Psicologia Escolar e Educacional

PAPER

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2175-35392021210204

Elocation - e210204

LEARNING EVALUATION IN THE PSYCHOLOGICAL FIELD AT UNIVERSITY - A CRITICAL OVERLOOK

Deisy Krzemien[1]; Lidia Pietrantuono[1]; Maria Marta Yedaide[2]

SUMMARY

Assessing university evaluation entails important pedagogic dimensions, especially in regard to ethical and political matters. In this text evaluation proposals in a university context are analyzed through document analysis of the syllabi, and underlying pedagogical assumptions are questioned. By means of a descriptive, cross-sectional and qualitative study, professors in charge of three courses in the Psychology Area of the Occupational Therapy Program were interviewed, and their instruments for planning and assessment analyzed. The contents resulting from these instances seem to indicate that the exam is a privileged instrument of evaluation to certify allegedly acquired knowledge. Although the discourse and plans prioritize a constructivist and formative perspective – and both process evaluation and student autonomy are fostered—the assessment instruments continue to adhere to a traditional quantitative perspective, focused on results. However, other learning activities do provide opportunities for the students to develop adequate metacognitive skills, though they are not taken into account for the final grade.

Keywords: evaluation; university education; teaching psychology

Evaluación universitaria del aprendizaje en el área psicológica - una mirada crítica

RESUMEN

Mirar críticamente la evaluación en la Universidad compromete dimensiones pedagógicas sustantivas, especialmente en atención a las consecuencias ético-políticas. En este trabajo se analizan las propuestas de evaluación del aprendizaje en el contexto universitario según se expresan en los Planes de Trabajo Docente y se reflexiona sobre los supuestos pedagógicos allí comprometidos. Mediante un estudio descriptivo, transversal y cualitativo, se entrevistó a profesores a cargo de tres asignaturas del área psicológica de la carrera Terapia Ocupacional, y se analizaron los instrumentos docentes de planificación y evaluación utilizados. Los contenidos co-producidos en estas instancias sugieren que el examen constituye un instrumento privilegiado de evaluación que otorga la acreditación de los conocimientos adquiridos. Si bien el discurso y los planes priorizan una perspectiva constructivista y formativa – y se evidencia énfasis en el proceso e interés en las devoluciones y creciente autonomía de los estudiantes – los instrumentos de evaluación para la calificación continúan adheridos a una perspectiva tradicional cuantitativa enfocada en los resultados. Sin embargo, se usan en combinación con otras producciones estudiantiles que sí logran coherencia con perspectivas epistemológicas y teóricas vigentes, aunque sin intervenir en la acreditación definitiva de las asignaturas.

Palabras clave: evaluación; docencia universitaria; psicología

Avaliação universitária da aprendizagem na área psicológica - um olhar crítico

RESUMO

Olhar criticamente a avaliação na Universidade compromete dimensões pedagógicas substantivas, especialmente em atenção às consequências ético-políticas. Neste estudo analisam-se as propostas de avaliação da aprendizagem no contexto universitário segundo se expressam nos Planos de Trabalho Docente e faz-se uma reflexão sobre os pressupostos pedagógicos ali comprometidos. Mediante um estudo descritivo, transversal e qualitativo, entrevistaram-se professores responsáveis por três disciplinas da área psicológica da carreira Terapia Ocupacional e analisaram-se os instrumentos docentes de planejamento e avaliação utilizados. Os conteúdos produzidos em parceria nestas instâncias sugerem que o exame constitui um instrumento privilegiado de avaliação que outorga a acreditação dos conhecimentos adquiridos. Entretanto, o discurso e os planos priorizam uma perspectiva construtivista e formativa – e evidencia-se ênfase no processo e interesse nas devoluções e crescente autonomia dos estudantes – os instrumentos de avaliação para a qualificação continuam aderidos a uma perspectiva tradicional quantitativa focada nos resultados. Entretanto, são usados em combinação com outras produções estudantis coerentes com perspectivas epistemológicas e teóricas vigentes, ainda que sem intervir na acreditação definitiva das disciplinas.

