



Assessment practices in three physical education courses in South America

Prácticas evaluativas en tres cursos de educación física en Sudamérica

-  **Matheus Lima Frossard** is studying a PhD at Universidad Federal del Espírito Santo (Brazil) (matheusmf@hotmail.com) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2273-7535>)
-  **Ronildo Stieg** is studying a PhD at Universidad Federal del Espírito Santo (Brazil) (ronildo.stieg@yahoo.com.br) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8698-4087>)
-  **Dr. Wagner dos Santos** is a professor at Universidad Federal del Espírito Santo (Brazil) (wagnercefd@gmail.com) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9216-7291>)

Received on: 2021-03-16 / Revised on: 2021-06-07 / Accepted on: 2021-06-11 / Published on: 2021-07-01

Resumen

El artículo tiene como objetivo analizar y comparar las prescripciones de los momentos y de las funciones de la evaluación en los planes de disciplinas de tres cursos de formación de profesores en Educación Física (Ufes/Brasil, Cesmag/Colombia y Udelar/Uruguay). Se caracteriza por ser una investigación de método mixto de tipo secuencial explicativo. Utiliza los programas de estudios de los cursos y los planes de disciplinas como fuentes. La metodología siguió tres etapas: a) análisis de la frecuencia de palabras; b) prueba de hipótesis para la proporción; y c) análisis crítico documental. Los resultados mostraron que los momentos y las funciones de evaluación prescritos en los planes de Cesmag/Colombia y Udelar/Uruguay están influenciados por las concepciones de evaluación presentes en los lineamientos gubernamentales de estos países. Ufes/Brasil se caracteriza por una política descentralizada, sin orientación gubernamental sobre la práctica evaluativa, y esta definición recae en los docentes. Se concluyó que la principal preocupación de las disciplinas consiste en las prescripciones de los instrumentos, faltando aún matizar la definición de los criterios, funciones, agentes, momentos y concepciones de la evaluación. También señala la urgencia de pensar una formación continua en evaluación para los docentes que laboran en la educación superior, especialmente teniendo en cuenta el área de Educación Física propiamente dicha, los desafíos de las prácticas evaluativas alineadas con el contexto del desempeño profesional y la incorporación de *habitus* que potencien la profesionalidad docente.

Descriptor: Formación docente, evaluación, currículo, educación física, políticas educativas, América Latina.

Abstract

The article aims to analyze and compare the moments and functions of the evaluation defined in the discipline plans of three training courses for Physical Education teachers (Ufes/Brazil; Cesmag/Colombia; and Udelar/Uruguay). The research uses a mixed method of explanatory sequential type. It uses the political projects of the courses and the discipline plans as a source. The methodology followed three stages: a) analysis of the frequency of words; b) hypothesis test for proportion; and c) documentary critical analysis. The results showed that the evaluation and function prescribed in the plans of Cesmag/Colombia and Udelar/Uruguay are influenced by the concepts of evaluation present in political projects and government guidelines at those countries. Ufes/Brazil is characterized by a decentralized policy with no governmental guidelines on evaluative practice, leaving this definition to the teachers. It was concluded that the main concern of the prescriptions is on the definition of the instruments. It is also necessary to qualify the definition of the criteria, functions, agents, moments and evaluation conceptions. It is evident the urgency to think about continuing education in evaluation for teachers who work in higher education in the training of new teachers, above all, taking into account Physical Education itself, the challenges of evaluative practices aligned with the context of performance and the incorporation of the *environment* in the teaching practice.

Keywords: Teacher education, assessment, curriculum, physical education, educational policies, Latin America.

Suggested citation: Frossard, M. L., Stieg, R., & Santos, W., (2021). Assessment practices in three physical education courses in South America. *Alteridad*, 16(2), 205-216. <https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v16n2.2021.04>

1. Introduction

Teacher training aims to provide a process of building professional identity also known as professionalism (Nóvoa, 2017), starting from the idea of the necessary qualities for the training of teachers and focusing on the concept of environment, where the student is placed in a field of forces and powers in which each one builds his/her position in relation to himself/herself and others (Bourdieu, 1989). This formation is understood as a space of positions and decision-making, allowing the “incorporation of durable provisions, and the possibility that this heritage will be transferred through a process of professional socialization” (Nóvoa, 2017, p. 1119, our translation).

Teaching practice is a space for the construction, training and production of knowledge in a formative way, which assumes knowledge related to teacher training linked to scientific knowledge and professional teaching practice, and educational evaluation is one of them (Nóvoa, 2004).

