The handle  http://hdl.handle.net/1887/46245 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Gysling, J.
Title: La evaluación : ¿dispositivo para promover el aprendizaje de todos o para seleccionar? : la formación de profesores en evaluación en Chile
Issue Date: 2017-02-28
Propositions
Jacqueline Gysling

1. Changes can currently be observed in assessment teacher education, with a move from a specialised and fragmented subject towards combining assessment with teaching course. This recalls the way in which teachers were trained in the first half of the twentieth century.

2. Academics indicate that the theoretical approach according to which assessment is tackled is constructivist and that its formative function is emphasised. However, the course’s practical emphasis is on the design of assessment instruments and not on descriptive feedback for students, with the latter being a fundamental element of formative assessment.

3. Assessment courses’ practical dimension is restricted to the design of assessment instruments, but these are not applied, which means they are not validated empirically and the information about learning obtained from their application is not analysed. Teaching students are not prepared to observe levels of understanding or the development of capacities and competences, with only the assessment of correct replies being favoured indirectly.

4. During their experience at schools, future teachers have to adapt to the establishment’s rules, carrying out traditional, summative assessments with the aim of awarding marks. In the practicum, there is no room for innovation or to learn in action from what was taught theoretically at university, making the practical weaknesses of training worse.

5. Three main statements organise the meanings of assessment for teaching academics and students: assessment is a process, assessing is not about giving marks and assessment must be fair. Based on this, future teachers believe that the best assessment method is the informal one, which is completely immersed in the process and has no negative consequences for pupils. Research shows that this informal practice can be arbitrary and reproduce social differences.

6. The understanding of assessment incorporates recognition of diversity as a new horizon for justice. This means to value the diversity of instruments, the very adaptation of these to the context and the legitimacy that is assigned to manipulating marks when faced with the failure of any one student.

7. National tests are rejected because they transgress the vision held of assessment. These are external to the teaching process, evaluate a fraction of the school curriculum, are standardised and are therefore not pertinent to the diversity of social contexts and students.

8. The predominant meanings that teaching academics and students attribute to assessment generally coincide among universities and degree programs. The main differences arise between students and academics, with students being more critical than their teachers of formal assessment procedures and national tests. As a result, the new generation of teachers will be more critical of state agencies’ actions on assessment.

9. There is a structural tension in education between formative purposes (aimed at giving all students the chance to learn) and the selective purposes of the system. In teacher education, this tension is expressed through the educational vision that universities communicate and the selective practices that are carried out where practical experience is done.

10. Despite future teachers’ strong criticism of assessment, it is highly unlikely that they will be able to innovate in practice, since they have not been prepared to do so. It is more likely that they will reproduce the system’s dominant practices, thus making the trivialisation of assessment worse.