Palavras-chave: avaliação; docência universitária; ensino de psicologia

[1] Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata – CONICET – Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud y Trabajo Social – Mar Del Plata – Buenos Aires – Argentina; deisykrzemien@gmail.com; pietrantuono.lidia1@gmail.com

[2] Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata – Facultad de Humanidades y la Facultad de Arquitectura, Urbanismo y Diseño – Mar Del Plata – Buenos Aires – Argentina; myedaide@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Assessment in higher education is a complex, diverse and controversial process that is often identified with the accountability of knowledge, although it should not be reduced to it. Such accountability usually corresponds to the legitimacy of knowledge provided for in the curriculum, and responds to institutional demand; it is usually carried out through an examination, which is still the privileged resource of the teacher (Celman, 2004; Alvarez Mendez, 2001).

When accountability is overrated, it leads exclusively to the alleged verification of the knowledge acquired. In this sense, both the students and the professors privilege passing instead of knowing, collaborating with the consequent handicap of the value of learning, centralizing and directing teaching to those contents that are subject to examination, and promoting limited learning. The students eventually become objects of such assessment, and little room is made for teachers to reflect on the evaluation procedures and implementation. Boud and Falchikov (2007) point out that when the dominant assessment practice in higher education emphasizes the evaluation of content and goals achieved, it focuses on demonstrating the student's current knowledge by providing information for academic accountability but often results restrictive and insufficient in providing material for the assessment of the work itself, and that of the students, and in preparation for performance in different fields of professional work.

However, when evaluation is considered as part of the process of knowledge construction, in the context of a teaching proposal, both the student and the teacher are involved (Boud, 2000; Litwin, 1998). Assessment is then considered as a means of building knowledge and, at the same time, teaching practice is optimized, which in turns enhances student performance (Celman, 1998).

The evaluating activity is closely linked to the conception of teaching processes and that of learning, and is a source of knowledge on a formative bias (Alvarez Méndez, 2001). Evaluating with formative intent is not comparable to qualifying, correcting, accounting, and passing; although paradoxically these are activities that have to do with evaluation, they cannot be confused with it, since evaluation transcends them. Evaluating should not only involve a retroactive aspect (negative feedback, such as error correction or inadequacies) but also a proactive character (encouraging positive feedback in terms of guidelines for performance improvement or optimization).

We have said that the evaluation of student learning in the history of higher education has followed a tradition whose primary objective has been to verify acquired knowledge. However, since the last decades, a paradigmatic transformation has been taking place in the conception of university evaluation. As Casassus (2002a, 2002b) says, it is a paradigm shift in education at the level of learning, the curriculum and evaluation. Actually, an epistemological transformation has occurred, moving away a positivist, objective, quantitative and empiricist perspective towards constructivist, interpretive and socio-critical approaches (Gimeno Sacristán & Pérez Gómez, 1989). This coincides with the influence of the cognitive paradigm revolution, since the mid-20th century, and the transition from a behavioral perspective to a genetic-constructivist and socio-cultural one, for which the student has an active role in the construction process of knowledge within a matrix of dialogical, dialectical and cooperative work exchange, in order to achieve meaningful learning (Coll, 2004). This paradigmatic renewal in education transcends the perspective focused on the result and the accountability of learned knowledge, towards an approach focused on the process and on the articulation between previous and new knowledge. However, teachers' implicit pedagogical representations and assumptions about teaching and evaluation do not often correspond to the constructivist perspective, but rather respond to direct positivist approaches (Silva, Fossatti, & Sarmento, 2011). Educational intervention modalities and the privileged use of positivist assessment instruments still prevail in teaching practices.