The preparation of future teachers for evaluative practices is directly linked to the theoretical discussion on the subject during training, either in specific disciplines or in activities presented throughout the course (Deluca & Klinger, 2010; Paula et al., 2018; Stieg et al., 2018); experiences that enable the future teacher to practice peer-to-peer evaluation (Sluijsmans & Prins, 2006; Tejada & Ruiz, 2016; Maureira-Cabrera et al., 2020), self-assessment (Kearney, 2013) or evaluation in the context of basic education (Frossard et al., 2018); and evaluation in higher education (Picos & López-Pastor, 2013; Hamodi et al., 2017).

Although evaluation is an important element in the curriculum, Picos and López-Pastor (2013) show that there is little specific discussion on the subject throughout the teacher training course. This shows that the future faculty will similarly examine how they were evaluated when they were students (Poletto et al., 2020). The absence of reference, from which students can

modify and create their own evaluation system, causes them to reproduce and not modify their evaluative practice (Picos & López-Pastor, 2013).

Thus, the evaluation is not carried out in a simple and linear way, but is constructed in a space of record and interpretation of the data, based on the constant exercise of reading clues and evidence, from which value judgments and decision-making are issued (Frossard et al., 2020). Evaluation, understood as an indivisible practice, uses instruments for students to question the teaching and learning processes under construction and not yet built, offering elements to analyze the relationship that students establish with learning (Santos, 2005, Santos et al., 2014).

The importance of content is known; however, it is needed to assume an evaluation concept based on a permanent evidence-interpretation exercise, which seeks to identify “knowledge obtained” “knowledge not fulfilled” and “knowledge in progress” (Esteban, 2003). Therefore, evaluation is seen as a process of reflection, contributing to the ability of teachers and students to perceive signs to achieve complexity levels in the interpretation of their meanings and to incorporate them as facts relevant to the teaching-learning dynamics.

Hence, the aim of the article is to analyze and compare the requirements concerning the moments and functions of the evaluation (Castillo-Arredondo & Cabrerizo, 2010) in the discipline plans (DPs) of three courses of teacher training in Physical Education (PE) (Ufes/Brazil, Cesmag/Colombia and Udelar/Uruguay). The analysis of this research focused on the questions: What do professors prescribe to evaluate students in the DPs? Do professors prescribe timing and functions of the evaluation? What are the guidelines provided by training curriculum to the evaluation? How does this set of prescriptions take into account the challenges of evaluation in the PE when incorporating an environment that enhances teaching professionalism?

It is understood that the preparation of future teachers in the area of evaluation is also related to the



way in which they are being evaluated during teacher training courses. This turns out to be interesting to investigate, since the students of these courses will have to implement evaluation methodologies and practices in their professional practice, specifically in the PE classes in a school context.

The importance of teacher training courses in the formation of a body of assessment knowledge and practices that enable the production of experiences for teaching PE in basic education is highlighted. In addition to the theoretical discussions on the subject and the situations of teaching practice experienced by students during the training, the way in which they are evaluated is also a didactic tool with direct impacts on their learning. This reinforces the need to investigate how teachers in PE courses prescribe evaluative practices and understand assessment in their disciplines.

2. Methodology

It is a mixed method research with explanatory sequential nature. It establishes a statistical analysis of quantitative data and a critical documentary analysis (Bloch, 2001) for qualitative data. According to Creswell and Clark (2011), the purpose of this type of research is to use a qualitative element to explain the initial quantitative

results. This method improves the assessment of trends, comparisons, and relationships between groups through quantitative data, and qualitative data should be able to explain the mechanisms and reasons behind the quantitative results.

2.1. Delimitation of sources

The participating institutions are part of the research collaboration agreement established in 2018 between Ufes, Udelar and Cesmag, through a research project titled *Avaliação educacional na formação inicial de professores em educação física na América Latina: diálogo com os alunos*. This project received financial support from the Universal Edict CNPq, with process number 435.310/2018-6.

For collecting the data, the Higher Education Institutions (HEI) were contacted to request the curricula that guide (CG) the teacher training courses in PE and the plans of all the disciplines that make up the curriculum of these courses. Sources come from documents available by each institution as shown in Table 1. DPs and CG of the courses are for the years 2014 (Ufes/Brazil) and 2017 (Cesmag/Colombia and Udelar/Uruguay) which were still in place at the time of data collection (July 2020).

Table 1. Quantity of DPs and CG analyzed by HEI

	Ufes/Brazil	Cesmag/Colombia	Udelar/Uruguay
Number of DPs	61/61 (100 %)	84/84 (100 %)	34/63 (54 %)
CG	1/1 (100 %)	1/1 (100 %)	1/1 (100 %)

Source: Own elaboration.

