

DOSSIER

Quality, learning and systemic assessment: discourses from international organizations for Latin American countries

Evaluation of pedagogical practice in the context of higher education in Colombia

Evaluación de la práctica pedagógica en el contexto de la educación superior en Colombia

Avaliação da prática pedagógica no contexto do ensino superior na Colômbia

Tomás Sánchez-Amaya^a
tsancheza@udistrital.edu.co

Luisa Carlota Santana-Gaitán^a
lcsantanag@udistrital.edu.co

Martha Janet Velasco-Forero^a
mjvelascof@udistrital.edu.co

ABSTRACT

The evaluation as praxis and human condition was installed in the educational event. That permeates: actions, processes, curriculums, programs, knowledge, subjects and institutions, to the point that any educational action (pedagogical, formative) that is not accompanied by various evaluative forms seems unimaginable. The pedagogical practice, installed with the relevance that currently characterizes it as an area of training does not escape evaluative action. This exercise deals with the analysis of what is actually said about the evaluation of pedagogical practices in some (public) higher education institutions in our country, particularly in some of their academic programs aimed at training licensed in various areas of knowledge. The research, documentary, analytical and descriptive, contains conceptualizations and characterizations; senses, teleologies and intentions; criteria; scenarios and subjects; procedures and instruments; evaluation systems, etc., that come into play in this action of evaluating institutionalized pedagogical practices.

Keywords: Evaluation. Pedagogical Practices. Higher Education. Teachers in Training.

RESUMEN

La evaluación en tanto praxis y condición humana se instaló en el acontecer educativo. Aquella permea: acciones, procesos, currículos, programas, saberes, sujetos e instituciones, al punto que parece inimaginable cualquier acción educativa (pedagógica, formativa) que no esté acompañada de diversas formas evaluativas.

^a Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas (UD), Bogotá, Colombia.

La práctica pedagógica, instalada con la relevancia que actualmente la caracteriza, en tanto ámbito de formación, no escapa a la acción evaluativa. Este ejercicio versa sobre el análisis de lo efectivamente dicho sobre la evaluación de las prácticas pedagógicas en algunas instituciones de educación superior (públicas) de nuestro país, particularmente, en algunos de sus programas académicos orientados a la formación de licenciados en diversas áreas del conocimiento. La pesquisa, de corte documental, analítico y descriptivo, contiene conceptualizaciones y caracterizaciones; sentidos, teleologías e intencionalidades; criterios; escenarios y sujetos; procedimientos e instrumentos; sistemas de valoración, etc., que entran en juego en esta acción de evaluar las prácticas pedagógicas institucionalizadas.

Palabras clave: Evaluación. Prácticas Pedagógicas. Educación Superior. Maestros en Formación.

RESUMO

A avaliação como práxis e condição humana foi instalada no evento educativo. Isso permeia: ações, processos, currículos, programas, saberes, disciplinas e instituições, a tal ponto que qualquer ação educativa (pedagógica, formativa) que não seja acompanhada por diversas formas avaliativas parece inimaginável. A prática pedagógica, instalada com a relevância que atualmente a caracteriza, como área de formação, não escapa à ação avaliativa. Este exercício trata da análise do que realmente se diz sobre a avaliação das práticas pedagógicas em algumas instituições de ensino superior (públicas) do nosso país, nomeadamente em alguns dos seus programas académicos destinados à formação de licenciados em diversas áreas do conhecimento. A pesquisa, documental, analítica e descritiva, contém conceituações e caracterizações; sentidos, teleologias e intenções; critério; cenários e assuntos; procedimentos e instrumentos; sistemas de avaliação, etc., que entram em jogo nesta ação de avaliação de práticas pedagógicas institucionalizadas.

Palavras-chave: Avaliação. Prácticas Pedagógicas. Ensino Superior. Professores em Formação.

Introduction

It has been said that evaluation is part of the human condition and that it has accompanied us throughout history in different forms, models, styles, perspectives, practices, and discourses; however, in recent times it has gained such resonance that we have gradually come to conceive it as: necessity, obligation, duty, right, daily practice, in short, as a permanent state, without which it would not be possible to weigh actions, projections, and human relationships.