Álvarez Méndez (2009) reveals the distance between the preparation of evaluations, as they are intended, and the level of practice, as they are specified. The purposes and conceptions that are part of the development plan refer to the continuous, systematic, flexible, orienting activity of learning and teaching, personalized and formative at the service of educational practice. In practice, teaching, learning and evaluation are compartmentalizing, and great importance is attached to the exam as a control and selection mechanism that responds to academic interests. The traditional exam has traditionally constituted an "objective" tool allowing the justification of academic success or failure. However, we know that the achievement of high academic grades is not always proof of effective learning, conceptual integration and the application of knowledge. Besides, in everyday practice the student continues to be the main object of evaluation, as he remains subjected to a hierarchical power relationship which allows the teacher to attribute and catalog with certain arguments. The prevalent correction criteria are the evidence of a minimum content acquisition, success in solving tasks, and the rates resulting from the comparison between the highest and lowest level reached, assuming that such consideration contemplates an objective and fair criterion, which considers the efforts made, wielding a particular interpretation of the evaluator. A change of perspective implies, among other issues, the inclusion

of other protagonists, and an earnest questioning about the educational assumptions implied in evaluation.

Thus, in university learning evaluation, more researchers insist on a renewed evaluation policy and practice in universities, which can be based on student participation. The interest is aimed at developing in students the ability to regulate their own learning processes through active participation in evaluation procedures (Boud & Associates, 2010; Boud & Falchikov, 2007; Carless, Joughin, & Mok, 2006; Ibarra Sáiz, Rodríguez Gómez, & Gómez Ruiz, 2012; Rodríguez Gómez, 2009). Over the last decades, the discussion and research work in university evaluation have been oriented to perceiving a student with autonomy in his learning process, capable of critical thinking and academic lucidity, and oriented towards the profile of the expected university graduate. In this sense, recent learning approaches propose students as the main characters of their learning process, promoting participatory methodological strategies such as collaborative learning, strategic learning, or problem-based learning. It thus seems necessary to renew the teaching planning and the evaluation practices according to the introduction of student participation in the evaluation procedures, to favor the self-regulation of learning, and to redirect decisions towards the scope of educational goals. The aim is to make the assessment activity a learning activity. Carless (2007) refers to "learning-oriented assessment" (p. 57) in an attempt to reconcile formative and summative evaluation, and focuses all assessments on the development of the student´s productive learning. For him and his colleagues, learning-oriented assessment comprises three interconnected dimensions: assessment tasks as learning tasks, student participation in assessment, and the implementation of feedback loops (Carless, Joughin, & Mok, 2006).

Coll, Rochera Villach, Mayordomo Saíz, and Naranjo Llanos (2007) present an integrated system of continuous and formative assessment to obtain better evidence of the students' knowledge and skills that facilitates the monitoring and support of the learning processes. Inspired by a socio-constructivist approach that postulates the link between teaching-learning-evaluation, the design combines activities organized in thematic blocks to obtain information about the understanding, application, and use of knowledge in diverse contexts. This alternative system is a suitable instrument to demonstrate the learning processes and manage the help of the students. The assessment approach is inherent to learning, which is why the applied assessment instrument is at the service of the student's learning processes, and the teacher can promote the necessary help to regulate these processes.

Despite the contributions of pedagogical approaches, university evaluation in the national context does not seem to capitalize on these new concepts, but follows historically shaped and naturalized trends, which have not been subjected to epistemological inquiries about their validity and relevance (Celman, 2004). In the field of higher education and the context of the state public university, there is a coexistence of conceptions that respond both to academic demands and to consider evaluation as a key function in the educational process (Rueda Beltrán & Torquemada González, 2008). In university evaluation, several questions should be considered, for example: who is evaluated, the criteria and instruments used, how results are analyzed, the cognitive and metacognitive abilities of the student and the pedagogical assumptions regarding evaluation which become involved. In this sense, teachers orient their work based on decisions about the conceptions they have about what teaching and learning are, and the nature of the knowledge that students must acquire concerning professional training. There is a set of explicit and implicit assumptions on which each teacher relies to construct explanations of the processes and functions related to the pedagogical intervention (Camilloni, 1998), and that condition the design of the assessment instruments.

