



Research article

# Concepts and Assessment Practices in Initial Teacher Training for Physical Education

Concepciones y Prácticas Evaluativas en la Formación Inicial del Profesorado en Educación Física

Concepções e Práticas Avaliativas na Formação Inicial de Professores de Educação Física

Asenjo-Paredes, Catalina<sup>1</sup>; Gallardo-Fuentes, Francisco<sup>2</sup>; Carter-Thuillier, Bastian<sup>3</sup> & Peña-Troncoso, Sebastián<sup>4</sup>

Asenjo-Paredes, C., Gallardo-Fuentes, F., Carter-Thuillier, B., & Peña-Troncoso, S. (2024). Concepciones y Prácticas Evaluativas en la Formación Inicial del Profesorado en Educación Física. *Revista Ciencias de la Actividad Física UCM*, 25(1), enero-junio, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.29035/rcaf.25.1.9>

## ABSTRACT

The evaluation has ceased to be a mere instance that only certifies the achievement through a grade; rather, it is currently understood as a fundamental element to promote teaching and learning processes. The objective of the present study was to "Understand the conceptions and evaluative practices of students and faculty in the ITEPE (Initial Teacher Education in Physical Education) of two university campuses in the southernmost region of Chile." For this purpose, a sample of 219 students (age  $M = 21.6$  and  $SD = 2.8$ ) from two university campuses undergoing Initial Teacher Education in Physical Education (ITEPE) and 21 teachers (age  $M = 50.3$  and  $SD = 13.2$ ) was used. The "Questionnaire for the study of the evaluation system in the initial teacher education of physical education" was administered in a virtual manner, subjecting the results to statistical tests such as mean, standard deviation, and inferential tests. The main results reveal the presence of traditional evaluation methodologies and instruments, as well as a differentiated perception between students and faculty. However, there is evidence of formative intent in the actions implemented by the faculty.

**Key words:** Higher education; Formative Assessment; Initial Teacher Training; Physical education.

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de los Lagos, Carrera Educación Física, Chile.  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4619-0962>, [catalinajaviera.asenjo@alumnos.ulagos.cl](mailto:catalinajaviera.asenjo@alumnos.ulagos.cl)

<sup>2</sup> Universidad de los Lagos, Departamento Educación, Chile.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3985-157X>, [fgallardo@ulagos.cl](mailto:fgallardo@ulagos.cl)

<sup>3</sup> Universidad de los Lagos, Departamento Educación, Programa de investigación en Deporte, Sociedad y Buen Vivir. Universidad Católica de Temuco, Facultad de Educación, Departamento de Didáctica y Práctica, Chile.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7342-4179>, [bastian.carter@ulagos.cl](mailto:bastian.carter@ulagos.cl)

<sup>4</sup> Universidad Austral, Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación. Universidad SEK, Doctorado en Educación, Chile.  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5438-0868>, [sebastian.pena@uach.cl](mailto:sebastian.pena@uach.cl)

## RESUMEN

La evaluación ha dejado de ser una instancia que sólo certifica el logro alcanzado a través de una calificación, sino actualmente se entiende como un elemento fundamental para favorecer los procesos de enseñanza-aprendizaje. El objetivo del presente estudio fue "Conocer las concepciones y prácticas evaluativas del alumnado y profesorado de la FIPEF (Formación Inicial del Profesorado en Educación Física) de dos campus universitarios de la zona sur austral de Chile". Para ello, se contó con una muestra de 219 alumnos y alumnas (edad  $M = 21.6$  y  $dt. = 2.8$ ) de dos campus universitarios que cursaban Formación Inicial del Profesorado en Educación Física (FIPEF) y 21 profesores y profesoras (edad  $M = 50.3$  y  $dt. = 13.2$ ). Se aplicó el "Cuestionario para el estudio del sistema de evaluación en la formación inicial del profesorado de educación física" de forma virtual, sometiendo los resultados a pruebas estadísticas como la media, desviación típica y pruebas inferenciales. Los principales resultados dejan ver la presencia de metodologías e instrumentos tradicionales de evaluación, así como, una apreciación diferenciada entre alumnado vs. profesorado. Sin embargo, se puede constatar la presencia de intencionalidad formativa en las acciones implementadas por el profesorado.

**Palabras clave:** Educación Superior; Evaluación Formativa; Formación Inicial del Profesorado; Educación Física.

## RESUMO

A avaliação deixou de ser apenas uma instância que certifica a conquista por meio de uma nota; atualmente, é compreendida como um elemento fundamental para promover os processos de ensino e aprendizagem. O objetivo do presente estudo foi "Compreender as concepções e práticas avaliativas dos estudantes e professores da FIPEF (Formação Inicial de Professores de Educação Física) de dois campi universitários na região sul-austral do Chile." Para isso, contamos com uma amostra de 219 alunos (idade  $M = 21,6$  e  $dp. = 2,8$ ) de dois campi universitários que cursavam a Formação Inicial de Professores de Educação Física (FIPEF) e 21 professores (idade  $M = 50,3$  e  $dp. = 13,2$ ). Foi aplicado o "Questionário para o estudo do sistema de avaliação na formação inicial de professores de educação física" de forma virtual, sujeitando os resultados a testes estatísticos como média, desvio padrão e testes inferenciais. Os principais resultados revelam a presença de metodologias e instrumentos tradicionais de avaliação, bem como uma percepção diferenciada entre alunos e professores. No entanto, há evidências de intencionalidade formativa nas ações implementadas pelos professores.