2.2. Data Analysis

The analysis process followed three steps. The first was to organize the data in frequency tables, which allowed to analyze the information that each discipline prescribed on evaluation. In the second step, statistical tests were performed to compare

whether the results found in the previous step showed statistically significant differences between the HEI. Finally, a qualitative analysis of the DPs was carried out, relating it with the literature that discusses the subject and the government documents that act as curricular guidelines for teacher training courses in the three countries.



Step 1

CG of the three courses and all DPs were read in full. In this research, the document called “CG” is understood as an instrument reflecting the educational proposal of the training course. This document helps to understand the guidelines and, in some cases, the assessment concept assumed by the course, and a document was done in Excel to organize the prescriptions according to each HEI.

“DPs” are understood as those documents prepared by teachers of the teacher training courses, the prescription of what will be taught and how it will be evaluated. In the three institutions, similar sections were identified: general objectives; content; methodology; evaluation; and bibliography. For this study, the section of the evaluation was specifically assumed, which allowed understanding how teachers assume and propose evaluative practices. For the analysis of these documents, a table was created in Excel per institution. In the first column, all the disciplines of the courses were distributed, and in the rest, the topics investigated: timing; instruments; criteria; functions; and agents of the evaluation. Thus, when reading the plans, what was prescribed for evaluation by each discipline was identified and marked on the table.

This article focused on timing and functions of the evaluation. Therefore, a second reading of the plans was performed to identify the evaluation moments that were proposed (initial, procedural and/or final) and the functions assumed (diagnostic, formative and/or summative). This process identified the information of the evaluation disciplines prescribed in each course.

Step 2

To compare the proportion of each variable analyzed, considering the different institutions surveyed, the Proportion Hypothesis Test (Bussab & Morettin, 2017) was used, whose null hypothesis

indicates that there are no statistically significant differences between the established proportions.

Thus, Chi-square test and Fisher’s exact test were used for comparing variables. For this, 5 % ($\alpha = 0.05$) was considered as a significance level and R software version 3.6.2 was used as a facilitator.

Step 3

Based on the probative paradigm proposed by Ginzburg (1989), CG of the courses and DPs are privileged sources that provide clues and evidence about the actions, thoughts and intentions of each professor. These documents are considered culturally constructed tools full of intention, because according to Bloch (2001), everything a man says or writes, everything he does or touches, can and must talk about him.

According to Ginzburg (1989), it was possible to identify, through words, the evaluative practices of CG courses in the three HEI studied. We agree with Bloch (2001) when indicating the need for research personnel to take an active attitude, because archaeological texts or documents, even the most seemingly clear and accommodating, speak only when we know how to question them. DPs were explored by analyzing the clues and evidence (Ginzburg, 1989) left by them and the intentions of those who produced them, mainly with regard to the requirements of the moments and the functions of the evaluation. Findings are articulated with authors and government documents—curricular guidelines—that guide teacher training courses in each country.

3. Results

Analyzing the evaluation proposals prescribed by teachers in the DPs, it was possible to establish some approximations and distances among the information covered in the evaluation section in the plans of each course of the three HEI. Table 2 presents the topics investigated, the frequency and proportion they appear in the discipline plans of each HEI.



Table 2. What part of evaluation is prescribed in DPs?

	Ufes/Brazil	Cesmag/Colombia	Udelar/Uruguay
Moments (initial, procedural and final)	22 (36 %) a	32 (38 %) a	16 (47 %) a
Instruments	49 (80 %) a	83 (99 %) b	30 (88 %) a
Criteria	24 (40 %) a	76 (90 %) b	25 (74 %) c
Function (diagnostic, formative and summative)	12 (20 %) a	28 (33 %) ab	14 (41 %) b
Agents (hetero-evaluation, co-evaluation and self-evaluation)	1 (1,6 %) a	34 (40 %) b	8 (24 %) b

Source: Own elaboration.

The proportions followed by the same letter do not differ statistically from each other using chi-square test or Fisher's exact test ($\alpha = 0.05$).

The main concern of Ufes/Brazil is to present the evaluation instruments to be used during the academic semester. In addition to the instruments, Cesmag/Colombia and Udelar/Uruguay also highlighted the prescription of the criteria. The moments, functions and agents appeared to a lesser extent in the DPs of the three courses.

