



Academic performance and formative and shared assessment in teacher education

El rendimiento académico y la evaluación formativa y compartida en formación del profesorado

- Miriam Molina-Soria** is a professor and researcher at Universidad de Valladolid (Spain) (España) (miriam.molina@uva.es) (<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2974-5535>)
- Cristina Pascual-Arias** is a professor and researcher at Universidad de Valladolid (Spain) (cristina.pascual@uva.es) (<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2781-5600>)
- Dr. Víctor Manuel López-Pastor** is a professor and researcher at Universidad de Valladolid (Spain) (Vlopez@mpc.uva.es) (<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2681-9543>)

Received: 2020-01-31 / Revised: 2020-06-06 / Accepted: 2020-06-08 / Published: 2020-07-01

Abstract

In the last decade a high interest is being aroused by the advantages that the application of a formative assessment seems to have in university teaching. The purpose of this study is to analyze whether the Formative and Shared Assessment in Pre-service Teacher Education helps students obtain better academic results. It's a case study is carried out with 37 students of the subject of Expression and Body Communication in Early Childhood Education in the fourth year of the Early Childhood Education Degree. Students can choose between three ways of learning and assessment: Continuous track, mixed track and final or non-face route. After the analysis of the official records of mark, the results obtained show that the Formative and Shared Assessment has influenced their academic performance, and the students who have opted for the continuous assessment pathway have obtained a better academic performance. Most students have opted for this way of learning and assessment. 97.3% of students have passed the subject and the average of the students' grades is remarkable. For this reason, it seems necessary to investigate further the topic with larger samples and, especially, in the face of the new situation of confinement and online teaching.

Keywords: Formative assessment, shared assessment, academic performance, pre-service teacher education, physical education, early childhood education.

Resumen

En la última década se está despertando un elevado interés por las ventajas que la aplicación de una evaluación formativa parece tener en la docencia universitaria. El presente estudio tiene como finalidad analizar si la Evaluación Formativa y Compartida en la Formación Inicial del Profesorado ayuda al alumnado a obtener mejores resultados académicos. Para ello se realiza un estudio de caso con 37 alumnos de la asignatura de Expresión y Comunicación Corporal en la Educación Infantil de cuarto curso del Grado de Educación Infantil. El alumnado puede elegir entre tres vías de aprendizaje y evaluación: Vía continua, vía mixta y vía final o no presencial. Tras el análisis de las actas oficiales de calificación, los resultados obtenidos muestran que la Evaluación Formativa y Compartida ha influido en su rendimiento académico, y el alumnado que ha optado por la vía de evaluación continua ha obtenido un mejor rendimiento académico. La mayoría del alumnado ha optado por esta vía de aprendizaje y evaluación. El 97.3% del alumnado ha superado la asignatura y la media de las calificaciones es de notable. Por esta razón, parece necesario investigar más a fondo el tema con muestras más grandes y, especialmente, ante la nueva situación de confinamiento y enseñanza on-line.

Descriptores: Evaluación formativa, evaluación compartida, rendimiento académico, formación inicial del profesorado, educación física, educación infantil.

1. Introduction and state-of-the-art

For years, the university professors in charge of Initial Teacher Training (ITT) is looking for a change in the assessment, seeking to move from “the exam culture” or “banking learning” to “culture of assessment” or “dialogical learning” (Dochy et al., 2002). The “exam culture” is a traditional methodology, based on the master lessons in which knowledge is focused on the teacher and only the final results are evaluated, while the “culture of assessment” aims to create assessment processes providing feedback to generate greater learning in students and improve the teaching-learning process; in this way, not so much importance is given to the grades (López-Pastor et al., 2020). Therefore, many authors consider that to improve the teaching-learning process, it is necessary to carry out processes of Formative and Shared Assessment (FSA) (Cañadas et al., 2018; Carter-Thuillier, 2015; Gallardo et al., 2019a; Gallardo et al., 2019b; López-Pastor et al., 2020; Romero-Martín et al., 2016), with a special attention on feedback and participation of students in the learning process (Biggs, 2005; Black & William, 2003; Boud, 2010; Boud & Falchikov, 2006; BrOwN & Glasner, 2003; Falchikov, 2005; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006).