Some researchers have identified the genesis of evaluation in latitudes distant from education and pedagogy (Casanova, 1988; Pacheco; Díaz-Barriga, 2000; Stufflebeam; Shinkfield, 1995) and indicate that it gradually entered educational and social systems, to gradually become what it is today: a culture that has spread its networks over the set of human actions and their condition. Of course, educational, formative, and pedagogical actions have not escaped its networks, since this panevaluative culture operates in multiple ways, on the being and happening of institutions, subjects, knowledge, relationships, and institutionalized processes.

This analytical exercise is articulated around the following questions: what are we talking about when we refer to the evaluation of pedagogical practice?, what elements should be evaluated and under what criteria?, is it possible to universalize the forms and practices of evaluation that run over the same practices, regardless of the contexts in which they develop?, how is the evaluation of these actions and formative procedures carried out?, what instruments would be most appropriate for evaluating pedagogical practice?, what moments of pedagogical action should be accompanied

by evaluation?, what subjects and instances intervene in the evaluative act?, what are the intentions of the evaluative action of pedagogical practice?, what social and institutional uses are given to the results of the evaluation of pedagogical practice? In short, what is the horizon of meaning that allows us to analyze the theoretical and practical educational processes that constitute the core of teacher training and that are put into context through pedagogical practice?

An attempt to answer these questions constitutes the purpose of this exercise, which draws on the analysis of diverse documentary sources of a theoretical and metatheoretical, prescriptive-normative, and epistemological-methodological order related to pedagogical practice and its evaluation. In such intentionality, categories of analysis are revealed, such as: conceptions (of evaluation and pedagogical practice); purposes of evaluation; constitutive aspects of the practice that are the object of valuation; scenarios and subjects (and their roles) in the exercise of valuation; meaning of evaluation; and, procedures and instruments of evaluative action.

Methodology

This article derives from a documentary, analytical, and descriptive research, which used the Foucauldian toolbox as a methodological instrument: archaeology, genealogy, and an analysis of subjectivity, from the perspective of historicizing knowledge and analyzing power relations and problematizing the relative to the forms of subjectivity inherent or correlative to pedagogical practice, its functioning, and its evaluation. The investigation focused on what was effectively said regarding the evaluation of pedagogical practices in some higher education institutions (public) in our country and, in particular, in some academic programs aimed at training graduates in various areas of knowledge.

The research emphasizes conceptualizations and characterizations; meanings, teleologies, and intentions; evaluative criteria; scenarios and subjects; procedures and instruments; systems of valuation, etc., that come into play in this action of evaluating institutionalized pedagogical practices; since, gradually and permanently, the incorporation of evaluation strategies has become natural and necessary in order to optimize and improve such practices.

Two types of inputs constitute the foundations (theoretical and practical) of this article: a body of documents consisting of institutional regulations related to pedagogical practice and its evaluation and information gathered through the application of interviews with six (6) university professors in charge of guiding pedagogical practice. The analyses carried out evidence of a polyphony of norms, practices, processes, scenarios, situations, instruments, and inputs in which, also, diverse subjects put these experiences on stage from the perspective of the upcoming exercise of the magisterial work of teachers in training.

Results and discussion

In the sources analyzed, descriptions, references, theorizations, and prescriptions on the evaluation of pedagogical practices are found: forms, procedures, inputs, instruments, actions, etc.,

that allow the concretion of the exercise of valuation, promotion and recognition, or of disapproval; those also contain a significant repertoire of elements relative or correlative to the evaluation of practices (modes, strategies, instruments, mechanisms, actions, subjects, institutions, contexts, designs, developments, projects, results, compliance, punctuality, dedication of time, attention to students, practice plans, criteria, tutorial seminars, workshops, classroom support, classroom workshops, tutoring, socialization spaces, etc.) all of which leads to forms of hetero-evaluation, co-evaluation, self-evaluation, and meta-evaluation of the same.