**Palavras chave:** Educação Superior; Avaliação Formativa; Formação Inicial de Professores; Educação Física.

## INTRODUCTION

For decades, assessment has been a fundamental process within the Chilean educational system, but it is difficult to have a clear conception of what “assessment” really means, given its polysemic nature (Careaga, 2001). Therefore, when we refer to assessment in a teaching-learning (T-L) context, it is sometimes confused with a meaning that is more sought after in technical professions, and which ultimately does not consist of grading or measuring, so that a quantifiable value is granted and there is no feedback to guide learning. The curricula that are installed in Chilean educational structures have led to the fact that today we have the legacy of a much more technical assessment and what is really done is to measure using the traditional grade scale. Current curricular guidelines call for putting the focus of the T-L process on students and their learning. With the implementation of competencies, there is a complete change of focus, with the center of this process becoming “the student” and not “the teachers” as it has been for a long time in traditional educational approaches. For all of the above reasons, an evaluation accompanied by feedback and dialogue is needed, although to this day the evaluative heritage with which we were trained continues to resonate and where traditional practices (measuring, grading and quantifying) have ended up influencing contemporary teachers and their evaluative practices, who once again repeat what they have experienced and which are usually summative evaluations. All of the above ultimately has a huge impact on Physical Education (PE), which is an educational discipline that is strongly influenced by competitive sport, forgetting that its function in the curriculum is not to train athletes, but to educate through motor skills (Vallejos-Sanhueza & Villar-Cavieres, 2023), which is established as a primary prevention mechanism against unhealthy lifestyles (Torres, 2021). The latter is added to reports of student demotivation and lack of knowledge among teachers in Chilean PE (Sandoval-Fuentes et al., 2021). Notwithstanding the above, PE continues with the tendency to measure performance and grade through performance tables, even though an adequate evaluation in PE has been shown to impact the learning of the discipline, in addition to contributing to the acquisition of values such as responsibility and teamwork, among others.

### The Evaluation

Assessment has been a fundamental process in many disciplines around the world for decades, making it difficult to have a clear conception of what “assessing” really means, since it is a polysemic term (Careaga, 2001); if we look at it from the pedagogical side, this concept plays a very relevant role in “traditional” teaching, since it is associated with grading (exams and tests, among others), leaving aside feedback for students (Sonsoles, 2017). However, currently, assessment as we know it is in constant tension, raising questions about its application in the classroom, as it was applied years ago. New evaluative currents suggest that today we must take into account that, when we refer to evaluation in a Teaching-Learning (T-L) context, we must renounce evaluative practices inherited from professions of a technical nature, and which ultimately do not evaluate, which, in addition, is repeated in different contexts, such as education, the business world, health and sports (Sánchez-González et al., 2022; López-Pastor, 2008; Sander, 1996). As mentioned above, in the past, evaluation had a high punitive burden and was used as a way to classify and label students according to their performance, however, this does not lead to meaningful learning, therefore, it has evolved over time and has gone through different approaches and methods throughout history (Valencia-Berrezueta, 2021).

## Evaluation and Curricular Paradigms

In the 1970s, the educational model was based on memorizing, applying and evaluating, leaving aside complex skills such as discussing, critically thinking and debating how and what was being taught; at that time, teachers were the "protagonists", leaving students in the background (Budnik et al., 2011), therefore, teaching was based on a traditional approach, since emphasis was placed on the transmission of knowledge and skills by teachers to students, and evaluation was based on memorizing and repeating this delivered knowledge (Zúñiga-Meléndez et al., 2014). In a constructivist approach, learning is seen as an active process in which the student builds his or her own knowledge through experience and interaction with the environment, therefore, in this case, the evaluation focuses on deep understanding and the ability to apply learning in real-world situations (Porlán, 2018), stimulating capacities and skills that exist in the student and the process through which he or she goes through to reach critical thinking both of himself or herself and of others (López-Pastor, 2012).

A clear example is formative assessments, which provide constant feedback to students and not multiple grades; these assessments focus on the process by which students are formed in order to reach the "final product", they also incorporate self-assessments allowing students to have a critical look at their work, responsibility and experiences; Peer assessments support teamwork and peer evaluation (Molina-Soria & López-Pastor, 2017), thereby the evaluation focuses on understanding and application, while in a traditionalist approach, the evaluation may focus on performance on standardized tests (López-Pastor et al., 2005).

## Formative and Shared Evaluation

Formative and Shared Evaluation (FSE) focuses on constant feedback, active participation of students and the teacher in the T-L process (Hamodi et al., 2015). This form of assessment is based on the fact that it should not only be used to grade or classify students but also as a tool to improve their skills and learning within the physical education classroom (Hamodi & López-Pastor, 2012), implying an exhaustive collection of information about the students' process over time, thus using tests, class work, projects, group discussions, self-assessment and peer assessments, among others (Puig, 2020). On the one hand, Formative Assessment is a continuous process that is carried out throughout the T-L process with the aim of monitoring and improving student learning, providing constant and useful feedback on their progress and performance to help them improve (Cáceres). -Mesa et al., 2018), which implies that students are actively involved in the assessment process, setting goals and reflecting on their own learning (López-Pastor, 2012). Shared assessment, on the other hand, implies involving students in the assessment process and shared decision-making within the classroom, the students participating in this process and in making decisions about their own learning (Palacios-Picos & López-Pastor, 2013). A clear example of this is: a) co-assessment, in which students assess the work of their peers; b) self-assessment, in which students assess their own work. Both types of assessments can complement the assessment by the teacher, giving way to "shared" assessment processes so that together with the FSE they can be powerful tools to improve student learning, establishing themselves as an ally and helping students to be active subjects and critical thinkers within the classroom (Capllonch & Buscá, 2012).