When comparing the three courses of the HEI, it can be observed that parts of the DPs that prescribed the "moments" of the evaluation do not present statistical differences, considering the level of significance adopted. With regard to the "instruments" and "criteria", a higher proportion is observed for Cesmag/Colombia. However, unlike with "instruments", and "criteria", parts of the DPs that prescribe them are statistically different for Ufes/Brazil and Udelar/Uruguay. The scenario found in Ufes/Brazil may be a concern, as 60% of

disciplines do not have evaluation criteria and therefore do not show what they consider important for students to learn and evaluate accordingly.

With regard to the topics "Functions" and "Agents" of the evaluation, it was noted that the highest proportion of DPs prescribed by them was from Cesmag/Colombia and Udelar/Uruguay, which did not have statistically significant differences between them. Although the proportion of DPs prescribed to the evaluators is small in the three courses analyzed, it is emphasized that only one discipline of the Ufes/Brazil identified this prescription.

Table 3 shows the information prescribed about the moments and functions of the evaluation, as well as the frequency and proportion they appear. For ratios diferente to zero, a comparative analysis between HEI is also presented.

Table 3. Moments and evaluative functions prescribed in the DPs

Moments	Ufes/Brazil	Cesmag/Colombia	Udelar/Uruguay
Initial	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	0 (%)
Process	22 (36 %) a	32 (38 %) a	13 (38 %) a
Final	0 (0 %)	0 (0 %)	3 (9 %)
Functions	Ufes/Brazil	Cesmag/Colombia	Udelar/Uruguay
Diagnostic	1 (1,6 %) a	18 (21 %) b	0 (%)
Formative	7 (11,5 %) a	25 (30 %) b	10 (29 %) ab
Summative	6 (10 %) a	5 (6 %) a	5 (15 %) a

Source: Own elaboration.

The proportions followed by the same letter do not statistically differ from each other using the Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test ($\alpha = 0.05$).



It could be seen that most of the DPs evaluate during the teaching-learning process (procedural), and only three plans of the Udelar/Uruguay evaluate at the end of the process. Among the disciplines of the three HEI that proposed procedural evaluation, no statistical differences were found at the significance level adopted.

Training was most significant in all three courses. There are statistically significant differences between Ufes/Brazil and Cesmag/Colombia when analyzing diagnostic and formative functions. Cesmag/Colombia disciplines are more concerned about assuming diagnostic and formative evaluation compared to Ufes/Brazil. No statistically significant differences were identified between the IES with respect to summative function.

4. Discussion and conclusions

The need for a harmonious and synchronous process between teaching, learning and evaluation is highlighted. For Castillo-Arredondo and Cabrerizo (2010), evaluation requires prior planning to ensure adequate monitoring of the rhythm and time of the teaching process. The design of the evaluation must be carried out in the same way as the teaching processes are thought and projected; it implies the prediction of: what, why, how, who, and when to evaluate? It is understood that proper evaluation planning can promote the union of their participation in the teaching-learning process. This requires greater teacher dedication regarding time, since it ceases to be understood as a point element and becomes part of the development of educational processes.

Although the DPs percentage of the courses in the three HEI does not provide enough information on the timing of the evaluation, it is possible to note a preference for procedural evaluation, where it occurs throughout the school period.

We highlight the difference between the time of evaluation and the function. Although, in some cases, the moment favors a certain function, since it is usually associated with the initial eva-

luation and the diagnostic function, as well as the procedural with the formative and the final with the summative, all being independent elements.

According to Castillo Arredondo and Cabrerizo (2010), the function of the diagnostic evaluation is to obtain information on the current state of the students, allowing a planning and adaptation of the didactic processes to the reality. On the other hand, the formative function serves as a strategy for improving, adjusting and regulating educational processes. It allows the teacher to identify his/her effectiveness and modify aspects of his/her performance, as well as to encourage students in their learning process, allowing them to know their real status and reorient their learning. Summative evaluation has a verification function; in which the idea is to check the results of learning by allowing to decide on promotion or retention in the educational cycle.

DPs “Body, Movement and Biochemical and Nutritional Knowledge” of Ufes/Brazil, “Anatomy” of Cesmag/Colombia, and “Exercise Physiology” of Udelar/Uruguay, provide clues about the summative and/or formative function assumed by the evaluation in each discipline.

There will be three learning evaluations each semester. Grades may consist of the average amount of school work performed. In order for students to pass the discipline, they must reach an arithmetic average in accordance with the Rules of the Ufes. Score 1-20 points; Score 2-20 points; Score 3-20 points; Verification of practices and complementary activities-40 points. (Body, Movement, Biochemical and Nutritional Knowledge, Ufes/Brazil, our translation)

[...] adopted continuous evaluation as an evaluation system, hence, from the first moment collaborative work will be carried out to develop in the course or outside it, exams, oral presentations and other forms that allow to observe the advances or difficulties presented by the students in the teaching-learning process. (Anatomy, Cesmag/Colombia, our translation)



Evaluation, as an important component of the curriculum, is used for a dual purpose: as another way of learning and as a means of certifying the student's learning (or performance, more precisely). During the course, at least two different evaluations will be carried out, which may be in written, although no other modalities are excluded. (Physiology of Exercise, Udelar/Uruguay, our translation).