This study aims to clarify the epistemological and theoretical assumptions and the pedagogical perspectives of professors of subjects in the Psychology area of the Undergraduate Course in Occupational Therapy at the School of Health Sciences at the State University of Mar del Plata, Argentina, as well as to analyze the assessment practices in the teaching plans of particular subjects.

METHODOLOGY

Design and sample

A cross-sectional descriptive study was conducted using qualitative methodology, carried out during 2011 and 2012. The design included a "multiple case study" (Rodríguez Gómez, Gil, & García, 1999, p. 96), using the following data collection sources: 1. Primary sources: data obtained through individual interviews with teachers, in order to learn about the epistemological-theoretical assumptions and pedagogical perspectives regarding learning assessment to which they adhere. The cases were three full professors in the Psychology area in charge of the General Psychology, Personality Psychology, and Developmental Psychology Chairs. The interview was conducted in a 45-minute session. Secondary sources: a) the Teaching Work Plans (PTD) of the Psychology area of the Undergraduate Course in Occupational Therapy at the School of Health Sciences at the State University of Mar del Plata, Argentina, and b) evaluation instruments. These documents were contemporary with the research process and

in accordance with the internal regulations of this University (Higher Council Ordinance No. 690/93 and modifying OCS No. 483/05).

Data analysis technique and procedure

A qualitative analysis was carried out using content analysis of the data produced in the interviews. We thus constructed units of meaning that proved relevant to the object of our interest, following the recommendations of Rodríguez, Gil and García (1999), and Miles and Huberman (1994). These focus on the identification of categories and propositions from an empirical information base (Sirvent, 2005). Synthetically, this analysis includes reduction of data, their arrangement and transformation, and the interpretation and formulation of conclusions. An interpretative and contextualized perspective was also used to analyze evaluation documents, instruments, and the courses' work plans, following these variables: 1. Evaluation practices and outcome assessment: criteria, design, scales, types of evaluation, co-evaluation, and self-evaluation, 2. Evaluation instruments (exams, reports, activities, tasks), and 3. Pedagogical perspectives and theoretical and epistemological assumptions.

RESULTS

1. Evaluation practices and outcome assessment:

From the analysis of the Teaching Plans, it was observed that the courses in the Psychology area consider three types of outcome, summative assessmen7, according to the aforementioned academic regulations in force:

- A "Regular" scheme, which requires a final examination, demands an 80- percent attendance of some classes, passing two exams or their respective make-up tests with a grade of 4 points on a scale from 0 to 10, and complying with a requested Task in due time and form.
- A "Direct" passing scheme that requires 80 percent attendance but in all classes, succeeding in obtaining 6 or more points (on the scale 0-10), and complying with the requested Task in due time and form.
- A "Free" scheme that allows the students to sit for both a written and an oral exam, which they must pass with a grade of 4, with no need of having attended the course.

In each type, especially the first two, the activities proposed are related to the contents developed during the course and to the socio-constructivist conception of learning prioritized in the chairs, emphasizing, in the evaluation instances, processes of comprehension, elaboration, relation, analysis, and synthesis. However, in assessing performance, the written or oral exam is not always related to this perspective.

As for the criteria involved in the evaluation, these are varied (quantitative and qualitative, of diverse cognitive complexity) and seldom exposed to the students, though in some opportunities shared after the evaluation. Co-evaluation is non-existent in the cases studied. Teachers define the designs of the evaluations, the criteria, the tasks, the form of performance measurement, and guide the student's self-evaluation. It is observed that teachers consider the students' training needs, their conditions, and difficulties in learning specific contents, but do not usually involve them actively in the evaluation process.

The chairs considered different evaluation options:

- Periodic evaluation, employing mid-term exams during the course that include the topics and bibliography developed in class;
- Continuous evaluation, considering the fulfillment of the proposed activities. Through practical assignment resolution, students are encouraged to make individual and group reviews that allow self-evaluation and reflection on their learning. The professors recognize that this serves as a reference for the students and the professorship to confront objectives and achievements obtained, allowing adjustments;
- Final evaluation. Students who have fulfilled the requirements to pass the course in its traditional modality have access to the final exam.