## Evaluation in Chile

Assessment is a very important tool in the Chilean education system, both for students and for teachers and educational establishments in general (Infante, 2010). Multiple efforts can be seen to understand the learning and performance of students in different areas. To this end, there are standardized tests that are applied during the school formative itinerary, in order to know the progress in areas such as: reading, writing, mathematics and science (Osandón et al., 2018). In the 1960s, the Academic Aptitude Test (AAP) was started and was applied between 1966 and 2002; this test measured reading and mathematics skills, which were mandatory (Pizarro-Sánchez, 2001). Then, from 2003 to 2020, the University Selection Test (PSU) was implemented; As the years went by, in 2021 the Higher Education Access Test (HEAT) was implemented. However, this way of seeking to understand learning has been criticized for more than two decades, since these tests are only based on memorizing and capturing learning that is taught within educational systems, leaving aside social, physical, cognitive and emotional skills, among others, which also conditions the way in which it is evaluated at school (Gallardo-Fuentes et al., 2022).

In light of the above, it should be noted that the Ministry of Education has implemented various initiatives to improve the quality of education, such as the National Plan for the Evaluation of Results (NPER), which seeks to improve the quality of education in the most vulnerable educational establishments in the country through the evaluation and monitoring of learning outcomes (Montecinos, 2014). This and other innovations attempt to establish assessment as a co-assistant of the T-L process in the development of skills and competencies through continuous and formative assessment (Decree 67, 2018), in which feedback is provided to students so that they can improve their performance and learn from their mistakes. Maldonado-Fuentes et al. (2020) suggest that teachers should implement an assessment that is dedicated to getting to know the students and that those who are dedicated to teaching should try to intervene in the T-L process, not to give a grade, but to train people with a critical mindset. Likewise, assessment tools have evolved, and different methods are now used, such as observation, self-assessment and peer assessment, in addition to traditional exams, which do not measure all the skills that students must acquire throughout their educational process (López-Pastor, 2008).

## Evaluation in the Physical Education Classroom

Physical Education is a discipline that focuses on the integral development of people through physical activity and movement. It covers a wide range of activities ranging from warm-up exercises, games, sports, relaxation techniques and recreational activities (Pedraz, 2010). Its purpose is to promote the physical, emotional, social and cognitive development of students, giving them the opportunity to experience and enjoy movement, thus improving their physical condition, acquiring motor skills and developing values such as teamwork, self-improvement, respect and solidarity (Carter-Thuillier & Gallardo-Fuentes, 2021). In addition to the physical aspects, it is also concerned with the acquisition of theoretical knowledge related to anatomy, physiology, health, nutrition and other topics related to the human body (Almonacid, 2012). In this way, evaluation in the physical education classroom has been established as an essential process to measure the progress and performance of students, but mainly their "physical condition", which is reflected in proposals that led to the application of the so-called Simce-PE (Rodríguez et al., 2015). This historical burden of traditional models focused on grading, and the weight of the disciplinary load that reveals evaluative practices focused on the verification of physical performance cannot be ignored, but especially worrying is its impact within the physical education classroom, because teachers carry the legacy of teaching as they were taught, and very few have changed their methodologies (Castejón-Oliva et al., 2011), which generates greater tension in the current context, since the promulgation of Decree 67 (on evaluation, grading and school promotion), implies understanding precisely that the T-L process must be shared, and teachers are called to establish clear objectives before beginning to teach, since this will help students to know what is expected of them and how they will be evaluated (Decree 67, 2018). Based on the above, it is understood that the evaluation must be fair and consistent for everyone, regardless of gender, abilities or level of physical condition, and not be installed at the end of each unit, but rather should be deployed regularly throughout the progress, making adjustments in teaching if necessary (Fraile et al., 2013). Likewise, we must keep in mind that it is essential to provide feedback to students so that they can identify their strengths, weaknesses and thus improve; therefore, feedback must be specific, constructive and timely (Gallardo-Fuentes et al., 2017; López-Pastor, 2005). In summary, evaluation in the physical education classroom is an important process that must be carefully planned and executed to measure student progress and performance fairly and effectively, leaving aside only "assessing for the sake of assessing" strict physical performance, but rather seeking to improve the delivery of knowledge. This is even more relevant at ITEPE, since it is precisely there where future teachers of the school system will acquire the concepts, techniques and instruments that they will use in evaluative terms for their future practice (Gómez & Guerra, 2012; Maldonado-Fuentes et al., 2020). For all the above reasons, the objective of the present study was to understand the evaluative conceptions and practices of students and teachers of ITEPE from two university campuses in the southern part of Chile.

## METHODS

The methodology used was quantitative (Gil-Pascual, 2015), considering that we will base ourselves on the collection of data through the completion of a questionnaire called "Questionnaire for the study of the evaluation system in the initial training of physical education teachers" which was used to record the perceptions of students and teachers on a Likert scale (where 0 = none or none; 1 = few or little; 2 = some or medium; 3 = quite a few or high and 4 = all or very high). The questionnaire was previously

validated and used in the Chilean context (Ruiz-Gallardo et al., 2013) and, for the purposes of this article, the items that have the highest level of connection with the objective pursued are presented. The sample consisted of 219 students (70.3% men; 29.7% women) of age (M= 21.6 and dt.= 2.8) and 21 teachers (52.4% men; 47.6% women) of age (M= 50.3 and dt.= 13.2) of the ITEPE belonging to two university campuses in the southern area of Chile.

After applying the questionnaire, descriptive analyses were developed, with the aim of seeking the collection of information without modifying the environment in which the research process was carried out (Valle et al., 2022). The numerical data obtained were processed through the statistical software SPSS. in its version 18.0. Using descriptive statistics techniques, the standard deviation (SD) and the arithmetic mean (M) of each of the items linked to the statements contained in the questionnaire were obtained. In turn, to establish a comparison between the perceptions of the students vs. the teachers, an inferential statistics analysis (difference in means) was performed by applying the Mann-Whitney U test (u) and the level of significance (sig) was set at  $p \leq .05$ .