The discipline offered by Ufes/Brazil PE course presents an evaluation process with three evaluations throughout the semester and it assumes the summative function. Its main concern is to verify what is learned and review the grades for approval or disapproval by the student. The discipline of the Cesmag/Colombia course also presented a procedural evaluation using different instruments; unlike the plan of Ufes/Brazil and the plan of Cesmag/Colombia which demonstrated the concern to observe the teaching process, learning, progress and difficulties of students, approaching a formative function. Udelar/Uruguay plan also adopts an evaluation process with dual function, formative and summative.

The evaluation function is related to the decision-making process, i.e., what use is made of the results of the evaluation process. In the examples of the three DPs, different purposes are perceived that impact student learning. It is understood that evaluation should not be limited to transmit-verify-register, but also focus on learning in a collaborative way between teachers and students that allows understanding the phenomena studied, reorganizing them and producing new knowledge.

Although there is no government curricular guideline for teacher training in Brazil to guide the evaluation, there is a general regulation of the Ufes/Brazil that presents an evaluation proposal for all teacher training courses (including PE courses), which consists on evaluating the frequency of students in classes and the grades obtained in school work, approaching only the summative function.

Art. 107. The verification of learning shall be carried out during the academic period and shall correspond to the verification of attendance and the grades obtained in the homework assigned by the Departments.

Art. 108. A minimum of 2 (two) school assignments per academic term will be required in each discipline.

§ 1º Homework shall include evidence, reports of work carried out, written or oral tests, projects and their defenses, monographs, supervised practices and other practical work thought by the Departments, depending on the nature of the disciplines. (UFES, 2014, p. 28, our translation)

It is possible to observe the influence of the Ufes institutional document on the evaluation requirements of the DPs of the Ufes/Brazil PE course, so the main concern of teachers was to prescribe evaluation tools to meet the minimum requirement of two school assignments per school year (four months). In addition, it was noted that 20 plans (31%) highlighted in the evaluation section the relationship with grades and frequencies required for approval/disapproval. It provides clues about the influence of the evaluation assumed in the general rules of the Ufes/Brazil and the absence of a discussion of the subject in the PE course which, despite being based on a cultural conception, it does not present guidelines on evaluation for the teaching practice in the same direction.

As for the Brazilian government document, *Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação* (Brazil, 1996) it does not provide guidance for evaluative practice in higher education, but instead its guidelines are restricted to basic education. In the context of secondary education, the document states that procedural and formative evaluation are the responsibility of educational institutions, while the federal government will set the expected performance standards, which will be a reference in the national evaluation processes.



In addition, three resolutions have been published in recent decades that prescribed the national curriculum guidelines for teacher training in Brazil: CNE/CP No. 1/2002 (Brazil, 2002), No. 2/2015 (Brazil, 2015) and No. 2/2019 (Brazil, 2019). Because CG of the Ufes/Brazil Course is 2014, its implementation was based on CNE/CP Resolution No. 1/2002 (Brazil, 2002). This document states in Art. 3 that evaluation is an integral part of the training process and a tool for diagnosing gaps and measuring results. However, the document does not provide an assessment concept.

CNE/CP Resolution No. 2/2015 (Brazil, 2015) focuses on seeking external evaluations of the regularization of training courses. CNE/CP No. 2/2019 (Brazil, 2019), establishes a common national curriculum for training courses for teachers of basic education and, in Chapter VIII, presents specific guidelines on the internal and external evaluation process. Similarly, the three resolutions do not define concepts of evaluation.

It is believed that the Brazilian context does not have a centralized policy to guide the evaluation of teaching and learning in higher education. The definition of evaluative concepts and practices is left to the educational institutions and the training courses. Specifically in the case of the Ufes/Brazil PE course, the DPs give clues that this has been a more individual choice of teaching staff in each discipline than a collective decision.

The lack of clarity identified in the prescriptions of evaluative practices in relation to the moments, criteria, functions and agents, shows a gap in the teacher training courses in relation to this topic. As a result, it points to the need for government documents to guide this evaluative practice in higher education, associated with a policy of continuing education.