After each evaluation, the teachers provide feedback on the exams and the practical activities. The purpose of this feedback is to make the students aware of the level of their production according to expectations, and to encourage the improvement of their performance by pointing out errors, omissions, inadequacies, confusions about what would be an optimal production.

2. Evaluation instruments

The exam is the main instrument for the assessment of learning in the courses analyzed. The grade is numerical and defines if the course is passed. In the documents considered in this study, the criteria adopted by teachers regarding correction and grading are not made explicit. The exam as a learning evaluation instrument responds to a traditional modality of evaluating students. In its formulation, emphasis is placed on the content selection to be evaluated, assessing the conceptual relevance and theoretical basis. The number of questions is related to the time available for its completion. The criteria for weighting the relative value of each of the items are not stated. The formulation of the instructions demands an elementary

resolution, requiring mainly elementary cognitive skills to define, differentiate, compare and expose. These items do not contemplate the development of complex, analytical, or dialectical thinking, nor do they require the students to elaborate answers that account for the constructive process of knowledge and the development of complex metacognitive skills. Disciplinary knowledge and specific content concerning the professional profile seem to prevail over the exercise of metacognitive skills that reveal the capacity for creativity, originality, and critical thinking. Although the teaching plans speak in favor of the construction of knowledge and an active role of the student in the learning process, there is a notorious inconsistency between the stated pedagogical purposes and the concrete actions when evaluating. In practice, results and the accomplishment of academic success according to certain standards are more important, both in the privileged use of the exam and the fulfillment and approval of activities, which reduces the formative and procedural potential.

Still, other evaluation instruments, such as participant observations, thematic reports, or oral expositions, are also used. These alternative instruments do not influence the final grade of the subject, for which the exam and its numerical grade are a priority. However, the use of these instruments is in line with the theoretical-pedagogical perspectives of the Plans. Assessment by means of these alternative instruments praises cooperative work, ethical positioning in a pre-professional intervention, use of appropriate terminology, bibliographic search skills, theoretical-empirical articulation, analysis based on what has been observed in reality, level of oral presentation through a group colloquium, and finally, the level of reflection on what has been experienced through the development of the work, all integrated. Here, the expression of thought through arguments, reasoning, and explanations, which is expected to help students achieve greater awareness of their knowledge, is encouraged. Teachers recognize that these evaluation activities awaken interest and motivation in their students, who assume an active role in the practical development activities, using different technological devices.

3. Pedagogical perspectives of evaluation and the theoretical and epistemological assumptions involved

The teacher's pedagogical perspective of learning assessment of the Psychology courses under analysis responds to a socio-constructivist approach. This is observed in the teaching plans and the implementation of educational activities. However, the teachers' representation of learning assessment and the design of the instruments implemented respond to a traditional positivist and quantitative approach that privileges result over constructive learning processes. The professors recognize that the epistemological assumptions, assessment types, and criteria applied are not discussed in the teaching team meetings, and the decision falls on the professor in charge of the course.

DISCUSSION

Evaluation in university history and the local context has followed guidelines based on ideas of the positivist tradition, and whose objective still is the verification of acquired knowledge. Although the types of assessment at university have been an object of study during the last decades, the reflection on the evaluation criteria, learning accountability, and the pedagogical and theoretical assumptions that sustain them is discontinuous, and discussion has remained implicit in a regional context. For the courses addressed in this study, reflection on learning assessment is a response to the research interest.

From the documentary analysis and interviews conducted with professors of the Psychology area at the Undergraduate Course in Occupational Therapy at the School of Health Sciences at the State University of Mar del Plata, Argentina, it is concluded that there is a disarticulation between the educational work proposals and their implementation in the practices of evaluation. It is also possible to notice that the criteria involved in the assessment are not sufficiently transparent. The pedagogical practices and proposals show little student participation in the evaluation process.

Even if teacher-student feedback circuits are enabled in the correction phases of exams, so that the students get better prepared for successive tests, the students are not usually involved in the procedures and establishment of evaluation criteria, which are not explicit in the teaching plans.