## RESULTS

Table 1 shows the results related to the coherence between the subject program and the evaluation systems used/experienced.

**Table 1**

*Means, SD and correlation between teacher and student assessments. For items 1 and 2 corresponding to the Evaluation System.*

Item	Students		Faculty		S vs. P	
	M	SD	M	SD	U S-F	p
In the subjects you have taken/teach, have the assessment systems applied corresponded to what is included in the program?	2.9	1.4	3.4	1.5	1902	.11
How often have teachers informed you about your learning through the assessment system used in the different subjects? Q. How often do you inform students about their learning through the assessment system used?	2.3	1.2	3.3	1.5	1440	.01*

U= Mann-Whitney U; F = Faculty; S = Students \* $p \leq .05$

As can be seen in Table 1, students perceived that the coherence between the applied evaluation systems and the subject programs occurs between some and quite a few times (2.9, according to the Likert scale), in contrast to the highest rating given by the teaching staff (3.4). Likewise, the students' perception shows a presence of feedback only sometimes, a perception that is significantly lower than that of the teaching staff, who consider that feedback is given quite a lot or always.

Table 2 shows the perception of students and teachers regarding the presence of different cognitive abilities in the subjects they have taken/taught and the assessment that students and teachers give to the importance of different cognitive abilities for future teaching performance.

**Table 2**

*Means, SD and correlation between teachers and students for the different cognitive abilities present in the evaluation and assessment systems that students and teachers give to the importance that the different cognitive abilities have for future teaching performance.*

In how many subjects that you have taken have the following cognitive abilities been present in the evaluation systems?	Students		Faculty		S vs. F	
	M	SD	M	SD	U S-F	p
Recall	3.1	0.9	2.3	1.0	1367	.01*
Apply	3.4	0.7	3.7	0.5	1746.5	.04*
Comprehend	3.4	0.7	3.3	0.9	2283	.95
Analyze	3.1	0.8	3.2	0.7	2176	.66
Synthesize	3.1	0.8	3.1	0.7	2256	.88
Value	2.9	1.0	3.3	1.2	1650	.03*

  

How important do you think the following cognitive abilities are for your development?	Students		Faculty		S vs. F	
	M	SD	M	SD	U S-F	p
Recall	3.4	0.8	2.8	0.9	1408.5	.01*
Apply	3.8	0.4	3.9	0.4	2151	.48
Comprehend	3.8	0.4	3.9	0.3	2147	.42
Analyze	3.6	0.6	4.0	0.2	1689.5	.01*
Synthesize	3.5	0.7	3.8	0.5	1750	.03*
Value	3.5	0.8	4.0	0.2	1576	.01*

U= Mann-Whitney U; F = Faculty; S = Students \*p≤ .05

In Table 2, the perceptions of students and teachers regarding the presence of different cognitive abilities in the evaluation systems can be seen. Of the three cognitive abilities that obtained significant differences between the perception of the teaching staff vs. the students, the cognitive ability of “Remembering” obtained significantly higher ratings by the students. While the cognitive abilities of “Applying” and “Evaluating” obtained significantly higher differences by the teaching staff.

Regarding the importance of various cognitive abilities in the training of ITEPE students, it can be seen that there is a significantly different assessment regarding the cognitive ability of “Remembering” with a perception of greater importance by the students. On the other hand, the cognitive abilities of “Analyzing” (3.6 for students vs. 4.0 for teaching staff); “Synthesizing” (3.5 for students vs. 3.8 for teachers) and “Evaluating” (3.5 for students vs. 4.0 for teachers) obtained significant differences with higher evaluations by teachers in all cases.

Table 3 shows the perception of students vs. teachers, linked to the presence of different assessment instruments and procedures in the subjects they have taken/taught.



**Table 3**

*Means, SD and correlations between student and teacher perceptions regarding the different assessment instruments at ITEPE.*

How often has the teacher used the following assessment instruments and procedures in the subjects you have taken?	Students		Faculty		S vs. F	
	M	SD	M	SD	U S-F	p
Teacher observation in class (observation sheets)	2.4	1.2	2.4	1.6	2229.5	.81
Control of participation in the classroom (in groups and debate)	2.9	1.0	2.5	1.1	1802	.09
Multiple choice test	2.7	1.0	1.8	1.7	1531	<b>.01*</b>
Open Question Exam	2.4	1.2	2.1	1.4	2063	.42
Short Question Test (Brief Explanations)	2.5	1.1	2.0	1.4	1730.5	<b>.05*</b>
Closed Question Exam (Definitions)	2.6	1.1	1.4	1.4	1190	<b>.01*</b>
Written exams with documents	2.5	1.3	2.3	1.5	2123.5	.55
Oral exams	2.1	1.3	2.0	1.4	2218.5	.79
Practical physical tests (physical exercises, game situations, etc.)	3.2	1.0	2.9	1.5	2115	.51
Portfolios	2.0	1.3	2.1	1.5	2258.5	.89
Field notebooks	1.7	1.3	1.9	1.4	2173.5	.67
Reports or written works	3.2	1.0	3.3	0.9	2205.5	.74
Essays based on written texts or audiovisual materials	2.9	1.1	2.6	1.1	1888.5	.16

U= Mann-Whitney U; F = Faculty; S = Students \*p≤ .05

Table 3 shows that, in the opinion of students and teachers, the most commonly used procedures are physical practical tests and written reports or assignments. However, there are significant differences in the frequency with which “multiple choice tests”, “short question tests” and “closed question tests” are used; according to student assessments, these instruments are used more than teachers say.

