Ballard & Elmore, 2009). The CSP course is added to education faculty programs within the framework of the service-learning approach (Küçüköğlü, 2012). However, this does not seem to reflect the current understanding. For this reason, a service-learning-based CSP course was designed. Service learning has five stages (Kaye, 2014; National Service-Learning

Clearinghouse, 2009; National Youth Leadership Council, 2018). The stages are as follows: (a) investigation, (b) planning and preparation, (c) action, (d) reflection and evaluation, and (e) demonstration and celebration. Each stage was included in the classroom assessment model example (PROFESS T) for assessment and evaluation.

2.1.4 Self assessment

One of the applications desired in the CSP course is the assessment of individuals in the group. It is emphasized in a study (Aslanoğlu, 2017) that self-assessment is effective in this regard. Within the scope of the course, forms were given to pre-service teachers for self-assessment after each stage.

2.1.5 Transparency

Transparency refers to ‘teachers’ efforts to at least inform students about what and how they will be evaluated.’ (Rogier, 2014, as cited in Settiawana & Ridho Hilmawanb, 2016). Related directives and studies emphasize that the evaluation system of the course should be shared with students in the first weeks of the CSP course. In addition, attempts have been made to ensure transparency through the feedback provided..

2 Method

2.1 Design

In this study, the formative evaluation approach, self-assessment technique, processfolio tool, stages of SL, and transparency principle were used together to design an example of a CSP classroom assessment model. In this study, the benefits of this model for later use in CSP courses were investigated. In other words, the research was designed to develop an example of an effective classroom assessment model. This purpose is consistent with the philosophy of action research. This method has a flexible and cyclical structure (Costello, 2003). This structure provided an opportunity to apply PROFESS T and to consider the effectiveness of the model. In this study, it was observed by the researcher in his previous experiences that the CSP course had deficiencies in classroom assessment. The literature has supported this situation. The PROFESS T model has been identified as a potential solution to this shortcoming. Technical action research was used in the research. In this context, it is aimed to test an exemplary classroom assessment model (PROFESS T) based on a predetermined theoretical framework. Therefore, it is necessary to determine whether the model can be applied to a real environment.

2.2 Participants

The research was conducted with 15 pre-service social studies teachers in the education faculty of a state university in Turkey during the spring term of 2020-2021. Pre-service teachers who chose the Community Service Practices Course conducted by the researcher were selected as the participants. In other words, the researchers’ backyards were used. In action research, it is important that the researcher conducts research in her/his own lesson, which is her/his backyard, because he is the person who makes the change (Glesne 2015). As per the CSP course directive of the faculty where the researcher works, a maximum of 15 students can choose the course of an advisor; therefore, 15 participants were studied. The participants’ characteristics and experiences are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the participating middle school students

Code Name	Age	Pre-Course Experiences of the Participants	Experience of a similar assessment system before the course
PST1	22	None	Exist
PST2	21	None	None
PST3	22	None	Partially
PST4	21	None	Partially
PST5	21	None	None
PST6	23	None	None
PST7	22	Partially	None
PST8	20	None	None
PST9	21	None	Partially
PST10	23	None	None
PST11	20	None	None
PST12	23	None	None
PST13	21	Exist	None
PST14	21	None	None
PST15	22	Partially	None

According to Table 1, the majority of the participants had no experience with activities such as community services and volunteering before the CSP course experience. Two participants had some experience. One of the participants carried out an activity to bring food to a person in need. Another participant took part in the activities prepared by the high school that he studied. Again, the majority of the participants did not experience an evaluation system similar to that used in the research. Three participants stated that they partially experienced this experience. These experiences are in the form of evaluating the course after the course and evaluating the process using a few assessment tools. It was observed that there was no experience with the form within the scope of this research.