The predominant evaluation resource continues to be the traditional exam designed and controlled by the teacher. At the end of the process, teachers offer self-evaluation opportunities. This happens once the grade has already been defined. There are no discussion and consensus through co-evaluation.

In many cases, the teachers expect their students to understand the reasons that support the corrections and to perform self-assessment, and so they share the ideal answers to each evaluated items and highlight errors or insufficiencies. This shows that collaborative work has limitations to favor a constructive learning process based on error and the proactive character (positive feedback) of evaluation.

The exam is still a privileged instrument in higher education that, using a quantitative criterion, secures accountability of acquired knowledge. However, it lacks information about how the student learns.

As both disciplinary literature and experience show, although the exam is an academically required act, it could also serve formative purposes. The exam can provide information about students' skills and

learning strategies; the constructive process of acquiring knowledge could be emphasized, progress in learning could be visible, and self-evaluation could be promoted.

This would be particularly simple in the context analyzed, since professors in the Psychology area use instruments associated with fieldwork. These instruments allow the students to assume a leading role, favoring critical and constructive reflection on learning, and constitute a suitable means of evaluation, revealing the progress achieved while enabling an assessment of the effective intervention. Besides, teachers value active student participation, exchange of ideas, and cooperative activity in the classroom.

We claim that it is paramount to foster the dialogic interaction whereby the constructive processes that the students carry out become explicit. Timely and guiding pedagogical interventions that stimulate learning and increase the effectiveness of the teaching function are desirable.

In Boud and Associates' (2010) proposal regarding the reformulation of university assessment, evaluation tasks should be meaningful learning activities that require student involvement. These activities should be designed in a constructive, organized, and coherent sequence that allows the development of skills to assess one's work.

The design of the evaluation instruments, the formulation of the instructions, the type of grading scale, the definition of its levels, the accountability criteria, they must all be submitted to critical reflection and epistemological and methodological vigilance to contribute to the interpretation of the academic achievements and difficulties in the learning process. Moreover, the pedagogical purpose, the educational processes, and the cognitive skills that the teacher intends to promote should define the selection of the nature and design of the evaluation instrument and not the other way around.

Finally, we believe that the application of various instruments has the advantage of contemplating the heterogeneity of the classes, given the interindividual variability in the acquisition of learning, the variety of interests and psychosocial skills, the instrumental resources, and the cultural diversity with which the teacher is confronted in the field of higher education.

CONCLUSIONS

As teachers, we can adhere to a socio-constructivist and critical conception of learning; if so, we should be promoting cognitive exercises in different activities, instead of filing information to be retrieved. To achieve this, evaluation needs to transcend the current interest in accountability and become part of the teaching and learning processes. Assessment will become coherent with this pedagogical presupposition when teaching promotes participation, reciprocity, and dialogue. Indeed, Gimeno Sacristán (1996) points out that the possibilities for assessment to function as an integrated part of these processes will depend on the specific pedagogical activities practiced and linked to teaching planning. Often, teaching has been focused on the selection of relevant content to teach, examining student performance while neglecting the metacognitive skills required in the construction of knowledge, and the production of constructive resolutions that lead to student´s autonomy in learning.

From a holistic point of view, the essence of learning consists in the development and modification of psychological and behavioral processes that involve cognitive, affective, volitional, and sociocultural aspects (Gómez Carmona, 2009). In the process of studying and learning, even in the field of higher education, the student not only learns the knowledge, skills, information, and resources related to the professional and disciplinary field but also develops skills and abilities, attitudes, volitional traits, strategies, and aptitudes are formed, specific to the entire vital domain (Gómez Carmona, 2009). For this reason, it is appropriate to review the paradigmatic approaches to learning assessment and assessment instruments used to focus on the skills they promote.

Besides the content selection and the consideration of the exam as an assessment instrument, we should reflect on the skills required to solve it. The question should be on how much information the test provides about the understanding of the content acquired and how it has been learned. In the traditional model, educational assessment instruments are used to collect information about what the student knows according to a given task. If, on the other hand, we endorse an innovative proposal of learning-centered assessment, the emphasis will be on how one learns and what skills and strategies are into play. If this knowledge is also made accessible to students, they will accept responsibility for the process itself. It will involve power-sharing and shared responsibilities.