According to Castejón et al. (2011), formative assessment focuses on improving learning teaching processes. In this sense, López-Pastor et al. (2020) state that formative assessment seeks to generate processes of improvement and learning in three ways: (a) improve the learning processes of students and the quality of their productions; (b) gradually improve the teaching practice; and (c) reconstruct the teaching-learning processes that are carried out in the classroom, throughout the subject and course by course.

López-Pastor and Pérez-Pueyo (2017) define shared assessment as the individual or group dialogues that are carried out between teachers and students about the teaching-learning processes previously conducted. The shared assessment promotes the participation of students in the assessment process and has shown that it also improves the learning process of students (Gallardo et al., 2019a; Carter-Thuillier, 2015; Moreno et al., 2019; López-Pastor & Pérez-Pueyo, 2017).

Currently, several studies defend the importance of student participation in assessment processes (Boud, 2010; Boud & Falchikov, 2006; BrOwN & Glasner, 2003; Falchikov, 2005; Ibarra et al., 2012; Herranz, 2013). In addition, López-Pastor and Pérez-Pueyo (2017) defend the participation of students in the assessment process through different techniques, which can be summarized in the following table (see table 1):

Table 1. Participation techniques of students in the evaluation (obtained from López-Pastor & Pérez-Pueyo, 2017)

Self-assessment	It is the assessment that a person performs on himself/herself. It can assess the process and/or the personal result obtained. This technique can be performed on an individual or group.
peer-assessment	It is the assessment between pairs (individually or in group).
shared assessment	Dialogue processes that are carried out between teachers and students on the teaching-learning processes previously conducted. It can be individual, in small groups or big groups.
Self grading	The student sets a grade he/she thinks the student deserves. It is important to establish qualification criteria by the teacher in advance. These criteria should be mentioned since the beginning of the subject and it is appropriate to agree with students.
Dialogue graded	It is the process that is carried out between teachers and students to discuss the final grade. To do this, it is also important that the qualification criteria are previously established. This process can be given individually, in small groups or in large groups.

Source: López-Pastor and Pérez-Pueyo (2017).



Some studies on the development of FSA experiences can be found in Latin America. Gallardo et al. (2017) review the perception of students, professors and graduates of a Chilean university about the possible application of such systems during the ITT. Subsequently, they investigate the extent to which the application of FSA systems influences the self-perception of competences acquired in ITT (Gallardo et al., 2018), as well as the advantages and disadvantages of applying this type of assessment in the ITT in Chilean universities (Gallardo et al., 2020). Additionally, Moreno et al. (2019) conduct a discursive study on the formative assessment and participation of students in a feedback activity at a public university in Mexico. Three categories of data analysis are performed: peer-assessment, peer-assessment, and self-assessment. The results show that students receiving feedback participate in their assessment by questioning and adding relevant data for a better learning.

There are studies that indicate that thanks to the implementation of FSA systems, students improve their academic performance (Angelini, 2016; Arribas, 2012; Gallardo et al., 2020; López-Pastor, 2008; Castejón et al., 2011; Fraile et al., 2013; Romero-Martín et al., 2014). It is understood that academic performance refers to the grades students get at the end of the subject.

López-Pastor (2008) conducts a case study in the ITT of physical education in which the author finds a high academic performance of the students. In addition, there are a number of reasons in this study that indicate why it is beneficial to implement FSA systems in the ITT: (a) because it allows to improve the teaching-learning processes, and as a consequence it increases their motivation and involvement in these processes; (b) because it is the most coherent assessment if active methodologies and systems focused on student learning are used; and (c) because these systems develop responsibility, autonomy and self-criticism in learning processes.