2.3 Measures

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews. The questions in the interview form were created in the context of the relevant literature, and the components of PROFESS T were considered. An expert opinion was obtained regarding the interview questions. The pilot implementation of the form was conducted with a pre-service teacher who took this course a semester ago. In this context, the research questions were as follows:

- Processfolio evaluation was made in the CSP course. In other words, every product or output prepared during the course is evaluated. What are your feelings and thoughts regarding this situation?
- A formative assessment was conducted during the CSP course. That is, direct results were not evaluated. The deficiencies of this process were identified. Guidance was then provided on addressing these deficiencies. What are your feelings and thoughts regarding this situation?
- We conducted SL-based CSP. There are five phases in this course: (a) investigation, (b) planning and preparation, (c) action, (d) reflection and evaluation, and (e) demonstration and celebration. Each stage is evaluated in the context of the workload. What are your feelings and thoughts regarding this situation?
- There was not only an advisory assessment of the CSP course. You have also conducted a self-assessment. What are your feelings and thoughts regarding this situation?

- The assessment and evaluation system for the CSP course was transparent. Shared at the beginning of the lesson. During this process, it was observed that the deficiencies were. The results were also shared transparently. What are your feelings and thoughts regarding this situation?
- Would you like to use such assessment and evaluation systems in your teaching life? From where?
- The name of the model we use is PROFESS T. What are your general feelings and thoughts regarding this model?

2.4 Data analysis

According to Meriam (2013), all qualitative data analyses are content. This is because the content of the interviews, field notes, and documents were analyzed. In this study, the contents of the interview forms were analyzed. According to Meriam (2013): Additional strategies can be used after this strategy. A descriptive analysis was used as an additional analysis strategy. This method allows the data to be summarized and interpreted according to previously determined themes (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). In this context, the data were analyzed and interpreted in the context of the research questions. The themes formed in the context of the research questions were as follows: Processfolio (process portfolio), formative evaluation (formative assessment), service-learning, self-assessment, transparency, belief in its use in professional life, and general opinion.

2.5 Ethical considerations

Ethics committee approval was obtained from the relevant institutions. Before the research, the process was explained to the participants, and a consent form was signed. Code names were used in direct quotations. Participants were randomly coded as the first letter of the pre-service social studies teacher. An example is as follows: PST1.

3 Findings

3.1 Processfolio (Process portfolio)

All of the participants have a favorable opinion about the processfolio. According to the statements of the participants, the reasons for this situation are presented in Table 2:

Table 2 Opinions of the participants about the processfolio

Theme	Code
Making the course meaningful	-Enabling awareness of the importance of every step of the course -Increasing interest in the lesson -Increasing the value/importance of the course -Ensuring that the entire course is cared for -Increasing the effectiveness/efficiency of the course -Increasing participation in the course and service activities during the course
Be meaningful to the participant	-Facilitating learning -Making yourself feel valued -Increasing self-esteem -Giving the feeling of having done a useful job -Being a source/guide for those who will take the course later
Making the evaluation meaningful	-Allowing completing of the deficiencies and correcting the mistakes -Enabling awareness of the importance of mistakes in the learning process -Providing objectivity

Making the process meaningful	-Allowing the difference between the beginning and the end to be seen -Allowing thinking healthy about the course process, -Providing a roadmap for the process -Making the stages of the process meaningful and interesting
Making the result meaningful	-Allowing intervention in the process so that the result is positive -Ensuring satisfaction with the result
Making the product meaningful	-Due to the nature of the course, each product should be meaningful, and allowing these products to be stored -Enabling more detailed consideration of the activities carried out during the course and the products revealed
Providing inter-stage connectivity	-Being meaningful for the next stage from the relevant stage and providing motivation for that stage -Providing integrity between the stages of the course

Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

Evaluating and talking about every product we made was a great source of motivation for my next event. In this way, it helped me think about the activities we did in the community service class down to the last detail. (PST9)

Processfolio made me care about the whole lesson. I also felt that I was being cared for. I participated in a very willing and determined way, with mutual care. In this context, the processfolio has been both a good evaluation and learning experience for me. (PST11)

3.2 Formative evaluation

Almost all participants had a positive opinion about the formative evaluation. The reasons for this situation according to participants' statements are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Opinions of the participants about the formative evaluation

