JAMBI MEDICAL JOURNAL
Jurnal Kedokteran dan Kesehatan
p-Issn : 2339-269x
e-Issn : 2580-6874
Vol. 11, No. 4, November 2023
DOI: 10.22437/jmj.v11i4.23428
Journal homepage: https://online-journal.unja.ac.id/kedokteran

Original Article

The Correlation Of *Ujian Tahap Bersama (UTB)* With Grade Point Average (Gpa)

Nyimas Natasha Ayu Shafira[1], Risa Nabila[2], Susan Tarawifa[3]

[1,3]Lecturers of the Medical Study Program FKIK Universitas Jambi
[2] Student of the Medical Study Program FKIK, Universitas Jambi
E-mail Corresponding: nyimas_natasha@unja.ac.id

Article History:

Received May 22, 2023
Accepted Nov 23, 2023

Keyword:

Evaluation
Index Prestasi Kumulatif
Ujian Tahap Bersama
Medicine

ABSTRACT

Background: There are several assessments in medical education in Indonesia. Currently, as a formative assessment at the preclinical level, UTB (Ujian Tahap Bersama) is being proposed to control the quality of medical education graduates.

Objective: This study aims to determine the correlation between UTB scores and Grade Point Average (GPA).

Methods: This study was an analytic study with a cross-sectional design using a total sampling technique. The sample of this study was students participating in UTB Stage 1 or UTB Stage 2 at the Medical Study Program, Faculty of Medicine and Health Science Jambi University.

Result: The average UTB Stage I score was 36.83±8.86, and the average UTB Stage II score was 45.42±7.43. There was a correlation between UTB Stage I score and GPA ($p < 0.001$), with a coefficient correlation of 0.677. There was a correlation between UTB Stage II score and GPA ($p<0.001$), with a coefficient correlation of 0.575.

Conclusion: There was a strong correlation between UTB Stage I scores and GPA and a moderate correlation between UTB Stage II scores and GPA.

INTRODUCTION

Medical education in Indonesia is implemented based on the Standar Kompetensi Dokter Indonesia (SKDI). Based on SKDI, curriculum in medical education is a Competence-based Curriculum (KBK). The SKDI is also used as a reference in developing national doctor competency exams.[1–3] Evaluation in medical education is conducted through several stages of assessment. Assessment has a positive steering effect on learning and the curriculum. With an assessment, a student will know important things related to education and motivate the student to learn (assessment drives learning).[4]

The assessment also helps determine the student's final competence, which is described on SKDI.[5]

Assessment in medical education is conducted at various levels, namely: 1) low stakes assessment, which is an assessment that is usually being held at the academic and institutional stages by educational institutions, and 2) high stakes assessment, an assessment at the national level in the form of a competency exam for medical graduates who will work in the community.[6] In 2012, AIPKI region III, to be precise Universitas Gajah Mada (UGM), in collaboration with the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education (Kemenristek-Dikti), proposed Ujian Tahap Bersama (UTB) as a formative assessment to be held nationally. [7] This program is an effort to control the quality of graduates of medical education because the national board medical examination, called Ujian Kompetensi Program Profesi Dokter (UKMPPD), has only been held in one stage. [8]

The UTB will consist of three stages, two with a written exam method or Multiple Choice Question (MCQ) at the preclinical level. After completing clinical rotations, the final stage is an Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE). The stages in UTB can describe the student competency achievements while attending medical education. As with UTB, the Grade Point Average (GPA) also describes how students understand the materials they have learned. Currently, UTB has only been held in two stages and has not been used as a test that affects the assessment of students. [7] Preliminary data surveys show that the Medical Study Program, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Jambi University, has participated in the UTB trial since 2019, and there have been 456 students who have attended UTB. This study aims to determine the correlation between UTB scores and GPA at the Medical Study Program, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Jambi University.

METHODS

This research is an analytic study with a cross-sectional design. This research was conducted at the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Jambi University, in July-August 2022. The sample of this study was students participating in UTB Stage I in June 2019, February 2021, and July 2021 or UTB Stage II in December 2019 and January 2021. The sampling technique for this study used a total sampling technique.