Castejón et al. (2011) conduct a study on the use of FSA systems in the ITT of physical edu-

cation to improve the academic performance of students from three Spanish universities through a descriptive statistical analysis. Students have the option to choose the learning process according to the type of assessment: continuous or final. The high attendance and participation of students in the assessment processes are very important to be able to carry out the continuous assessment. These authors conclude that the use of FSA can help achieve better academic performance for students who opt for continuous assessment, compared to students who choose the final assessment. On the other hand, Fraile et al. (2013) conduct a study to analyze the influence of FSA on ITT on the academic performance. A descriptive statistical analysis and ANOVAS are performed on academic performance data from 19 Spanish universities in 52 different subjects. Students are offered several means of assessment and the FSA vs mixed or final exam is compared. The percentages of students working in the subject developing FSA are 83% suitable (mostly notable), 8% did not present and 9% suspense. Therefore, the results obtained seem to indicate that students who chose FSA achieve better grades than students who opt for the final exam. In addition, in American universities, Boud and Falchikov (2006) conduct studies on the reliability of the participation processes of students in the assessment, obtaining positive results. Boud (2010) says it is good to involve students in their assessment process because it actively improves their learning.

On the other hand, Arribas (2012) conducts a study on academic performance according to the assessment system used, using a sample of 2192 students from fourteen Spanish universities. The results indicate that the assessment system used has an influence on the academic performance of students and that continuous assessment is the one that generates the best academic results. Likewise, Romero-Martín et al. (2014) analyze the influence of FSA on the ITT of fifteen Spanish universities, with a sample of 3625 students from 30 different subjects through a descriptive statistical analysis and ANOVAS.



The results presented indicate that students who experience FSA improve their academic performance and are satisfied with this type of assessment because they participate and their learning improves. Another study by Romero-Martín et al. (2015), analyze the divergences of teachers and students in the ITT after applying FSA, indicating that although the FSA is very demanding for students, the final grades of the subject were good.

Gallardo et al. (2020) conduct a study at a Chilean university on the perception of ITT students of physical education and professional training Technical University Sports on the FSA used in diversity care subjects. The results show that students positively value the FSA that has been carried out during the subjects, even though they consider that it requires mandatory attendance, continuity and greater time and effort. These drawbacks to the assessment system used are considered to be rewarded with greater learning and improved academic performance.

Lopez et al. (2016) state that the use of FSA is related to the use of active learning methodologies. In this sense, López-Pastor et al. (2020) highlight the importance of using active methodologies and FSA as an alternative to traditional methodologies, because it is the most logical assessment. According to Castejón et al. (2011), there seems to be a link between the use of active methodologies and FSA systems, since the professor and the student work together through constant feedback to improve the teaching-learning process: it guides the decision-making of professors and students, it regulates teaching actions, it establishes reflection-action cycles, etc.

Therefore, the main objective of this research is to analyze whether FSA in the ITT help students to obtain better academic results through the continuous learning compared to the final learning.

2. Materials and methods

The design of this research is a simple case study since only a case is analyzed in a group of stu-

dents. According to Martínez (2006), the case study method measures and records the behavior of people of the phenomenon that wants to be studied through a scientific rigor that demonstrates validity and reliability in the results. A case study is characterized by being a descriptive study that has a single sample, either a person or a group of people (Montero & León, 2005). This research will analyze a specific case of a single subject in a real ITT context.

The context in which this study is carried out is a Faculty of ITT in Segovia (Universidad de Valladolid, Spain), specifically in the subject of Expression and Body Communication in Early Childhood Education that takes place in the first semester of the 2019-2020 course. It is an optional subject of 6 ECTS credits (150 hours). The exhibition is composed of 37 students and fourth-year students of the Children's Education Degree and fifth year of the Joint Undergraduate Studies Program in Early Childhood and Undergraduate Education in Primary Education. Teacher degrees in Spain last four years and are equivalent to 240 ECTS credits. The Faculty of Education of Segovia offers two types: Degree in Early Childhood Education and Degree in Primary Education. In addition, a Joint Undergraduate Study Program in Early Childhood and Grade Education is offered for 5 years. In the last course of the degree, the student should choose the specialization, composed of five subjects specialized in the chosen subject. The specializations in the Degree of Early Childhood Education at this center are: (a) Expression and Artistic Communication and Motor Skills; and (b) Observation and exploration of the environment. The specialization for the Degree of Primary Education are: (a) Music Education; (b) Physical Education; and (c) Environment, Nature and Society.