Theme	Code
Be meaningful to the participant	-Preventing mistakes from being accepted as correct -Providing reflective thinking -Reducing anxiety about making mistakes -Providing full learning -Enabling the desired behavior to take place (education) -Allowing the development of views and thoughts and progress in this context, -Providing professional development
Making the course meaningful	-Ensuring the adoption of the lesson and the activities carried out -Overcoming the aim of passing the course and focusing on the gains of the course -Offering a responsible and enjoyable lesson experience -Ensuring that every step of the course is important. -Increasing motivation for the course and activities
Making the evaluation meaningful	-Making people realize that the primary purpose of the assessment is not to give points but to provide learning. -Offering the opportunity to complete the deficiencies and correct the mistakes. -Preventing confusion
Making the result meaningful	-Providing an assessment experience in line with the constructivist approach -Allowing intervention in the process thus ensures that the result is positive

Providing inter-stage connectivity -Ensuring to be more effective in the next stage

Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

Instead of anxiety about a consultant like it?, we made self-criticism by asking, ‘How successful have I been at this job? How well did I do it?’ Therefore, we embraced what we had done. We did not have priority to pass the class. We aimed to achieve course gains. The course ceased to be a boring lesson and turned into a lesson for which we both enjoyed and took responsibility. (PST3)

Formative evaluation allowed us to see mistakes and shortcomings at every stage and have the opportunity to correct them. (PST4)

Apart from these statements, there were also more positive participants’ comments, such as ‘it was very impressive,’ ‘it was the best evaluation in my life,’ etc. In addition, one participant emphasized that their immediate surroundings were aware that they also had a different course experience. Of course, negative situations also exist. One participant (PST6) stated that the assessment system created anxiety during the first week. In the continuation of her statements, he said that this anxiety quickly disappeared, as he considered it essential for the teacher to give feedback to her student. Another participant (PST1) drew attention to a situation of injustice. He emphasized that it would create an unfair situation if someone who gave complete and correct homework in the first place and someone who made corrections later received similar scores. It is seen that he has a role conflict in the continuation of her statements. While he defends this idea from the student’s point of view, he states that the existing system is correct from the teacher’s perspective. Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

Although this situation causes stress in the first few weeks, I believe that the most important thing between the teacher and the student in education is to provide feedback. (PST6)

When I look at this system as an outsider or a teacher, I do not think it’s a problem, but I believe that it should be developed more while I am in the system (course student). (PST1)

3.3 Service-Learning

All participants had a positive opinion about evaluating each stage of SL. The reasons for this situation according to participants’ statements are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Opinions of the participants about the service-learning

Theme	Code
Be meaningful to the participant	
Making the stage meaningful	-Understanding the importance of each stage -Paying attention to the points that need attention at every stage -Achieving the gains in each stage -Living a more profound experience of learning experience that must be experienced at each stage
Making the course meaningful	-Providing planned progress -Ensuring fewer mistakes are made throughout the course -Reducing anxiety -Being a facilitator ¹² . Uzmanlık kazanmak için yapma -Making to gain project development skills -Giving a sense of trust -Developing the value of responsibility

Making the evaluation meaningful	-Allowing completing of the deficiencies and correcting the mistakes.
Making the result meaningful	-Ensuring that the result is positive
Making the course meaningful	-Understanding the importance of the course in general and gaining a positive attitude toward the course

Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

In my opinion, the evaluation of each stage is more relaxing for students. This is an opportunity for him to understand each step in the most accurate way. The fact that there is time allocated for each step enables the process to be learned more deeply. (PST7)

In the first lesson, I admitted that I found some of these stages unnecessary and tedious. At the end of the lesson, I said, 'Let us do what we are going to do directly, let it be finished.' I think as follows: Each of these stages brought us professionalism. This also allowed us to make progress with fewer mistakes. Unfortunately, as students are accustomed to being motivated by evaluation, if these stages were not evaluated, we would not be meticulous at each step, and perhaps we would not realize that these stages are so important. (PST11)

3.4 Self-Assessment

All participants had positive opinions about the self-assessment. The main reason for this is that self-assessment prevents injustice. Within a group, individuals can show social loafing behavior. Second, individuals can notice the advantages and disadvantages of this assessment. Thus, the individual develops herself. Finally, it makes the individual feel more valuable, and therefore, more active. Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