Unlike Ufes/Brazil, the CG course in Cesmag/Colombia presents guidelines for the evaluative practice of teachers, showing the adoption of the continuous evaluation system. From the very beginning work is done to develop

tools and evaluation methodologies inside and outside the course which allow to observe the teaching-learning processes.

Likewise, the student regulations of the institution mention evaluation as an integral formation process of the students, in which it is sought to respond to values and competences and to monitor the progress and difficulties of the students. Out of the 84 DPs analyzed in Cesmag/Colombia, 17 (21%) had guidelines provided by the institution for teachers to carry out a formative and continuous evaluation with criteria based on competences and skills.

Jiménez (2020) said that the design of PE for teacher training courses followed the guidelines of the Ministry of National Education (MEN) and created Quality Guidelines for Bachelor of Education (Colombia, 2014) and Resolution No. 18583 issued on September 15, 2017 (Colombia, 2017) regulating the characteristics of degrees. In addition to these documents, the Colombian System of Teacher Training and Policy Guidelines (Colombia, 2013) describes the Colombian educational system, its purposes and functioning, and highlights an evaluation concept for teacher training.

The conception is based on the book of Juan Manuel Álvarez Méndez (2007), who understands evaluation as a moment that allows the teacher to know and improve his/her practice and must collaborate so that the students learn and overcome their difficulties. Thus, it stresses that evaluation must take two paths in teacher training courses:

[...] one, create relational learning environments for the future teacher and evaluate his/her knowledge process and ways to educate. Additionally, train the teacher for educational action including evaluation. Thus, the educator is evaluated and formed as an evaluator. The other way is to consider evaluation as part of a continuum and it must be procedural, continuous, integrated into the curriculum and learning. Consequently, evaluation should not be understood as a discrete, discontinuous,



isolated or insignificant task. (Colombia, 2013, p. 66, our translation).

In addition, it was possible to perceive a relation between the evaluation proposed in the Colombian government document with the DPs, the course PE and the institutional regulations. The national orientation in evaluation for teacher training has been the same as assumed in the CG course in Cesmag/Colombia.

It is important to highlight the dual role that the evaluation assumes in the Colombian document that when assuming a conception of continuous training, students are evaluated and trained as an evaluator. Its potentiality is pointed out in teacher training courses, where teaching and evaluation practices fulfill their role and serve as an example.

The evaluation indicated in the documents of the Colombian government and in the DPs of Cesmag/Colombia has a formative perspective of the process and not only of the results; therefore, it must be incorporated from the beginning of the work and must provide permanent data on the development of learning. In this way, it promotes continuous and personalized learning, without subjecting to equal parameters and levels for all students, adjusting the rhythms and styles of learning (Vlachopoulos, 2008).

In the Spanish context, the concept of continuous evaluation has been used in the General Education Law of 1970 and remains in force in current legislation at all educational levels (Spain, 2006). Another characteristic that resembles the evaluation of the Cesmag/Colombia course to the Spanish educational context is its orientation toward competences. It provides clues about the influence of Spanish authors on the conceptions of evaluation and teacher training in PE of Cesmag/Colombia.

Like Cesmag/Colombia, CG of the Udelar/Uruguay course also guides the practice of teachers in terms of evaluation, but it must be modeled in two roles: formative and forming. In addition to certification, evaluation processes

should be understood as a learning mechanism that adds value, allowing a new encounter with knowledge, consolidating itself as an educational practice linked to teaching.

General Education Law No. 18437 (Uruguay, 2008a) does not have a conception or guidelines for the evaluative practice of teachers. However, this topic is explored in the National Integrated Plan of Teacher Training (Uruguay, 2008b), which analyzes in depth a conceptual and theoretical framework to support evaluation policy in Uruguay. The document differentiates the certification evaluation. The former can and should contribute to learning, while the latter reflects institutional need, and both are needed.

In the above line of thinking, the evaluation/certification should encompass partial and final results and the whole learning process that the student performs, understood as a change of reference schemes in the critical understanding of reality and in the possibility of acting on it. In this sense, tests in general, including traditional exams, should be directed to be 'on' knowledge, i.e., reflection, criticism, application, transfer, troubleshooting, etc., more than 'of' knowledge [...]. (Uruguay, 2008b, p. 86, our translation).

Since 2008, Uruguay has adopted a national teacher training policy that assumes a concept of phenomenological and critical evaluation for this context. Article 44 of the document emphasizes that the evaluation of a discipline must be consistent with the formative objectives and the criteria defined by each national department. Thus, the assessment "[...] in a phenomenological and critical way proposes the triangulation between the vision from the hetero-evaluation of the teacher, the self-evaluation of the student and the subgroup/group co-evaluation" (Uruguay, 2008b, p. 86, our translation). Although the PE is not included in the national document for teacher training in Uruguay, it is possible to observe a proximity between the government proposal and the evaluation requirements presented in the DPs and CG of the Udelar/Uruguay PE course.