Evaluation can be characterized as praxis in itself (Cavalli, s.d.), as Apolinar & Zapata (2013) also argue, when considering its reflexive-critical-processual dimension of the formative aspects that shape teacher training, because “it constitutes the basis for generating improvements both in the same training processes and in the action of the students who begin and complete their practices in the different spaces in which their work is demanded by the educational community and society” (Apolinar; Zapata, 2013, p. 87); even more so if it is considered that the staging of evaluation is ordered to the improvement of pedagogical practice (Toro, 2001), which results in the accompaniment of the student and his formative process (Materón; Lizarazo; Mora, 2006), and which would have to impact the improvement of the quality of education.

At the institutional level, evaluation (in a diversity of forms, moments, purposes, intentions...), was installed as an integrated and integral practice of all academic, administrative, research, and more, formative processes, in the manner of a panevaluative culture that regulates everything, manages everything, controls everything, determines everything.

Conceptualizations on the evaluation of pedagogical practice

The normative documents examined do not properly define what they conceive as the evaluation of pedagogical practice, although they describe in some detail their procedures, instruments, actions, purposes, and the tools put into play in such exercise; however, the evaluation of pedagogical practice can be understood, following the guidelines of the Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia (UPTC), as “the result of the qualitative and quantitative assessment of the work of the academic, administrative, and community developments of the teacher in training (...) in accordance with the criteria defined semiannually by the Committee for Investigative Pedagogical Practice” (UPTC, 2015, art. 28).

The Agreement 248 of 2012 of the Consejo de la Facultad of the Universidad de Antioquia (UdeA), through which the Regulations for Academic Practices for the undergraduate programs of the Faculty of Education are established, refers to evaluation as “a fundamental component of pedagogical practices”, having a formative character that is related to constitutive variables of pedagogical action “such as education, training, teaching, learning, didactics, formative research, curriculum, teacher, and student” (UdeA, 2012, art. 20).

For its part, the regulations for the pedagogical practice of the Recreation Degree at the Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (UPN) maintain that evaluation is “the result of the analysis of the development of the practice process among the different expected performances achieved by the

students, which will be reflected in the learning throughout the process and will be supported by a socialization in the institutions where the practice was carried out and, another, general within the degree" (UPN, 2013, art. 22).

The document *La práctica educativa en el Proyecto Curricular de Licenciatura de Educación Básica con Énfasis en Humanidades y Lengua Castellana da Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas. Facultad de Ciencias y Educación* (UD, 2016, p. 8), after carrying out an analysis on: the components of the Pedagogical Research Field and the foundation of the pedagogical practice of the project; the general guidelines of the practice; the methodological proposal (procedures and instruments), refers to the strategies for monitoring, development, and evaluation of practices in line with the contributions of Ordoñez Pachón & Díaz Flórez (cited in the document) who consider evaluation as a collegial practice ordered to the verification of the fulfillment of actions that allow the subject to observe themselves and build meaning about themselves, the other, the other subjects or objects.

Meaning of the evaluation of pedagogical practice

The aforementioned regulations that prescribe pedagogical practices and their evaluative processes, at the Universidad de Antioquia (UdeA), indicate that evaluation implies a "set of pedagogical actions that favor and promote interaction, communication, and the participation of all actors involved in pedagogical practices, to achieve the understanding and qualification of the processes that are the object of transformation" (UdeA, 2012, art. 21); also, the evaluation of the trainee (teacher in training) is carried out on the entirety of the formative process (implicit in the practice) and based on the competencies (pedagogical, disciplinary, cognitive, communicative, investigative, and attitudinal) achieved by the students (UdeA, 2012, art. 22). This evaluative process, in addition to considering different levels of development, must address "the personal, cultural, ethnic, and social diversity of teachers in training, and will be defined based on the criteria presented and in the activities, on the dates of fulfillment and in the percentages assigned, to weigh the final grade: from one to five" (UdeA, 2012, art. 22, paragraph 1).