The course is developed during thirteen weeks, scheduled from September to December. Two hours of practice, one hour of theory and one hour of seminary a week are taught. In Table 2, a forecast of students' dedication to the subject is developed.



Table 2. Student dedication hours to the subject

In-person activities	Hours	Remote activities	Hours
Theoretical-practical classes	30	Research and individual autonomous work	40
Practical classes in the classroom	23	Research and autonomous group work	40
Seminars	7		
Group tutoring			5
Evaluation			5
In-class total	60	Remote Total	90

Own elaboration

The study focuses on one of the results generated by the assessment system used, and it will be explained with more detail in this section of the context. When the organization of the subject is presented and explained the first day of class, students are offered three learning and assessment options: (a) continuous, (b) mixed and (c) through final or remote (see table 3). Students can choose the option that best suits their personal situation, although sometimes and depending on the subject, there are people who go continuously through the mixed option.

According to Castejón et al. (2011) and Biggs (2005), students choose the learning and assessment system in the context of active methodologies and FSA systems.

Table 3 presents the requirements that students must meet for each type of assessment, as well as the percentages on the final grade granted to each learning activity. It is important to note that, on the first day of class, students are discussed to see if they agree on the weighting of each activity on grading, or if they want to make any changes.

Table 3. Requirements for the different learning and assessment option and weighting in the final grade of the subject

Continuous	Mixed	Remote
Attendance to all classes (students can only miss 15% of classes if justified) Requires to present all the works of the subject There is a partial exam with peer-assessment	Attendance to all classes (students can only miss 15% of classes if justified) Requires to present all the works of the subject There is a partial exam with peer-assessment	Attendance is not mandatory Works are not presented Final exam: theoretical and practical
Weighting of the final grade		
Tutored Learning Project (TLP): 35% Dossier with notes and concept maps: 10% Session sheets: 20% Recensions and individual work (rehearsal, dialogical talks...): 15% 2nd exam with peer-assessment or peer evaluation: 20%	PAT: 30% Hands-on works: up to 20% 2 nd term exam with peer-assessment: 50%	TLP: 30% Final exam with a theoretical part (50%) and a practical part (20%) and the presentation of a report on the TLP that accounts for 30% on the final grade.

Own elaboration



Students have descriptive scales with the assessment and grading criteria for each learning activity. It is important to note that, in order to be able to approve, the student needs to overcome each section. All dedicated learning jobs and activities are returned corrected by the teacher within a week, and thanks to the feedback provided, students can improve the work in the same time frame.

On the continuous option, the students follow a continuous and formative process, with constant follow-up and feedback, without the need to take a final exam. On the mixed option, there are students who cannot attend 100% of the classes of the subject, but do perform work and follow the usual functioning of the classes. The final or remote option is for students who do not attend any class and have not done any learning work or activity; it is based on a final and summative assessment.

During the subject, different learning activities are carried out and these are briefly explained.

- **Tutored Learning Project (TLP):** is a group work in which each group chooses a topic from those provided by the teacher and texts are assigned to develop a theoretical framework and session plan according to the topic. The hands-on session takes place with the rest of the colleagues and the theoretical framework is presented in 10 minutes. After the implementation, they should make a report reflecting on the practice. Throughout the process, tutoring is carried out to correct the documents.
- **Dossier of notes and conceptual maps:** during theoretical sessions, students must expand and reinforce the contents of the dossier provided to them on the platform. In the dossier there are activities on theory: questions, tables, bibliographic quotations, etc. In addition, for each topic of the dossier a conceptual map is elaborated in which students must show that they know the contents and are able to relate the information.
- **Session sheets:** practical sessions are held every week and each group of students must

draw up a session sheet that must follow the following structure: session narration, advantages, disadvantages and improvements of the proposal, a personal experience, a brief analysis of the teaching competences.