In group work, one group member puts in a lot of effort, whereas another group member does not put in the same effort. In this case, it would be incorrect to evaluate it in the same way. This is why it is nice to have a self-assessment as well. (PST4)

Since we have individual duties in the group, I think it is fair to determine whether the individuals fulfill their obligations fully and score them accordingly. (PST9)

Almost all participants had positive opinions about the self-assessment approach for being predominantly included in the individual evaluation. While one participant (PST1) found the system correct, he only drew attention to fairness. One participant (PST2) thought that individuals could not act fairly while evaluating themselves. The primary reasons for adopting the participants' self-assessment with positive opinions were that self-assessment develops self-criticism skills and enables the individual to see the pros and cons. Thus, individuals can develop solutions for themselves and monitor their development. One participant even discovered new things in herself and stated that her curiosity increased. Self-assessment was significant in terms of seeing not only her own development but also her contribution to the group. In addition, one participant emphasized that the individual could best evaluate herself. Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

This appraisal approach enables individuals to be open to positive and negative self-criticism. Therefore, self-assessment is a vital evaluation approach that should be emphasized. (PST11)

I often find it difficult to be fair to evaluate myself. This may also be the case with others. (PST2)

3.5 Transparency

All pre-service teachers had positive opinions about transparency. According to the participants' opinions, the introduction of the assessment system in the first week of class eliminated confusion, reduced anxiety, focused on activities rather than scores, and made planning more manageable. It also facilitated the individual's adaptation to the lesson and made her feel responsible. Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

In the process, it eased anxiety about what it would be. As I encountered such a system for the first time, fear gave way to my curiosity. (PST6)

The lessons were transparent. It was easy to progress, as we knew how to proceed. (PST7)

According to the participants' opinions, the transparent sharing of the evaluations made by the advisor on all participants each week with the whole class created an environment that also allowed for peer evaluation. Each group saw examples of different activities. More importantly, they learned lessons themselves. They were motivated to be more successful each week than in the previous week. Anxiety about the impact of each activity on the overall assessment decreased, and even the feeling that the lesson was compulsory decreased. The objectives of the lesson were quickly achieved. Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

This is not the usual method of progress. However, unlike others, I think it has been successful. We had no obligations. (PST8)

An environment in which all pre-service teachers could analyze each other was created. This is a highly effective evaluation system. (PST12)

3.6 Belief in its use in professional life

Almost all participants had positive opinions about using a similar evaluation approach in their professional lives. The reasons for this situation according to participants' statements are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Opinions of the participants about using a similar classroom assessment model in their professional life

Theme	Code
In the context of the assessment itself	-Giving importance to process evaluation, -Desire to intervene in deficiencies and/or mistakes, -Being a fair system, -Desire to feel the importance of every action taken, -Providing transparency, -Not finding it appropriate to make evaluations with a few traditional techniques.
In the context of the student	-Desire to offer reinforcement, -Desire to provide complete learning, -Desire to eliminate the anxiety of passing the exam and course, -Eliminating the question marks in the heads, -Desire to make students feel valued,
In the context of the lesson	-Students desire to draw their attention to the lesson, -Desire to have an efficient and enjoyable course process.

Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

Yes, I would like to use it. Because; I want students to see and correct their mistakes in the process, feel that every activity they perform is important, and ensure transparency so that there is no question mark in their minds. (PST4)

I would like to apply it because I show my students that something is possible without worrying about exams and grades throughout the process. (PST6)

On the other hand, one participant stated that it was difficult to use a similar understanding depending on the conjuncture. Because he thinks that in an exam-centered system, families will put pressure on multiple-choice exams. A pre-service teacher also stated that she wanted to use the evaluation model by changing it slightly. She believes that it has the features that students will abuse. Examples of statements that support these judgments are as follows:

It is very difficult for me to use this system when families attribute their children's success to four options and have adopted it. (PST2)

While I find the evaluation system successful, I think it is open to abuse by students. (PST5)

3.7 Generally

All participants had a positive opinion about the PROFESS T in general. Some participants wished to have a similar model for other courses. Some participants compared the traditional assessment methods and emphasized that the model was more effective. Some participants stated that this system allowed them to focus on the course and activities carried out within the course, not the score. It was also emphasized that it is a model that develops a positive attitude toward the course and advisor. Apart from these, it was emphasized that it is a very effective, efficient, loving, comforting, fair, different, and successful model. Two participants stated that they were worried at the beginning of the process, but that their anxiety decreased in a short time. Examples of statements supporting these judgments are as follows.