The Agreement on Academic Cooperation of the Licenciatura en Educación Básica con Énfasis en Humanidades y Lengua Castellana de la Universidad Distrital indicates that pedagogical practice is a permanent construction that develops throughout the educational process, occupies a relevant place in the formative and investigative process of the future teacher, because it allows "the formulation of criteria for training, evaluation, and operationalization of the pedagogical research component" (UD, 2016b, p. 3), from the perspective of theoretical and methodological integration, curricular flexibility, the continuity itself of the formative processes, and the concretion in particular practices.

For its part, the specific regulations of the practice indicate that the first two levels are ordered to the design and execution of "a proposal for innovation and pedagogical research", so that the constituent elements of the same: Insertion in the school space; Identification and construction of a problem; Design, execution, and evaluation of an intervention proposal; Systematization and analysis of their own teaching practice, involve, as such, evaluative practices (UD, s.d., art. 34).

On the meaning of the evaluation of pedagogical practice, it is also pertinent to listen to the voices of the teachers who, at the institutional level, guide these formative spaces (subjects):

- The evaluative meaning consists of “evaluating the process, you as a teacher how you have developed, and [the estimation of] this development is the meaning of this evaluation”. (M.L. Araújo, personal communication, April 15, 2021).
- I talk about evaluation that has to be integral, that evaluates cognitive processes, but also the practical component related to the issue of attitudes, and the responsibilities they assume, and in the context of the pandemic, it has been a success that students have highlighted, the emotional dimension, which has always been important to strengthen. (E. Hernández, personal communication, April 20, 2021).

Both in prescriptive discourses and in those derived from praxis itself, a formative meaning of evaluation is evident in relation to the progress made by trainees (teachers in training) in their role of becoming teachers; this formative dimension of evaluation is complemented by other characteristics that emerge from the sources analyzed: continuous, integral, participatory, flexible, in which self-evaluation has a central place, because teachers in training “are building criteria that develop reflexivity on their professional work” (E. Hernández, personal communication, April 20, 2021).

Criteria for evaluating pedagogical practices

Given the autonomy granted to higher education institutions and extended to academic programs — or curriculum projects according to the curriculum guidelines of the Universidad Distrital — there are no universal criteria for evaluating pedagogical practices, since at the program or institutional level, the specific regulations determine the criteria through which the evaluative action is staged.

The regulation that governs pedagogical and research practices (disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and in-depth) of undergraduate programs (in the face-to-face and distance modalities) at the Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia (UPTC, 2015) states that the criteria for evaluating pedagogical practices, since “they are developed as part of a subject” are determined by each academic program (UPTC, 2015, art. 27). The evaluative results are derived from “the qualitative and quantitative assessment of the work of the academic, administrative, and community developments of the teacher in training (...) in accordance with the criteria defined semiannually by the Committee for Investigative Pedagogical Practice” (UPTC, 2015, art. 28); the minimum passing grade for the practice is 3.0, a grade that must be reported at the end of the period (semester) as the only grade (UPTC, 2015, art. 29).

This regulation describes a range of responsibilities for teachers in training (UPTC, 2015, art. 31) that can be read in terms of evaluative criteria since they become conditions of possibility for the approval or disapproval of the practice, such as: attendance at induction workshops organized by the Committee; compliance with the guidelines and commitments established by this body; knowledge, compliance, and observance of the regulations of the institutions in which the practice is carried out and the regulations of the University; attendance at the development of the practice; compliance

with the weekly hours throughout the practice; permanence in the institution and the development of all the activities programmed as part of the formative process; the presentation of the plan of activities to be developed weekly (with the respective adjustments if necessary); the presentation of the classroom pedagogical project for the realization of the practice, in accordance with the institutional and social context; attendance and participation in the practice meetings scheduled by the advisor; the preparation and socialization (at the University and at the Institution) of a written work as a result of the classroom pedagogical project, from the perspective of its publication; attendance at the socialization of the practices scheduled by the Committee.