Comparing the PE courses of the three HEI, Colombia and Uruguay present a national assessment concept for teacher training that guides teaching practice. Colombia provides HEI with greater autonomy to define the details of the academic structure, and the documents present a concept of continuous formative evaluation with criteria based on competences and skills also present in Cesmag/Colombia. In Uruguay, the logic of internal organization along with the national departments favor and contribute to a unification of the concepts of formation and evaluation with a phenomenological and critical perspective in the case of Udelar/Uruguay. On the other hand, the Brazilian context did not show the existence of government curricular guidelines designed to orient evaluative practices for teacher training courses, evidencing a more decentralized policy among the three countries analyzed.

It is necessary to consider the complexity of the curricula of teacher training in PE, because of its diverse areas of knowledge that move in the biological, pedagogical, sports dimensions, etc. The prescriptions of evaluative practices in the DPs are more related to the incorporation of the environment from the tradition of the knowledge area of teacher training and the nature of the discipline, showing that the evaluative practice is a reflection of the teacher professionalism related to his/her formative career and the context of his/her work. It is understood that evaluating learning from the content of discipline is important, however, it is also necessary to build evaluative practices that encourage the formation of vocational performance repertoires. In other words, teachers of the training course, in addition to evaluating the knowledge covered by their discipline, must project the challenges of teaching practice in the school context for their students. This is an important way of thinking and seeing evaluation in the context of teacher training, specifically in PE.

References

- Álvarez-Méndez, J.M. (2005). *Evaluar para conocer, examinar para excluir*. Morata.
- Bloch, M.L.B. (2001). *Apologia da história ou o ofício do historiador*. Zahar.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). *O poder simbólico*. Ática.
- Brasil (1996). *Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional*. Lei número 9394, 20 de dezembro de 1996. <https://bit.ly/2S7jw29>
- Brasil (2002). Conselho Nacional de Educação. Institui Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação de Professores da Educação Básica, em nível superior, curso de licenciatura, de graduação plena. Resolução CNE/CP n. 02/2002, de 19 de fevereiro de 2002. Brasília, *Diário Oficial da União*, seção 1, p. 1-9. <https://bit.ly/2Qs5d80>
- Brasil (2015). Conselho Nacional de Educação. Define as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a formação inicial em nível superior e para a formação continuada. Resolução CNE/CP n. 02/2015, de 1º de julho de 2015. Brasília, *Diário Oficial da União*, seção 1, p. 8-12. <https://bit.ly/3tXK6bA>
- Brasil (2019). Conselho Nacional de Educação. Define as Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para a Formação Inicial de Professores para a Educação Básica e institui a Base Nacional Comum para a Formação Inicial de Professores da Educação Básica (BNC-Formação). Resolução CNE/CP n. 02/2019, de 20 de dezembro de 2019. *Diário Oficial da União*, Brasília, 23 de dezembro de 2019 - Seção 1, p. 115-119. <https://bit.ly/3bTNA8T>
- Bussab, W.O., & Morettin, P.A. (2017) *Estatística básica*. Saraiva.
- Castillo-Arredondo, S., & Cabrerizo, D.J. (2010). *Avaliação educacional e promoção escolar*. Unesp.
- Colombia (2013). Ministerio de Educación Nacional. *Sistema colombiano de formación de educadores y lineamientos de política*. <https://bit.ly/2Qv0SRF>
- Colombia (2014). Ministerio de Educación Nacional. *Lineamientos de calidad para la licenciaturas en educación*. <https://bit.ly/3vnoypv>