RESULTS

Stage I UTB was held in June 2019, February 2021, and July 2021. The national average scores for each UTB period are different. In June 2019, the national average was 42.28. In February 2021, the national average was 42.20. In July 2021, the national average was 37.20. At the medical program at Jambi University, 107 (34.74%) out of 318 students scored above the national average. **(Table 1).**

Stage II UTB was held in December 2019 and January 2021. The national average scores for each UTB period are different. In December 2019, the national average was 45.70. In January 2021, the national average was 44.70. At UTB Stage II, 82 (60.30%) out of 136 students scored above the national average **(Table 2).** The average score for UTB Stage I was 36.83 ± 8.86. The average GPA of students participating in Stage I UTB was 3.14 ± 0.31. The average score for UTB Stage II was 45.42 ± 7.43. The average GPA of students participating in Stage II UTB was 3.29 ± 0.17 (**Table 3).**

Table 1. Frequency distribution of Stage I UTB values with the national average

Stage I UTB Value	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Period June 2019		
< 42.28	20	76.92
≥ 42.28	6	23.08
Total	26	100
Period February 2021		
< 42.20	94	69.63
≥ 42.20	41	30.37
Total	135	100
Period July 2021		
< 37.20	97	61.78
≥ 37.20	60	38.22
Total	157	100

Table 2. Frequency distribution of Stage II UTB values with the national average

Stage II UTB Value	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
December 2019 period		
< 45.70	17	36.69
≥ 45.70	32	65.31
Total	49	100
Period January 2021		
< 44.70	37	42.53
≥ 44.70	50	57.47
Total	87	100

In the correlation between UTB Stage I scores and GPA using the Spearman test, the p-value was 0.001 (p < 0.05), and the correlation coefficient (r) was 0.677. Therefore, it can be concluded that the UTB Stage I score is positively related (+) to the GPA score with a strong correlation. In the correlation between UTB Stage II scores and GPA, using the Pearson test, the p-value was 0.001 (p < 0.010), and the correlation coefficient value (r) was 0.575. Therefore, it can be concluded that the UTB score is positively related (+) to the IPK score with a moderate degree of correlation **(Table 4).**

Table 3. Overview of UTB and IPK values

	N	Means	*Std. Deviation*
UTB Score I	318	36.83	8.86
UTB II Value	136	45.42	7.43
IPK scores of students taking UTB I	318	3.14	0.31
IPK scores of students taking UTB II	136	3.29	0.17

In the correlation between UTB Stage I scores and IPK using the Spearman statistical test, a significance value of a small probability of 0.001 ($p < 0.05$) was found and the correlation coefficient (r) was 0.677. Therefore, it can be concluded that the UTB Stage I score is positively related (+) to the IPK score with a degree of strong correlation. In the correlation between UTB Stage II scores and IPK, it was found that the Pearson statistical test found a small probability significance value of 0.001 ($p < 0.010$) and the correlation coefficient value (r) was 0.575. Therefore, it can be concluded that the UTB score is positively related (+) to the IPK score with a moderate degree of correlation (**Table 4**)**.**

Table 4. Correlation of UTB scores with IPK scores

Variable	N	Average	Distribution Significance	*Significance of Correlation*	*Correlation Coeficient*
UTB Stage I	318	36.83 ± 8.86	0.200		
IPK	318	3.14 ± 0,31	0.005	< 0.001	0.677
UTB Stage II	136	45.42 ± 7.43	0.200		
IPK	136	3.29 ± 0,17	0.200	< 0,01	0.575

DISCUSSION

Nationally, the average UTB scores tends to be low. This may be caused by several factors, such as variations in the curriculum implementation in each medical faculty, which can lead to differences in learning material achievement from one medical faculty to another so that the competence of UTB participants is not homogeneous. The regulation UTB is still in the trial stage, which may also make some students not maximize their abilities in conducting exams so that the concept of assessment drives learning is not achieved. The different regulations between medical faculties have caused not all medical faculties encourage students to carry out UTB optimally. This can be seen in the participation of UTB participants who have not covered 100% of all medical faculties in Indonesia. [7]