The Universidad del Atlántico (UA) prescribes that each academic program determines the criteria and mechanisms for evaluating and grading the practice “but there must be at least one evaluation by the respective tutors both from the university and the company and a self-evaluation by the student” (UA, 2011, p. 7).

The formative perspective of the evaluation of pedagogical practices that the regulations refer to on this matter at the Universidad de Antioquia (UdeA) requires considering as an essential condition for valuation, diverse forms and evaluative practices (self-evaluation, co-evaluation, and hetero-evaluation), as well as “the basic agreements reached by consensus among the actors involved: teachers in training, advisors, coordinators, and practice centers” (UdeA, 2012, art. 21); and the results (theoretical and methodological advances) must be socialized in events that integrate different levels of practices.

The regulations describe the criteria that must be taken into account for the assessment of the final report of the practice, as well as for the degree papers: “Contribution of the work to the topic studied; Treatment of the topic, sources, and methodology; Solidity and theoretical and methodological coherence; Style and writing; Correct citation of the bibliography and of the sources” (UdeA, 2012, art. 23). The work is graded by the jury with the qualitative concepts: Approved; Approved with modifications; Not approved” (UdeA, 2012, art. 24). Once the final report is approved, its authors must carry out “an oral presentation of the research results derived from the pedagogical practice proposal before the academic community of the Faculty” and as alternatives for dissemination and dissemination (internal and external) “they will carry out a socialization activity in the practice centers or in local, regional, or national events” (UdeA, 2012, art. 25), in which other academic programs or educational institutions can participate and, as much as possible, with regional retransmission through ICT tools; at the end of these procedures, “the students will deliver to the Coordinator of Practices of the Program, the degree paper according to the standards of the Library System, to be sent to the Documentation Center of the Faculty” (UdeA, 2012, paragraph 3).

In the Regulations for Pedagogical Practice of the Licenciatura en Recreación of the Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (UPN, 2013), various elements (criteria) are read that are correlative to the evaluation of pedagogical practice, such as, for example, that its registration is a condition of possibility for realization and therefore for evaluation; the regulations also determine places, time, and modes defined by the University and by the educational institution in which it is developed (UPN, 2013, art. 11). The evaluative processes can lead to two possible results: 1) that the pedagogical practice is approved, if it complies with all the requirements established in the regulations and after the full compliance of all its actions and processes; 2) the non-approval of the pedagogical practice,

which may occur for the following reasons: “For absences (3) to the Pedagogical Practice, including tutoring, in accordance with the Student Regulations (UPN, 2013, art. 26); for non-compliance with the regulations of the University or of the institution in which the practice is carried out; and, “For non-compliance with pedagogical assignments by the practice tutor and valuation” (UPN, 2013, art. 13). The grounds for non-approval (loss) of the practice become final after a prior investigation and sanction process.

The regulations for the pedagogical practice of the la Licenciatura en Humanidades y Lengua Castellana at the Universidad Distrital (UD, s.d., art. 35) explicitly set out some general guidelines for the evaluation of these formative spaces, such as: The final evaluation of the Teacher in Training is done by the Practice Teacher, taking into account the concept of the Titular Teacher, the preparation of the class and their performance in the classroom, participation in the seminars and workshops planned, the timely delivery of management reports and the didactic proposals, research, classroom projects that arise from the Practices; it also takes into account the self-evaluation and attendance.

For its part, the document that prescribes the cooperation agreements signed between the curriculum project and various educational institutions also refers to some evaluation criteria that involve “effective accompaniment, cooperative work, and continuous evaluation through which [through which] the titular teacher will accompany the classroom work permanently and will make a written evaluation every academic period” (UD, 2016a, p. 2); also, it sets out some general evaluation criteria, namely: 1) the timely delivery of all the documents mentioned as written products, in whose content the following will be observed: clarity, fulfillment of the purpose of the document, sufficient information with respect to such purpose, possibility of verification of the information, through oral presentation or with other associated products; 2) the report of the practice coordination at the school institution, which includes aspects such as: assessment of the trainee’s academic performance, fulfillment of the proposed objectives, attitude towards the process, the institution and the University, commitment to the assigned tasks and to institutional life, ability to solve the problems that they face during the practice, production of documents (UD, 2016a, p. 3).