Table 4 shows the perception of students vs. teachers for a series of statements that link assessment instruments and teaching skills.

**Table 4**

*Means, SD and correlation to the coherence between the evaluation instruments and the teaching competencies.*

What degree of coherence do you think exists between the following assessment instruments/procedures and the development of your skills to be a teacher?	Students		Faculty		S vs. F	
	M	SD	M	SD	U S-F	p
Teacher observation in class (observation sheets)	3.0	0.9	3.1	1.2	1922.5	.19
Control of participation in the classroom (in groups and debate)	3.2	0.9	3.2	0.9	2231	.81
Multiple choice test	2.8	1.0	3.0	1.2	1928.5	.20
Open Question Exam	2.9	1.0	3.3	1.0	1678.5	<b>.03*</b>
Short Question Test (Brief Explanations)	2.9	1.0	2.9	1.0	2234.5	.82
Closed Question Exam (Definitions)	2.8	1.0	2.6	1.3	2183.5	.69
Written exams with documents	2.7	1.2	2.8	1.2	2107	.51
Oral exams	2.6	1.1	3.3	1.1	1435.5	<b>.01*</b>
Practical physical tests (physical exercises, game situations, etc.)	3.4	0.9	3.4	1.2	2064	.37
Portfolios	2.4	1.3	2.9	1.1	1793.5	.09
Field notebooks	2.2	1.3	2.6	1.4	1870.5	.15
Reports or written works	3.0	1.0	3.5	0.7	1577	<b>.01*</b>
Essays based on written texts or audiovisual materials	3.0	1.0	3.1	1.3	2046.5	.37

U= Mann-Whitney U; F = Faculty; S = Students \*p≤ .05

The degree of coherence between the assessment instruments/procedures and the development of competencies to be a teacher is given to a greater extent, according to the opinion of students and teachers, in “physical practical tests”, with an assessment that is between high and very high. Regarding the significant differences, these were located in the “open question exams”, “oral exams” and “reports or written works”, in all three cases, with a perception of coherence significantly greater by the teachers.

**Table 5**

*Means, SD and correlation for statements linked to inadequate evaluation systems.*

Rate your level of agreement with the following statements: In the subjects where there has not been an adequate evaluation system, this has been due to:	Students		Faculty		S vs. F	
	M	SD	M	SD	U S-F	p
Teacher demotivation	1.8	1.3	1.0	1.2	1426.5	<b>.01*</b>
Lack of teacher training	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.3	1852	.13
The complexity of the evaluation system itself	2.2	1.1	1.6	1.2	1732.5	<b>.05*</b>
The teacher's lack of clarity in applying it	2.3	1.2	1.2	1.4	1248.5	<b>.00*</b>
Lack of time to evaluate	2.1	1.2	2.0	1.4	2261.5	.90
Excessive number of students per class	2.1	1.5	2.6	1.6	1880.5	.16

U= Mann-Whitney U; F = Faculty; S = Students \*p≤ .05

Table 5 presents the assessments given by students and teachers to a series of statements linked to reasons why the assessment systems experienced have not worked. According to the students' perception, the occasions where there has not been an adequate assessment system is due to "The teacher's lack of clarity in applying it"; this perception, moreover, is significantly higher than that of the teachers for the same item.

## DISCUSSION

This research offers a valuable perspective on the evaluative conceptions and practices of Initial Teacher Training in Physical Education. Nowadays, evaluation is no longer an instance that only certifies the achievement reached through a grade, since it is currently understood as a fundamental element to favor T-L processes (Sonsoles, 2017). The main results reveal the presence of traditional evaluation methodologies and instruments, as well as a differentiated appreciation between students vs. teachers, which is worrying given the need for greater coherence between what teachers and students appreciate regarding evaluative practices in T-L processes. Along these lines, other studies can be identified, such as those by López-Pastor (2008), Sander (1996) and Sánchez-González et al. (2022), who refer that evaluative practices must be fed back both from the role of the teacher and from the students in order to build a constructivist and accompanied teaching. Analyzing the results of the questionnaire applied to the ITEPE students, there is a dissonance between what the teachers say and what the students perceive regarding the evaluation practices that incorporate feedback processes. The results of the study show, with respect to the coherence between the evaluation systems applied and the subject programs, that there are contradictions between the answers given by the teachers vs. students, since the students show a lack of feedback, once again revealing that in the practices they have experienced there is no constant feedback in the classroom, which becomes worrying, if it is considered that this practice is essential to improve T-L, according to Barrientos et al. (2019).

The perceptions of students and teachers, regarding the presence of different cognitive capacities in the evaluation systems, presented differences; A higher perception was observed by students in relation to cognitive abilities such as "remembering", however, teachers give a perception of greater presence to the cognitive abilities of "applying", "assessing", "synthesizing" and "analyzing". Unfortunately, this situation reinforces the traditional tendency, according to the opinion of the students, which uses evaluation methods that promote the memorization of concepts. However, it is expected that this trend will change, so that the intention of curricular modification in Chile is very positive, supported by various regulations that seek curricular adaptation according to the needs present in the Chilean educational system (Campo-Peña et al., 2020).