If the system of every course were similar, it would be more permanent. (PST15)

It is more successful than the preferred evaluation systems. (PST5)

It was initially a cause for concern, as it was an evaluation process that I encountered for the first time. Later, I realized that it was a psychologically relaxing assessment. (PST6)

4 Discussion

The processfolio in the CSP course is meaningful for all pre-service social studies teachers participating in the research. In this respect, it is similar to the study results (Silveira, Beauregard, & Bull, 2017), which found that it was meaningful for pre-service music teachers as an original assessment tool. In addition, the CSP course was based on the students' creativity. Processfolio is also an effective tool for creativity assessments (Molaie, Raby & Hartwell, 2020). In this context, it is not surprising that this tool makes sense in the context of this course. With Processfolio, students are encouraged not only to create, but also to revise, re-evaluate, and improve (Robinson, 1995). In the results of this research, clues that the processfolio is effective for realizing these goals were also found. In this context, it is recommended to use processfolio in the CSP course and conduct research specific to processfolio.

Adopting a formative evaluation approach in the CSP course is meaningful for almost all pre-service social studies teachers participating in the research. In this respect, it is similar to the results of a previous study (Metin & Özmen, 2010), which found that its usage in the technology and material design course is meaningful for pre-service classroom teachers. Moreover, the results that formative evaluation provides the opportunity to complete the deficiencies and correct the mistakes and be more effective in the next stage support the results of Bell and Bronwen (2001)

and Brookhart (2001). In this context, it is recommended to adopt a formative evaluation approach in the CSP course and conduct research specific to formative evaluation.

Evaluation of each stage of SL in the SL-based CSP course is meaningful for almost all pre-service social studies teachers participating in the research. Thus, the proposal of a study (Fritz, 2002) emphasizing the importance of periodic evaluation of each SL stage was considered. However, as emphasized in the same study, it is important to develop this assessment to include other stakeholders. In this context, it is recommended that the CSP course be grounded in the understanding of SL and that every stage should be evaluated.

The use of the self-assessment technique in this context in the CSP course is meaningful for almost all pre-service social studies teachers who participated in the research. In this respect, it is similar to the results of a study by Kearney (2004), which found that self-assessment skills can be developed through an SL-based course. In addition, practitioners who want to apply a more detailed self-assessment tool to understand SL are recommended to examine a study by Furco (1999), who has important studies in this field. In this context, it is recommended to carry out an individual assessment in addition to group assessment in the CSP course, focus on self-assessment in individual evaluations, and conduct research on self-assessment within the scope of the CSP course.

It is meaningful for pre-service social studies teachers to share the course evaluation system transparently in the CSP course during the first week. Many related studies (Küçükoğlu et al., 2010; Hoş-Ercin, 2011; Kesten, 2012; Korkmaz, 2015) have shown that pre-service teachers are not informed about the CSP course evaluation system, and it is strongly recommended that this information be provided in the first week. This research supports these studies and takes their suggestions into account. In addition, it is meaningful for pre-service social studies teachers that the evaluations of all participants made by the counselor are shared transparently with the entire class every week. It is not surprising that transparency makes sense for the participants. As emphasized in a previous study (Wiiand, 2005, as cited in Jonsson, 2014), transparency is essential for students because their ignorance of what is expected of them in the course can negatively affect their learning. In this context, it is recommended to share the evaluation system of the course in the first week of the CSP course and to continue this transparency in the remaining period. In addition, studies should be conducted on transparency within the scope of CSP courses.