- **Recensions and individual work:** three dialogical talks are held throughout the subject. Two texts are provided on the virtual platform and each student must read one of them and choose at least three paragraphs and justify why they have done so. Then, during in-classroom classes, small group discussions are established about the paragraphs that each partner has chosen. In addition, in this section they also write an essay: it consists of doing a brief work of 2000 words on a subject of physical education of their interest. The essay should have an abstract, an introduction, a theoretical framework, a small work proposal, advantages and disadvantages, conclusions and bibliographic references.
- **Partial exam:** this is a knowledge test where students collaborate in the elaboration of possible questions. An assessment and correction process is also carried out between pairs at the end of the exam, with a template provided by the teacher.

The data collection tools are the official degrees of qualification of the subject and the teacher's journal. The procedure followed by the data collection of each student has been carried out through the collaborative folders. These folders are delivered on the day of the partial exam and represent a collection of all the learning activities they have performed throughout the subject. Both the first installments and corrections must be after the feedback from the teacher.

The professor reviews each collaborative folder, both the individual and the group part, and the final grade is obtained based on the qualification criteria established at the beginning of the subject.



3. Analysis and results

Table 4 shows the number of students who have opted for each learning and assessment option.

Table 4. Number of students in each learning and evaluation option

	Percentage	N° of students
Percentage	N° of students	34
Mixed option	2.7%	1
Final or online option	5.4%	2
Total	100%	37

Most students have opted for the continuous learning and assessment option (91.9%). By contrast, only 2.7% of students have opted for the mixed option because they have not been able to submit all the work at time, and 5.4% of the students have chosen the final or remote

option because they could not attend the classes. In Table 5 is presented the overall results of the subject. It is important to highlight the high number of students who have passed the subject in the first call of the subject (97.3%).

Table 5. Overall results of the subject

Final grade	Percentage	N° of students
With honors	Percentage	N° of students
Outstanding	21.62%	8
Good	54.06%	20
Approved	16.22%	6
Reproved	0	0
Did not present	2.7%	1
Total	100%	37

The final grades of the students of this course are quite good, there is only a 2.7% who have not passed the subject because they have not taken the exam. The rest of the students have passed the subject with quite high grades. The

average grade of the subject is 7.72 points out of 10. Table 6 shows the percentages of each grade according to the learning and assessment option chosen by the students.

Table 6. Percentages of each grade according to the learning and assessment option chosen by the students

Options	DP	Reproved	Approved.	Good	Out.	With Honor	Total
Continuous	-	-	13.52%	51.36%	21.62%	5.4%	91.9%
Mixed	-	-	2.7%	-	-	-	2.7%
Exam	2.7%	-	-	2.7%	-	-	5.4%
Total	2.7%	-	16.22%	54.06%	21.62%	5.4%	100%

Considering this data, academic performance is different depending on the assessment

method chosen. First, all the students who have followed the continuous option have passed the



subject and, in addition, have obtained the best results. 2.7% of students who have opted for the mixed option have obtained an approved grade. With regard to the final exam option, there are two cases: 2.7% which has passed the subject with a remarkable score and 2.7% who did not take the final exam. The results show that the highest grades are obtained through the continuous option of learning and assessment: mostly good and outstanding. While the final or remote option only 2.7% manages to pass the subject with a remarkable grade; a number that is not usual.

4. Discussion and conclusions

This work shows the results obtained after the implementation of FSA, combined with the use of active methodologies in a fourth course of the Master's Degree in Early Childhood Education. On the one hand, this experimentation seems to show that the use of FSA is most consistent with the use of active methodologies in the ITT.

Students are offered the choice of one of the three learning and assessment options: continuous and FSA, mixed and final (final exam). The final exam option is usually chosen by students who do not want to be continuously involved in their teaching-learning process or who are unable to attend class. In this case, most students have chosen the continuous option, even if it involves more work and there are more requirements (attendance, works, etc.). These results are similar to those found by Julian et al. (2010), Martínez-Mínguez et al. (2015) and Vallés et al. (2011), who collect experiences of ITT students who positively value the experience of FSA during their training and are quite satisfied with the experience, because they generate greater learning, even though it involves more involvement and more working time for students and teachers.

On the other hand, the results show a high academic performance that, in addition, seems to be different depending on the learning and assessment option chosen by the students.