The most commonly used procedures are multiple choice tests, short questions and closed question tests, and the degree of coherence between the evaluation instruments and the development of the competencies to be a teacher occurs to a greater extent, according to the opinion of both parties, in "practical physical tests" with an assessment that is between high and very high. This finding had already been noted in previous studies in the same context (Gallardo-Fuentes et al., 2017). A significant difference is observed regarding "open question exams", "oral exams" and "reports or written work"; in all three cases, there is a significantly higher perception on the part of the teaching staff. This differentiation reinforces the idea that, when establishing the use of evaluation procedures, students

point out that there is a much greater use of techniques and instruments that are linked to a technical rationality (Maldonado-Fuentes et al., 2020). Likewise, it was observed that when talking about the reasons why the evaluation systems experienced have not worked, the perception of the students is significantly higher than that of the teaching staff to the statement "the lack of clarity of the teacher when applying it". To overcome these tensions, according to the authors Sarni-Muñiz & Corbo-Bruno, it is necessary "to carry out an evaluation that allows the group of subjects who participate in it to confront the norm, break it down, question it, overcome it, and along the way build their own, in a participatory manner..." (Sarni-Muñiz & Corbo-Bruno, 2020, p. 162).

Given all of the above, it is necessary to ask ourselves: how should we unify the opinions of both teachers and students on these practices? Why are there differences in the answers given within the applied questionnaire? Are we really doing a good job as teachers/students? Are we being haunted by the legacy of a more technical evaluation already in 2023? These and other questions have mobilized, almost two decades ago, multiple authors to go in search of the presence of FSE (Herrero-González et al., 2020). It should be noted that the purpose of PE classes is to promote the physical, emotional, social and cognitive development of students, giving them the opportunity to experience and enjoy movement, thus improving their physical condition, acquiring motor skills and developing values such as teamwork, self-improvement, respect and solidarity (Carter-Thuillier & Gallardo-Fuentes, 2021), and the task of generating adequate evaluation processes must come from the hand of the teaching staff, thus respecting Decree 67 (2018).

Maldonado-Fuentes et al. (2020) suggest that teachers should implement an evaluation that is dedicated to getting to know the students and those who are dedicated to teaching should try to intervene in the T-L process, not to give a grade, but to train people with a critical mindset (Molina & López-Pastor, 2019). Likewise, assessment tools have evolved, and it is necessary to incorporate a variety of methods, including observation, self-assessment, and peer assessment, in addition to traditional exams, provided that these serve a formative purpose and are capable of consistently accompanying the development of the skills that students must acquire throughout their educational process (López-Pastor, 2008).

Finally, this study highlights the need to reformulate and modernize the assessment approaches in ITEPE on the university campuses studied. This change is essential to adapt to the current demands of the Chilean educational system, which requires an assessment that not only certifies achievement, but also facilitates and enriches T-L processes. The evolution of assessment practices should be a primary objective in the training of future physical education teachers.

## CONCLUSION

After analyzing the results of the study, which focused on understanding the state of evaluative conceptions and practices at ITEPE in two university campuses in southern Chile, focusing on the perception of students and academics, we can conclude by mentioning that there is a clear dissonance between the predominant evaluative practices at ITEPE and the current needs that the educational system requires, and even requests, through current regulations, which is reflected in the lack of coherence in the accounts of teachers vs. students, when referring to the evaluation that is carried out at ITEPE. Also, a strong presence of traditional evaluation methodologies and instruments is observed,

which suggests a resistance to the adoption of contemporary and formative approaches in evaluation. On the other hand, the disparity in perception between students and academics raises the need for greater communication and alignment of objectives in relation to assessment at ITEPE, which could translate into a greater understanding of students' expectations and a more coherent and effective approach to the T-L process in evaluative terms.

Considering the limitations found, it is important to highlight that the presence of formative intentionality is identified in the actions implemented by the teaching staff. This finding is encouraging, because it suggests that, although traditional approaches persist, there is a recognition of the importance of using assessment as a learning tool.

Finally, this study highlights the need to reformulate and modernize evaluative approaches at ITEPE on the university campuses studied. This change is essential to adapt to the current demands of education, which require an assessment that not only certifies achievement, but also facilitates and enriches T-L processes. The evolution of evaluative practices should be a primary objective in the training of future Physical Education teachers in this region.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article is linked to the project "ANID, FONDECYT REGULAR Program 2023, Folio (1230609)", entitled "¿Cuándo cambia la normativa de la escuela también debe hacerlo la Formación Docente? impacto del nuevo decreto sobre evaluación, calificación y promoción escolar en la preparación de los/as futuros/as Profesores/as de Educación Física".

## REFERENCES

- Almonacid, A. (2012). La educación física como espacio de transformación social y educativa: perspectivas desde los imaginarios sociales y la ciencia de la motricidad humana. *Estudios Pedagógicos*, 38(Especial), 177-190. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052012000400010>
- Barrientos, E.H., López-Pastor, V., & Pérez-Brunicardi, D. (2019). ¿Por qué hago evaluación formativa y compartida y/o evaluación para el aprendizaje en EF?: La influencia de la formación inicial y permanente del profesorado. *Retos*, 36, 37-43. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v36i36.66478>
- Budnik, J., Chávez, R., López, J., Rojo, J., Edmonson, R., & Morales, M. (2011). La empresa educativa Chilena. *Educação & Sociedade*, 32(115), 305-322. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-73302011000200004>
- Cáceres-Mesa, M., Gómez-Meléndez, L., & Zúñiga-Rodríguez, M. (2018). El papel del docente en la evaluación del aprendizaje. *Conrado*, 14(63), 196-207. [http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S1990-86442018000300196](http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1990-86442018000300196)
- Campo-Peña, A., Campo-Peña, E., Coba-Vides, J., & Acevedo-Merlano, A. (2020). Estrategias para la enseñanza de la educación física en búsqueda de la calidad educativa. *Revista Científica Estelí*, (33), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.5377/farem.v0i33.9606>
- Capllonch, M., & Buscá, F. (2012). La evaluación formativa como innovación: experiencias en una Facultad de Formación del Profesorado. *Psychology, Society & Educación*, 4(1), 45-58. <https://repositorio.ual.es/bitstream/handle/10835/2892/vista%20Capllonch%20Bujosa.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