- Colombia (2017). Ministerio de Educación Nacional. *Resolución 18583 del 15 de septiembre de 2017*. <https://bit.ly/3tZk6fC>
- Creswell, J.W., & Clark, P.V.L. (2011) *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. 2nd Edition, Sage Publications.
- Deluca, C., & Klinger, D.A. (2010). Assessment literacy development: identifying gaps in teacher candidates' learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 17(4), 419-438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2010.516643>
- España (2006). Ley Orgánica nº 2, de 3 de mayo de 2006, de Educación. *Boletín Oficial del Estado*, Madrid, mayo, 2006. <https://bit.ly/3bA6XUf>
- Esteban, M.T. (2003). *Avaliação: uma prática em busca de novos sentidos*. DP&A.
- Frossard, M.L. et al. (2018). Apropriações das práticas avaliativas para o exercício da docência de estudantes de licenciatura em Educação Física. *Journal of Physical Education*, 29, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.4025/jphyseduc.v29i1.2970>
- Frossard, M.L., Stieg, R., & Santos, W. (2020). A avaliação na formação de professores em educação física: experiências de estudantes de sete universidades federais brasileiras. *Educação Unisinos*, 24, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.4013/edu.2020.241.38>
- Ginzburg, C. (1989). *Mitos, emblemas, sinais: morfologia e história*. Companhia das Letras.
- Hamodi, C., López-Pastor, V.M., & López-Pastor, A.T. (2017). If I experience formative assessment whilst studying at university, will I put it into practice later as a teacher? Formative and shared assessment in Initial Teacher Education (ITE). *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1281909>
- Jiménez, M.M. (2020). Indução profissional docente na Colômbia: desafios para a formação inicial e contínua. *Formação Docente: Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa sobre Formação de Professores*, 12(23), 53-66. <https://doi.org/10.31639/rbpf.v12i23.287>
- Kearney, S. (2013). Improving engagement: the use of 'authentic self-and peer-assessment for learning' to enhance the student learning experience. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(7), 875-891. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.751963>
- Maureira-Cabrera, O., Vásquez-Astudillo, M., Garrido-Valdenegro, F., & Olivares-Silva, M.J. (2020). Evaluación y coevaluación de aprendizajes en blended learning en educación superior. *Alteridad*, 15(2), 190-203. <https://doi.org/10.17163/alt.v15n2.2020.04>
- Nóvoa, A. (2004). *Formação de professores e trabalho pedagógico*. Educa.
- Nóvoa, A. (2017). Firmar a posição como professor: afirmar a profissão docente. *Caderno de Pesquisa*, 47(166), 1106-1133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/198053144843>
- Paula, S.C., Ferreira-Neto, A., Stieg- R., & dos Santos, W. (2018). Ensino da avaliação nos cursos de educação física da América Latina. *Estudos em Avaliação Educacional*, 29(72), 802-830. <https://doi.org/10.18222/ea.v29i72.5326>
- Picos, A.P., & López-Pastor, V.M. (2013). Haz lo que yo digo pero no lo que yo hago: sistemas de evaluación del alumnado en la formación inicial del profesorado. *Revista de Educación*, 36, 279-305. <https://doi.org/10.4438/1988-592X-RE-2011-361-143>
- Poleto, F.M., Frossard, M.L., & Santos, W. (2020). As prescrições de avaliação dos cursos de formação de professores em educação física. *Revista Práxis Educacional*, 16(43), 542-568. <https://doi.org/10.22481/rpe.v16i43.7057>
- Santos, W. (2005). *Currículo e avaliação na educação física: do mergulho à intervenção*. Proteoria.
- Santos, W., Rostoldo-Macedo, L., Martins Cassani Matos J., da Silva-Mello, A., & Schneider, O. (2014). Avaliação na educação física escolar: construindo possibilidades para atuação profissional. *Educação em Revista*, 30(4), 153-179. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-46982014000400008>
- Sluijsmans, D.M., & Prins, F. (2006). A conceptual framework for integrating peer assessment in teacher education. *Studies' in Educational Evaluation*, 32, 6-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2006.01.005>
- Stieg, R., Vieira, A.O., Frossard, M.F., Ferreira Neto, A., Santos, W. (2018). Avaliação educacional nos cursos de licenciatura em educação física nas IES brasileiras: uma análise das disciplinas específicas. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 18, 639-667. <https://bit.ly/2Sw1GXx>



- Tejada, J., & Ruiz, C. (2016). Evaluación de competencias profesionales en educación superior: retos e implicaciones. *Educación XXI*, 19(1), 17-38. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.12175>
- Ufes (2014). *Regimento Geral*. <https://bit.ly/3tX1ugr>
- Uruguay (2008a). Ministerios de Educación y Cultura. *Ley General de Educación: Ley n. 18.437*. Dirección Nacional de Impresiones y Publicaciones Oficiales, Montevideo. <https://bit.ly/2QsR22y>
- Uruguay (2008b). Administración Nacional de Educación Pública (ANEP). *Sistema Único Nacional de Formación Docente 2008*. Documento Final. <https://bit.ly/3bDwnAb>
- Vlachopoulos, D. (2008). ¿Evaluación final o evaluación continua?: un estudio sobre la valoración de los sistemas evaluativos por los estudiantes de lengua griega antigua. *Classica, Revista Brasileira de Estudos Clássicos*, 21(1), 7-24. https://doi.org/10.14195/2176-6436_21-1_1