The Dean Forum in July 2019 explained that out of 5971 students who filled out the UTB Stage 1 questionnaire, only 34% made special preparation (study) to participate in Stage I UTB. Based on questionnaire analysis, 92% of students could not work on some questions because they couldn't recall the learning material related to UTB questions. Based on questionnaire analysis, 45% of students could not work on the questions because the learning material related to the questions had not been taught. Some of the other challenges that students complained about were lack of time for preparation, anxiety, and stress because the questions were difficult to understand, lots of questions that made sleepy and sore eyes, and the exam was held at the same time with regular exam and regular OSCE at their faculty. [7] At the Medical Study Program Jambi University, 318 students took UTB Stage I with an average score of 36.83 ± 8.86, and 107 (33.64%) students scored above the national average. At Stage II UTB, 136 students took it with an average score of 45.42 ± 7.43, and 82 (69.49%) students scored above the national average. From the results of this study, it can be seen that from Stage I UTB, there are still many medical students who get

scores below the national average, although there is an increase from the average Stage I UTB Stage I to Stage II UTB. This may be due to the absence of a contribution from UTB scores to student assessments directly so that students tend not to prepare themselves. Another possible cause is the lack of preparation time for UTB and the absence of encouragement from the faculty.

The average GPA of students participating in Stage I UTB in this study was 3.14. Meanwhile, the average GPA of students participating in Stage II UTB was 3.29. It was stated that students who graduated could be considered competent as a doctor, indicating that the higher the GPA, the higher the individual quality as a doctor. [9] In the correlation between Stage I UTB scores and GPA, a significant correlation was obtained with a strong correlation (r=0.677). In the correlation between Stage II UTB scores and GPA scores, a significant correlation was obtained with moderate correlation strength (r=0.575). This means the higher the UTB score, the greater the student's GPA score.

Similar research by Khadafianto in 2021 revealed that UTB and the Progress Test (PT) are partially and simultaneously related to GPA. This research was conducted at the Universitas Islam Indonesia with a sample size of 324 students and found a moderate strength correlation between UTB and PT with GPA.[10]

The UTB is an exam held to determine student competency achievements at educational stages and is conducted nationally. The material tested in UTB has been studied in previous lectures. The study results found that the national average UTB score was still relatively low, so a review might be needed regarding the implementation of UTB and the factors that influenced the low UTB score.

CONCLUSION

A moderate to strong correlation was found between UTB scores and GPA in the medical study program at Jambi University.

REFERENCES

1. *Peraturan Menteri Riset, Teknologi dan Pendidikan Tinggi Republik Indonesia Nomor 18 Tahun 2015.*
2. *Konsil Kedokteran Indonesia (KKI). Standar Kompetensi Kedokteran Indonesia. 2012.*
3. *Konsil Kedokteran Indonesia (KKI). Standar Nasional Pendidikan Profesi Dokter Indonesia. AIPKI. 2019.*
4. *Amin Z, Seng CY, Eng KH. Practical Guide to Medical Student Assesment. Singapore: World Scientific; 2006.*
5. *Johan Bension Hutagalung, Farah Cristina Noya, Stazia Noija, Filda De Lima, Elpira Asmin. Evaluasi Capaian Kompetensi Pembelajaran Berbasis Komunitas Pada Mahasiswa Fakultas Kedokteran Universitas Pattimura. Molluca Medica. 2020;13(1):58–64.*
6. *DPR RI. Rancangan Undang Undang Tentang Pendidikan Kedokteran. 2021.*
7. *Gizela BA, Halleyantoro R, Shitarukmi S, Khoiriyah U, Suhoyo Y. Forum Dekan AIPKI 2019. In: Mencetak Dokter Yang Kompeten dan Berintegritas Melalui Pedidikan Yang Berkualitas [Internet]. Yogyakarta; 2019. Available from: https://fk.uii.ac.id/fordek2019/*

8. *Universitas Baiturrahmah FK. Ujian Tahap Bersama (UTB) Tahap I [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2022 Mar 24]. Available from: https://fk.unbrah.ac.id/uji-tahap-bersama-utb-tahap-i/*
9. *Rezki R, Asni E. Korelasi Indeks Prestasi Kumulatif Dengan Nilai UKMPPD CBT Periode November 2018 – Agustus 2019 Fakultas Kedokteran Universitas Riau. JIK. 2020;14(Maret 2020):36–41.*
10. *Khadafianto F. The Correlation of Regional Stage Exam (UTB) and Progress Test (PT) to Grade Point Average (IPK) of Medical Students at Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Islam Indonesia. Proc Int Conf Med Educ (ICME 2021). 2021;567(Icme):152–5..*