Similar results have also been found in studies with other samples and contexts (Angelini, 2016; Arribas, 2012; Buscá et al., 2010; Gallardo et al., 2020; López-Pastor et al., 2013), who indicate that the development of FSA in ITT improves the academic performance of students in Spain and Chile. Due to the high percentage of students who have passed the subject (97.3%), it can be concluded that it seems that the development of FSA seems to improve the academic performance of students. These data can also be found in studies such as the ones conducted by BrOwN and Glasner (2003) and Castejón et al. (2011).

There are several works that state that academic performance is usually better following a continuous assessment option, in which there is a process of improving the student learning thanks to the rapid feedback of the teacher (Black & Wilian, 2003; Boud, 2010; Boud & Falchikov, 2006; Fraile et al., 2013; López-Pastor, 2008; Romero-Martín, 2014 and 2015).

The results of the mixed option are ambivalent: on the one hand, there are usually people who are unable to attend all classes and, on the other hand, people who do not present the work or who do not meet the minimum criteria required. In this situation, students often pass the subject (2.7%). These results can be contrasted with those presented by Castejón et al. (2011), Vallés et al. (2011) and López et al. (2011).

Regarding the final test option, 2.7% who did take the test have obtained a good grade, while the remaining 2.7% did not present the test. This is not usual in this option, as can be seen in the studies of Arribas (2012) and Fraile et al. (2013). In addition, Castejón et al. (2011) refer that normally this option helps accumulating the final work at the end of the semester, having an impact in the academic performance, which is usually low.

As the main limitation of study, it can be pointed out that it is a single subject and one group only, therefore the results cannot be generalized in any case, but can be transferred to another context. Since this is not an experi-



mental study, each student freely chooses the assessment and learning option that they prefer. This increases the number of students on the formative and continuous assessment, which could also be a limitation of the study.

This article may be of interest to ITT teachers who have initiated in active methodologies and FSA, and to teachers who already apply these systems in their classrooms and/or research on the influence of FSA on students' academic performance or on the different learning and evaluation options that can be offered to students in higher education.

Based on these results, it seems appropriate to carry out studies with broader samples and with different subjects using FSA systems in the ITT, or comparative analysis of academic performance obtained in successive courses in this same subject. But, most relevant in these times of mandatory online classes in many countries due to the COVID19 pandemic, would be to analyze the extent to which this remote and distance learning situation has affected the development of FSA systems in the ITT.

References

- Angelini-Doffo, M.L. (2016). Estudio sobre la evaluación formativa y compartida en la formación docente en inglés. *Revista Actualidades Investigativas en Educación*, 16(1), 1-21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15517/aie.v16i1.22614>
- Arribas, J.M. (2012). El rendimiento académico en función del sistema de evaluación empleado. *Relieve*, 1(18) 1-15. <http://bit.ly/2whMTV5>
- Biggs, J.B. (2005). *Calidad del aprendizaje universitario*. Narcea.
- Black, P., & William, D. (2003). In Praise of Educational Research: Formative assessment. *British Educational Research Journal*, 5(29), 623-637. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192032000133721>
- Boud, D., & Associates (2010). *Assessment 2020: Seven propositions for assessment reform in higher education*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2006). Aligning assessment with long-term learning. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31,4, 399-413. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600679050>
- BrOwn, S., & Glasner, A. (2003). *Evaluar en la Universidad. Problemas y nuevos enfoques*. Narcea.
- Buscá, F., Pintor, P., Martínez, L., & Peire, T. (2010). Sistemas y procedimientos de Evaluación Formativa en docencia universitaria: Resultados de 34 casos aplicados durante el curso académico 2007-2008. *Estudios Sobre Educación*, 18, 255-276. <http://bit.ly/2QqXJPv>
- Cañadas, L., Santos-Pastor, M.L., & Castejón F.J. (2018). Desarrollo de competencias docentes en la Formación Inicial del Profesorado de Educación Física. Relación con los instrumentos de evaluación. *Estudios Pedagógicos*, 44(2), 111-126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052018000200111>
- Carter-Thuillier, B. (2015). Evaluación para el aprendizaje: Innovación, Democracia y Transformación en Educación Física. En M. Cresp, J. Serra-Olivares, B. Carter-Thuillier & R. García (Eds.), *Evaluación para el aprendizaje: Educación Física e Innovación en procesos formativos* (pp. 24-49). Lambert-EAE.
- Castejón Oliva, F.J., López-Pastor, V.M., Julián Clemente, J.A., & Zaragoza Casterad, J. (2011). Evaluación formativa y rendimiento académico en la formación inicial del profesorado de Educación Física. *Revista Internacional de Medicina y Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte*, 11(42), 328-346. <http://bit.ly/2WoLw1C>
- Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Dierick, S. (2002). Nuevas vías de aprendizaje y enseñanza y sus Consecuencias: Una nueva era de evaluación. *Revista de la Red Estatal de Docencia Universitaria*, 2(2), 13-29. <http://bit.ly/3a0OEEX>
- Falchikov, N. (2005). *Improving Assessment Through Student Involvement. Practical solutions for aiding learning in higher and further education*. Routledge.
- Fraile-Aranda, A., López-Pastor, V.M., Castejón-Oliva, F.J., & Romero-Martín, R. (2013). La evaluación formativa en docencia universitaria y el rendimiento académico del alumnado. *Revista Aula Abierta*, 41(2), 23-34. <http://bit.ly/2WncDtJ>