A model such as PROFESS T is meaningful for the professional lives of almost all preservice social studies teachers. In this respect, it supports the results of a study (İzci, Göktaş, & Şad, 2014), which included pre-service social studies teachers among its participants and found that pre-service teachers had positive opinions about alternative assessment and evaluation tools. Again, this result is similar to that of another study (Akkuş, 2014), which found that pre-service social studies teachers had positive views on assessment and evaluation activities based on a constructivist approach. However, pre-service social studies teachers find themselves moderately competent in assessment and evaluation methods (Çalışkan et al., 2013). Therefore, action plans should be developed for this purpose.

4.1 Limitations and Future Directions

The use of PROFESS T as a classroom assessment tool in CSP courses is meaningful for pre-service social studies teachers. In this context, CSP course advisors should use this model example

in their courses. Different examples of classroom assessment models can be developed within the scope of the CSP course and in the context of relevant literature.

4.2 Conclusion

As a result of the research, an example of a classroom assessment model, each of which is meaningful, has emerged for pre-service social studies teachers within the scope of the CSP course.

5 Statement of Researchers

5.1 Researchers contribution rate statement

%100

5.2 Conflict statement

None

5.3 Support and thanks

None

References

- Akkuş, Z. (2014). Views of preservice teachers of social studies about the assessment and evaluation activities based on constructive approach. *The Journal of Selcuk University Social Sciences Institute*, 31. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/susbed/issue/61811/924670>
- Aslanoğlu, A. E. (2017). Assessment of the individual in a group: Peer and self-assessment. *Bogazici University Journal of Education*, 34(2). Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/buje/issue/37026/424752>
- Assessment for Learning Assessment Reform Group (2002). *Pamphlet assessment for learning—beyond the black Box*. <http://www.assessment-reform-group.org.uk>
- Aykırı, K. (2022). What is Not A Community Service Practices Course? A Review Of Existing Problems. *Journal of Education and New Approaches*, 5(2), 266-283. <https://doi.org/10.52974/jena.1215391>
- Ballard, S., M., & Elmore, B. (2009). A labor of love: constructing a service-learning syllabus. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 9(3),
- Bell, B., & Bronwen, C. (2001). *Formative assessment and science education*. Kluwer Academic.
- Brookhart, M., S. (2001). Successful students' formative and summative uses of assessment information. *Assessment in Education Principles, Policy & Practice*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940123775>
- Çalışkan, H., Uymaz, M., & Tekin, D. (2013). The evaluation of the competency of social studies teachers candidates' regarding measurement and evaluation methods. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.14520/adyusbd.581>
- Community Volunteers Foundation (2013). *Üniversitelerde sosyal sorumluluk ve sosyal girişimcilik pilot projesi*. https://www.tog.org.tr/wpcontent/uploads/2019/01/2_Üniversitelerde_Sosyal_Sorumluluk_Rapor.pdf
- Costello, P., J., M. (2003). *Action research*. Continuum.