Clearly, the exam is not a neutral instrument; it is also an axiological, intentional, evaluative activity that concentrates and distributes power. When the exam integrates the teaching plan as a resource for knowledge construction and as an instrument of self-evaluation, it becomes "meaningful evaluation" (Anijovich, 2010), and generates political learning regarding authority and power (Álvarez Méndez, 2002).

Generally, the application of a grading system is based on the comparison of achievements between students or in reference to some guidelines established by the teacher. We believe it is best to remove any system that comes from the comparison among students; the evaluation process should consider the students' performance and the degree of progress in

the learning process. Therefore, the evaluation should include information on the strategies used and allow recognition of the resources involved. In this way, the assessment would become a helpful resource for learning.

The importance lies in the students´ ability to become aware of the effective procedures that allow them to achieve meaningful learning and incorporate what is new according to their interests. According to this, students will plan actions, select study strategies according to the task, and self-supervise their production, understanding performance. In order to understand how a student solves learning questions and the learning strategies involved in the evaluation process, teachers should consider not only the content but also the resources implemented to reach the answers.

The term learning strategies refer to conscious and intentional actions that help knowledge construction (Celman 2004; Camilloni, 1998). The strategies constructed by the student have been learned in the formal educational context. According to this, strategies review in the same context could be helpful to deconstruct some of them.

Likewise, we concluded that different instruments should be applied to facilitate co-evaluation and self-evaluation, promoting transparency in evaluation criteria and the exercise of students' metacognitive skills. The objective pursued is an evaluation of the service of learning in which teacher and student are involved. In this sense, the evaluation will have the intention of optimizing learning. This intention will imply the teacher's effort to break redundant routines, naturalized modalities, and will revise pedagogical assumptions that underlie the assessment practice, as instituted and formalized evaluation habits are uprooted both for the teachers and the students. Therein lies the true innovative challenge in assessment (Mateo, 2000).

Finally, we understand that the value of these conclusions lies in the closeness that it is possible to establish between the participants and the context of the pedagogical practice itself. Far from pretending to represent all university higher education or to formulate generalizations, the intention is to promote deep reflection, which will allow us to analyze our teaching practices and how they support the educational interests we pursue in educational processes. We are hopeful about future research on pedagogical assumptions, which may further address evaluation instruments and strategies and their relationship with the learning processes.

REFERENCES

Álvarez Méndez, J. M. (2001). *Evaluar para conocer, examinar para excluir*. Madrid: Morata.

Álvarez Méndez, J. M. (2009). La evaluación en la práctica del aula. Estudio de campo. *Revista de educación, 350*, 3351-3764.

Anijovich, R. (2010). *La evaluación significativa*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Boud, D. (2000). Sustainable Assessment: Rethinking assessment for the learning society, *Studies in Continuing Education, 22*(2), 151-167. doi: 10.1080/713695728

Boud, D.; Associates (2010). *Assessment 2020. Seven propositions for assessment for reform in higher education.* Sydney: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

Boud, D.; Falchikov, N. (Eds.). (2007). *Rethinking Assessment in Higher Education.* London: Routledge.

Camilloni, A. (1998). La calidad de los programas de evaluación y de los instrumentos que lo integran. In Camillloni, A.; Celman, S.; Litwin, E.; Palou de Maté, M. C. (Eds.), *La evaluación de los aprendizajes en el debate contemporáneo* (pp. 67-92). Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Carless, D. (2007). Learning-oriented assessment: conceptual bases and practical implications. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44*(1), 57-66.

Carless, D.; Joughin, G.; Mok, M. M. C. (2006). Learning-oriented assessment: Principles and practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *31*(4), 395–398.

Casassus, J. (2002a). Cambios paradigmáticos en educación. *Revista Brasileira de Educação, 20*, 48-59.