- Careaga, A. (2001). La evaluación como herramienta de transformación de la práctica docente. *Educere*, 5(15), 345-352. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/356/35651519.pdf>
- Carter-Thuillier, B., & Gallardo-Fuentes, F. (2021). Emociones, interculturalidad y educación física. *Tándem: didáctica de la educación física*, 71, 21-25. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7784527>
- Castejón-Oliva, F., López-Pastor, V., Julián-Clemente, J., & 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 del Deporte*, 11(42), 238-346. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/542/54222171007.pdf>
- Decreto 67 de 2018. Aprueba normas mínimas nacionales sobre evaluación, calificación y promoción y deroga los decretos exentos n° 511 de 1997, n° 112 de 1999 y n° 83 de 2001, todos del Ministerio de Educación. 20 de febrero de 2018. <https://www.bcn.cl/leychile/navegar?idNorma=1127255>
- Fraile, A., López-Pastor, V., Castejón, J., & Romero, R. (2013). La evaluación formativa en docencia universitaria y el rendimiento académico del alumnado. *Aula Abierta*, 41(2), 23-34. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=4239063>
- Gallardo-Fuentes, F., Carter-Thuillier, B., López-Pastor, V., Ojeda-Nahuelcura, R., & Fuentes-Nieto, T. (2022). Sistemas de evaluación en la formación del profesorado de Educación Física: un estudio de casos en contexto chileno. *Retos*, 43, 117-126. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v43i0.88570>
- Gallardo-Fuentes, F., López-Pastor, V., & Carter-Thuillier, B. (2017). ¿Hay evaluación formativa y compartida en formación inicial del profesorado en Chile? Percepción de alumnado, profesorado y egresados de una universidad. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 9(2), 227-238. <https://ojs.ual.es/ojs/index.php/psye/article/view/699>
- Gil-Pascual, J. (2015). *Metodología cuantitativa en educación*. Uned.
- Gómez, V., & Guerra, P. (2012). Teorías implícitas respecto a la enseñanza y el aprendizaje: ¿Existen diferencias entre profesores en ejercicio y estudiantes de pedagogía? *Estudios Pedagógicos*, 38(1), 25-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052012000100001>
- Hamodi, C., López-Pastor, V., & López-Pastor, A. (2015). Medios, técnicas e instrumentos de evaluación formativa y compartida del aprendizaje en educación superior. *Perfiles Educativos*, 37(147), 146-161. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iissue.24486167e.2015.147.47271>
- Hamodi, C., & López-Pastor, V. (2012). La evaluación formativa y compartida en la Formación Inicial del Profesorado desde la perspectiva del alumnado y de los egresados. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 4(1), 103-116. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=3961366>
- Herrero-González, D., López-Pastor, V., & Manrique-Arribas, J. (2020). La Evaluación formativa y compartida en contextos de aprendizaje cooperativo en Educación Física en Primaria. *Cultura, Ciencia y Deporte*, 15(44), 213-222. <https://doi.org/10.12800/ccd.v15i44.1463>
- Infante, M. (2010). Desafíos a la formación docente: inclusión educativa. *Estudios Pedagógicos*, 36(1), 287-297. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052010000100016>
- López-Pastor, V. (2012). Evaluación formativa y compartida en la universidad: clarificación de conceptos y propuestas de intervención desde la Red Interuniversitaria de Evaluación Formativa. *Psychology, Society & Education*, 4(1), 117-130.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260189933\\_Evaluacion\\_Formativa\\_y\\_Compartida\\_en\\_la\\_Universidad\\_clarificacion\\_de\\_conceptos\\_y\\_propuestas\\_de\\_intervencion\\_desde\\_la\\_Red\\_Universitaria\\_de\\_Evaluacion\\_Formativa](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260189933_Evaluacion_Formativa_y_Compartida_en_la_Universidad_clarificacion_de_conceptos_y_propuestas_de_intervencion_desde_la_Red_Universitaria_de_Evaluacion_Formativa)

- López-Pastor, V. (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., Pascual, M., & Martín, J. (2005). La participación del alumnado en la evaluación: la autoevaluación, la coevaluación y la evaluación compartida. *Tándem: Didáctica de la Educación Física*, 17, 21-37. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=1090624>
- López-Pastor, V. M. (2005). La evaluación como sinónimo de calificación. Implicaciones y efectos en la Educación y en la Formación del Profesorado. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, 8(4), 1-7. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=217017876007>
- Maldonado-Fuentes, A., Tapia-Ladino, M., & Arancibia-Gutiérrez, B. (2020). ¿Qué significa evaluar? Representaciones atribuidas por estudiantes de formación inicial docente en Chile. *Perfiles Educativos*, 42(167), 138-157. <https://doi.org/10.22201/issue.24486167e.2019.167.59208>
- Molina-Soria, M., & López-Pastor, V. (2017). La transferencia de la evaluación formativa y/o compartida desde la formación inicial del profesorado de educación física a la práctica real en Educación Primaria. *Infancia, Educación y Aprendizaje*, 3(2), 626-631. <https://uvadoc.uva.es/bitstream/handle/10324/53550/La-transferencia-de-la-evaluacion-formativa-y-o-compartida-desde-la-formacion-inicial-del-profesorado-de-Educacion-Fisica.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Molina, M., & López-Pastor, V. (2019). ¿Evaluó cómo me evaluaron en la facultad? Transferencia de la Evaluación Formativa y Compartida vivida durante la formación inicial del profesorado a la práctica como docente. *Revista Iberoamericana de Evaluación Educativa*, 12(1), 85-101. <https://doi.org/10.15366/riee2019.12.1.005>
- Montecinos, C. (2014). Análisis crítico de las medidas de presión propuestas para mejorar la formación inicial de docentes en Chile por el panel de expertos para una educación de calidad. *Estudios Pedagógicos*, 40(Especial), 285-301. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052014000200017>
- Osandón, L., Caro, M., Abraham, M., Magendzo, A., Abraham, M., Lavín, S., González, S., & Cabaluz, J. (2018). *Estado, Mercado y Currículum Escolar. La Experiencia Chilena (1964-2018)*. OIE-UNESCO.
- Palacios-Picos, A., & López-Pastor, V. (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*, (361), 279-305. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=4350158>
- Pedraz, M. (2010). Educación física e ideología: creencias pedagógicas y dominación cultural en las enseñanzas escolares del cuerpo. *Retos*, 17, 76-85. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v0i17.34674>
- Pizarro-Sánchez, R. (2001). Nueva PAA chilena: algunas consideraciones políticas, teóricas, técnicas y funcionales. *Revista de Psicología*, 10(1), 51-62. <https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-0581.2001.18539>
- Porlán, R. (2018). *Enseñanza universitaria: cómo mejorarla*. Morata.
- Puig, N. (2020). *Evaluar y aprender: un único proceso*. Octaedro.