- Gallardo, F., Carter, B., & López-Pastor, V. M. (2019a). Evaluación formativa y compartida en la universidad chilena: Resultados tras cuatro años de implementación. *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*, 12(1), 139-155. <https://doi.org/10.15366/riee2019.12.1.008>
- Gallardo-Fuentes, F., López-Pastor, V.M., Martínez-Angulo, V., & Carter-Thuillier, B. (2019b). Evaluación formativa en educación física y atención a la diversidad. Percepción del alumnado de educación física. *Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación*, 12 (25), 169-186. <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.m12-25.efef>
- Gallardo-Fuentes, F., López-Pastor, V.M., & Carter-Thuillier, B. (2017). ¿Hay evaluación formativa y compartida en la formación inicial del profesorado en Chile? Percepción de alumnado, profesores y egresados de una universidad. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 9(2), 227-238. <https://doi.org/10.25115/psye.v9i2.699>
- Gallardo-Fuentes, F., López-Pastor, V.M., & Carter-Tuhillier, B. (2018). Efectos de la aplicación de un sistema de evaluación formativa en la autopercepción de competencias adquiridas en formación inicial del profesorado. *Revista Estudios Pedagógicos*, 44(2), 55-77. <https://bit.ly/3dCblkz>
- Gallardo-Fuentes, F., López-Pastor, V., & Carter-Thuillier, B. (2020). Ventajas e inconvenientes de la evaluación formativa, y su influencia en la autopercepción de competencias en alumnado de Formación Inicial del Profesorado en Educación Física. *Retos, Nuevas tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*, 38, 417-424. <https://bit.ly/30c5YEU>
- Hamodi, C., López-Pastor, V. M., & López-Pastor, A.T. (2017). If I experience formative assessment whilst at University will I put it into practice later as a teacher? Formative and shared assessment in Initial Teacher Education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 171-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1281909>
- Herranz, M. (2013). *Desarrollo de procesos de autoevaluación y evaluación compartida en la etapa de Educación Primaria. Un estudio de casos en el área Educación Física* [Tesis Doctoral, Universidad de Valladolid, Segovia]. <http://bit.ly/2Uf4a9v>
- Ibarra, M.S., Rodríguez, G., & Gómez, M. A. (2012). La evaluación entre iguales: Beneficios y estrategias para su práctica en la universidad. *Revista de Educación*, 359, 206-231. <https://doi.org/10.4438/1998-592X-RE-2011-359-092>
- Julián, J.A., Zaragoza, J., Castejón, F.J., & López-Pastor, V.M. (2010). Carga de trabajo en diferentes asignaturas que experimentan el sistema ECTS. *Revista Internacional de Medicina y Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte*, 10(38), 218-233. <http://bit.ly/2vwxmAl>
- López Pastor, V.M. (2008). Desarrollando sistemas de evaluación formativa y compartida en la docencia universitaria. Análisis de resultados de su puesta en práctica en la formación inicial del profesorado. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(3), 293-311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760802208452>
- López-Pastor, V.M., Archilla, M., & Real, F. (2016). Evaluación formativa, calificación y carpetas colaborativas: Una práctica de éxito en educación superior. In C. Hamodi Galán (Coord.), *Formar mediante la evaluación en la Universidad. Propuestas prácticas útiles para docentes* (pp. 67-82). Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid
- López-Pastor, V.M., Manrique, J.C., & Vallés, C. (2011). Evaluación y calificación en los nuevos estudios de Grado. Especial incidencia en la Formación Inicial del Profesorado. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 39(14.4), 1-20. <http://bit.ly/33E0pih>
- López-Pastor, V.M., Molina, M., Pascual, C., & Manrique, J.C. (2020). La importancia de utilizar la Evaluación Formativa y Compartida en la formación inicial del profesorado de Educación Física: Los Proyectos de Aprendizaje Tutorado como ejemplo de buena práctica. *Retos, Nuevas tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*, 37, 680-687. <http://bit.ly/2wlyUi>
- López-Pastor, V.M., & Pérez-Pueyo, A. (Coords.) (2017). *Evaluación formativa y compartida en Educación: Experiencias de éxito en todas las etapas educativas*. Universidad de León. <http://bit.ly/2J2BRFP>