Casassus, J. (2002b). Problemas de la gestión educativa en América Latina. La tensión entre los paradigmas de tipo A y el tipo B. *Em Aberto*, *19*(75), 49-69.

Celman, S. (1998). ¿Es posible mejorar la evaluación y trasformarla en una herramienta de conocimiento? En Camillloni, A; Celman, S.; Litwin, E.; Palou de Maté, M. C. *La evaluación de los aprendizajes en el debate didáctico contemporáneo* (pp. 35-66). Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Celman, S. (2004). La evaluación democrática. Remando contra la corriente. *Voces,* 8(5), 15-32.

Coll, C. (2004). El análisis de los procesos de enseñanza y aprendizaje mediados por las TIC: una perspectiva constructivista. In Barberá, E.; Mauri, T.; Onrubia, J. (Eds.), *Como valorar la calidad de la enseñanza basada en las TIC* (pp. 47-60). Barcelona: Graó.

Coll, C.; Rochera Villach, M. J.; Mayordomo Saíz, R. M.; Naranjo Llanos, M. (2007). Evaluación continua y ayuda al aprendizaje. Análisis de una experiencia de innovación en educación superior con apoyo de las TIC. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Psicoeducativa, 5*(3), 783-804.

Gimeno Sacristán, J. (1996). La evaluación de la enseñanza. In Gimeno Sacristán, J.; Pérez Gómez, A. (Eds.), *Comprender y transformar la enseñanza* (5ª ed., pp. 334-394). Madrid: Ediciones Morata

Gimeno Sacristán, J.; Pérez Gómez, A. (1989). *La enseñanza: su teoría y su práctica.* Madrid: Akal.

Gómez Carmona, N. (2009) Los procesos psicológicos de aprendizaje, *Revista Digital: Innovación y experiencias*

educativas, *23*, 1-11.

Ibarra Sáiz, M. S.; Rodríguez Gómez, G.; Gómez Ruiz, M. A. (2012). La evaluación entre iguales: beneficios y estrategias para su práctica en la universidad. *Revista de Educación,* (359). doi: 10-4438/1988-592X-RE-2010-359-092

Litwin, E. (1998). La evaluación: campo de controversias y paradojas o un nuevo lugar para la buena enseñanza. In Camilloni, A.; Celman, S.; Litwin, E.; Palou de Maté, M. C. (Eds.), *La evaluación de los aprendizajes en el debate didáctico contemporáneo* (pp. 11-34). Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Mateo, A. J. (2000). *La evaluación educativa, su práctica y otras metáforas*. Universidad de Barcelona: ICE-HORSORI.

Miles, M. B.; Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2a. ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rodríguez Gómez, G. (2009). *EvalHIDA: Evaluación de Competencias con Herramientas de Interacción Dialógica Asíncronas (foros, blogs y wikis)*. Cádiz: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Cádiz. Recuperado el 20 de julio de 2011, http://www.tecn.upf.es/~daviniah/evalhida.pdf

Rodríguez Gómez, G.; Gil, J.; García, E. (1996). *Metodología de la investigación cualitativa.* Archidona, MA: Aljibe.

Rueda Beltrán, M.; Torquemada González, A. D. (2008). Las concepciones sobre "evaluación" de profesores y estudiantes: sus repercusiones en la evaluación del desempeño docente. *Reencuentro,* 97-112.

Silva, S.; Fossatti, P.; Sarmento, D. (2011). Teorias implícitas sobre o ensino e a aprendizagem. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional, 15*(2), 291-299.

Sirvent, M. T. (2007). *El Proceso de Investigación*. Buenos Aires: Investigación y Estadística I Cuadernos de la Oficina de Publicaciones de la Facultad de Filosofía y Letras (OPFYL). UBA.

Acknowledge:

CONICET (National Scientific and Technical Research Council) and SECyT- UNMDP (the Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata Science and Technology Secretariat).

This paper was translated from Spanhis by Maria Marta Yedaide

Received: August 01, 2018
Approved: April 20, 2020