- Council of Higher Education/CHE (2011). *Community service practices directive*. <https://docplayer.biz.tr/405543-Topluma-hizmet-uygulamalari-yonergesi.html>
- Ekşi, Z., & Cinoğlu, M. (2012). An evaluation of the community service applications course. *Manisa Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(2). Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/cbayarsos/issue/4066/53629>
- Fritz, J., M. (2002). A little bit of sugar: Integrated service-learning courses. *Sociological Practice*, 4(1). <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43735969>
- Furco, A. (1999). *Self-assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service-learning in higher education*. <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen/12>
- Gelmez-Burakgazi, S. (2018). Volunteering: Evaluation of community service learning program. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.17569/tojqi.410893>
- Glesne, C. (2015). *Introduction to qualitative research*. (Trans. Ed. A. Ersoy ve P. Yalçinoğlu). Anı Publishing.
- Gürol, A., & Özeran, M., G. (2010). *Determining the views on the implementation of the Community Service Practice course*. In the 9th National Primary Teacher Education Symposium (539-544). Elazığ.
- Hoş-Ercin, N. (2011). *Determination of lecrurers' and pre-services teachers' knowledge, skills and experiences about community service practise course*. [Unpublished master's thesis] Karadeniz Tecnical University, Institution of Education Sciences. [Thesis no: 300392].
- İzci, E., Göktaş, Ö., & Şad, S., N. (2014). Prospective teachers' views and perceived efficacy regarding alternative measurement and evaluation. *Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty*, 15(2). Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/kefad/issue/59460/854333>
- Jonsson, A. (2014). Rubrics as a way of providing transparency in assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.875117>
- Kaf-Hasırcı, Ö., & Sarı, M. (2013). An analysis of instructors and teacher candidates' views on community service practices course in the context of democratic citizenship education. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, 3(5), 25-42. Retrieved from <https://www.ijocis.com/index.php/ijocis/article/view/97>
- Kaye, C., B. (2014). *The complete guide to service learning*. Free Spirit Publishing.
- Kearney, K., R. (2004). Students' self-assessment of learning through service-learning. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 68(1). <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj680129>
- Kesten, A. (2012). Evaluation of the community service practices course from the perspective of teacher candidates and lecturers. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 12(3).
- Korkmaz, S. (2015). *Prospective english language teacher's views on the implemantation process and the outcomes of community service practices course*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Institute of Education Sciences. [Thesis no: 399330].
- Kop, Y. (2017). Encountered problems and solution recommendations about project development process at community service practices. In R. Efe et al., (Ed.) *Developments in Social Sciences*, 131-140. St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Kuran, K. (2013). Evaluation of the community service practices course according to the opinions of primary school teacher candidates. In the V. *International Türkiye Educational Research Congress (581-591)*. Çanakkale: Türkiye.

- Küçüköğlü, A. (2012). Service learning in Turkey: Yesterday and today. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.015>
- Küçüköğlü, A., Kaya, H. İ., Bay, E., Taşgın, A., & Ozan, C. (2010). Community service practices as an approach that supports social entrepreneurship and participation in teacher training. *II. International Türkiye Educational Research Congress*, 29 April-2 May. Antalya
- Metin, M. & Özmen, H. (2010). Prospective teachers' views about formative assessment. *Journal of National Education*, 40(187). Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/milliegitim/issue/36197/407045>
- Molaie, S., Raby, F., & Hartwell, L. M. (2016). A multiple-intelligence approach to creativity in ESP courses. *Etudes En Didactique Des Langues*, 27.
- Nicolaidou, I. (2012). Can process portfolios affect students' writing self-efficacy?. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2012.08.002>
- National Service-Learning Clearinhouse (2009). *K-12 service-learning project planning toolkit*. <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/20602092/k-12-service-learning-project-planning-toolkit-national-ffa>
- National Youth Leadership Council (2018). *The IPARD framework*. <https://gsn.nylc.org/clearinghouse/results?key=&type=&attrs=33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40>
- Özdemir, S. (2011). Evaluation of community service practices course in education faculties. *In International Higher Education Congress: New Trends and Challenges* 2217-2224.
- Robinson, M. (1995). Alternative assessment techniques for teachers. *Music Educators Journal*, 81(5). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3398853>
- Seban, D. (2013). Learning by serving society in teacher education according to advisor faculty members. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 42(2). Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/cuefd/issue/4136/54290>
- Settiawan, D., & Hilmawan, R. (2016). Increasing transparency in assessment to improve students' learning at Language Development Centre of UIN Suska Riau. *In PROSIDING ICTTE FKIP UNS 2015*, 364–368.
- Silveira, J., M., Beaugard, J., & Bull, T. (2017). Development of the processfolio: Promoting preservice music teacher reflection through authentic assessment. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 27(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083717697632>
- Uçan, Y., E., Yiğit, A., Toprak, E., & Tabak, G. (2009, Ekim). Evaluation of the community service practices course according to the opinions of pre-service teachers. *18th National Educational Sciences Congress*. Aydın: Türkiye.
- Yanık, F. (2019). *Determination of social responsibility levels of candidates teacher taking community service practices course and evaluation of their views about the course*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Atatürk University, Institute of Education Sciences. [Thesis no: 584749].
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences*. Seçkin Publishing.
- Wolfe, R., E. (2013). Process-folios: Peeking into a student's head. <https://studentsatthecenterhub.org/resource/process-folios/>