- López-Pastor, V., Pintor, P., Muros, B., & Webb, G. (2013). Formative assessment strategies and their effect on student performance and on student and tutor workload: The results of research projects undertaken in preparation for greater convergence of universities in Spain within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 37*, 163-180.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2011.644780>
- Martínez Carazo, P.C. (2006). El método de estudio de caso. Estrategia metodológica de la investigación científica. *Pensamiento y gestión, 20*, 165-193. <http://bit.ly/2WndjPN>
- Martínez-Mínguez, L., Vallés-Rapp, C., & Romero-Mínguez, M.R. (2015). Estudiantes universitarios: Ventajas e inconvenientes de la evaluación formativa. *Revista d'Innovació educativa, (14)*, 59-70.
<https://doi.org/10.7203/attic.14.4217>
- Montero, I., & León, O.G. (2005). Sistema de clasificación del método en los informes de investigación en Psicología. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 5(1)*, 115-127.
<https://bit.ly/3gUCtgA>
- Moreno Ruiz, J.A., Candela Martín, A., & Bañuelos Lagunes, P. (2019). Evaluaciones formativas en el aula: Análisis discursivo de la actividad de retroalimentación en la práctica supervisada de psicólogos educativos en formación. *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa, 12(1)*, 121-137.
<https://doi.org/10.15366/riee2019.12.1.007>
- Nicol, D., & MacFarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31(2)*, 199-218.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Romero-Martín, M.R., Asún, S., & Chivite, M.T. (2016). La autoevaluación en expresión corporal en formación inicial del profesorado de educación física: Un ejemplo de buena práctica. *Retos. Nuevas tendencias en Educación Física, Deportes y Recreación, 29*, 236-241.
<http://bit.ly/38ZKsE1>
- Romero-Martín, R., Fraile-Aranda, A., López-Pastor, V.M., & Castejón-Oliva, F.J. (2014). Relación entre sistemas de evaluación formativa, rendimiento académico y carga de trabajo del profesor y del alumno en la docencia universitaria. *Revista Infancia y Aprendizaje, 37(1)*, 16-32.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02103702.2014.918818>
- Romero-Martín, R., Castejón-Oliva, F.J., & López-Pastor, V.M. (2015). Divergencias del alumnado y del profesorado universitario sobre las dificultades para aplicar la evaluación formativa. *RELIEVE, 21(1)*, 1-16.
<https://doi.org/10.7203/relieve.21.1.5169>
- Vallés, C., Ureña, N., & Ruiz, E. (2011). La evaluación Formativa en Docencia Universitaria. Resultados globales de 41 estudios de caso en su primer año de desarrollo. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria, 9(1)*, 135-158.
<http://bit.ly/2Uhg8PJ>