- Rodríguez, F., Estrada, D., Quezada, T., Tapia, Á., Valderrama, C., & Moreno-Doña, A. (2015). Sistema de medición de la calidad de la educación física en Chile y su influencia en la realidad escolar. *Movimento*, 21(2), 435-448. <https://doi.org/10.22456/1982-8918.49693>
- Ruiz-Gallardo, J., Ruiz, E., & Ureña, N. (2013). La evaluación en la formación inicial del profesorado: qué creemos hacer y qué perciben los alumnos. *Cultura, Ciencia y Deporte*, 8(22), 17-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12800/ccd.v8i22.220>
- Sánchez-González, S., Castro-Barrientos, C., Prat, A., & Castillo-Paredes, A. (2022). La Pedagogía en Educación Física en Chile en contextos escolares, las universidades y las políticas públicas: Una revisión. *Retos*, 43, 904-915. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v43i0.87807>
- Sander, B. (1996). Nuevas tendencias en la gestión educativa: democracia y calidad. *Revista Interamericana de Desarrollo Educativo*, 40(123-125), 29-40. [https://repository.unad.edu.co/bitstream/10596/8327/3/406007\\_nuevas\\_tendencias\\_en\\_la\\_gestion\\_educativa.pdf](https://repository.unad.edu.co/bitstream/10596/8327/3/406007_nuevas_tendencias_en_la_gestion_educativa.pdf)
- Sandoval-Fuentes, M., Quiroga-Celis, D., & Cárcamo-Oyarzún, J. (2021). Visión del profesorado de educación física hacia su asignatura en Chile. *Revista Ciencias de la Actividad Física*, 22(1), 1-12. <http://doi.org/10.29035/rcaf.22.1.9>
- Sarni-Muñiz, M., & Corbo-Bruno, J. (2020). La evaluación en educación física: más allá del control social. *Educación Física y Deporte*, 39(1). <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.efyd.v39n1a07>
- Sonsoles, F. (2017). Evaluación y Aprendizaje. MarcoELE. *Revista de Didáctica Español como Lengua Extranjera*, 24, 1-43. [https://marcoele.com/descargas/24/fernandez-evaluacion\\_aprendizaje.pdf](https://marcoele.com/descargas/24/fernandez-evaluacion_aprendizaje.pdf)
- Torres, A. (2021). Educación Física y Salud. Evaluación de la aptitud muscular y la adiposidad corporal en adolescentes escolares. *Revista Ciencias de la Actividad Física*, 22(2), 1-12. <http://doi.org/10.29035/rcaf.22.2.5>
- Valencia-Berrezueta, R. (2021). *Un nuevo enfoque a la docencia universitaria* [Tesis de postgrado, Universidad del Azuay]. <https://dspace.uazuay.edu.ec/handle/datos/11385>
- Valle, A., Manrique, L., & Revilla, D. (2022). *La Investigación Descriptiva con Enfoque Cualitativo en Educación*. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú. <https://repositorio.pucp.edu.pe/index/handle/123456789/184559>
- Vallejos-Sanhueza, H., & Villar-Cavieles, N. (2023). La Universidad Católica del Maule y su aporte al desarrollo de la psicomotricidad en Chile. *Revista Ciencias de la Actividad Física UCM*, 24(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.29035/rcaf.24.1.11>
- Zúñiga-Meléndez, A., Leiton de Sulia, R., & Naranjo-Rodríguez, J. (2014). Del sistema educativo tradicional hacia la formación por competencias: Una mirada a los procesos de enseñanza aprendizaje de las ciencias en la educación secundaria de Mendoza Argentina y San José de Costa Rica. *Revista Eureka sobre Enseñanza y Divulgación de las Ciencias*, 11(2), 145-159. <http://hdl.handle.net/10481/37421>



### Address for correspondence

---

Francisco Gallardo-Fuentes  
Doctor en Investigación Transdisciplinar en Educación  
Universidad de los Lagos  
Departamento de Educación  
Osorno - Chile.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3985-157X>

Contact: [fgallardo@ulagos.cl](mailto:fgallardo@ulagos.cl)

Received: 13-03-2024

Accepted: 03-04-2024



Esta obra está bajo una licencia de  
Creative Commons Reconocimiento-CompartirIgual 4.0 Internacional