It can be inferred, from what has been said, that there are sufficient and clear criteria for the evaluation of pedagogical practices; also, a wealth of actions can be appreciated for their valuation. This does not prevent, of course, that, under the protection of academic freedom, of teaching and learning, the practice guiding teachers, put into play a vast evaluative instrument to qualify these formative processes.

Scenarios and subjects (and their roles) in the exercise of valuation

Pedagogical practices take place in a variety of settings where diverse agents participate, each with different functions. In these settings, individuals put into circulation topics and issues related to didactics, curriculum, assessment of learning, research, communication, and school interaction, which constitute “objects of study for teacher training and everyday concerns of pedagogical practice in the classroom” (UD, 2016a, p. 2) and converge in the evaluative processes.

It is well known, as suggested by (Figuroa, 2015), that the first antecedents regarding pedagogical practices are found in normal schools, some of which evolve into higher normal schools,

and these, such as the normal schools of Tunja and Bogotá, laid the foundation for the creation of faculties of education (and later universities, such as the Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, headquartered in Tunja, and the Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, headquartered in Bogotá, respectively). However, given that the purpose of this analysis is pedagogical practices in higher education, the study focuses on this educational level, particularly on some higher education institutions and, within them, the faculties of education and their academic programs. From there, they transcend to diverse educational institutions (whether public or private and of different educational levels) and are projected to governmental and non-governmental social organizations (slums, local administrative boards, community action boards, community organizations, etc.); to companies of diverse economic and social nature; and to a variety of institutions such as: Regional Autonomous Corporations, Science and Technology Centers, Research Centers and Groups, Natural Parks (local and national), museums, city halls, cultural centers, recreational and sports centers, hospitals, kindergartens, prisons, libraries, etc.

The roles and responsibilities — evaluative — of the agents who intervene in pedagogical practices are stated in the prescriptive documents analyzed; it is worth noting, moreover, that some regulations evidence the institutionalization of collegiate bodies (curriculum committees, practice committees, area committees) that play different roles in the development and evaluation of practices.

The evaluation of investigative pedagogical practice for in-depth study, according to the regulations of the UPTC (2015, art. 28), is the responsibility of the professor (or professional head) of the institution where the practice is carried out, the advisor of the practice, and the student themselves (teacher in training); for their part, the Committee for Investigative Pedagogical Practice is responsible for defining, in addition to the evaluative criteria, the percentages of valuation of those trained; the design of the evaluation instruments and the periodicity of the partial valuations (UPTC, 2015, art. 29).

At the Universidad del Atlántico, the document *Procedure for the Development of Academic Practices* (UA, 2011, p. 1) indicates that the bodies responsible for the evaluation of practices (when these constitute a degree option) are the Mission Committee for Research and the Curriculum Committee (of the program); similarly, within the framework of autonomy, “there must be at least one evaluation by the respective tutors both from the university and the company and a self-evaluation by the student” (UA, 2011, p. 7); however, the partial and final grades of the practice are the direct responsibility of the teaching tutor. A relevant figure in the valuation of the different modalities of practices (those contained in the curricula, practice as a degree option, and practice requested by the student) is the evaluation jury, since, when students deliver the final report of the practice, “the evaluation jury is assigned [who] evaluates and grades the final report, and delivers the final result at the Faculty” (UA, 2011, p. 8)¹. For its part, the Regulations for Student Academic

¹ The regulations referring to the Universidad del Atlántico do not specifically correspond to graduate training programs; However, considering the correlation that exists between professional practices, training practices, academic practices and pedagogical practices, it is considered pertinent for the analysis to refer to what happens with these training processes in various fields of knowledge, especially when in the professional teaching practice, in accordance with the regulations in force in Colombia (decrees 1278 and 1279 of 2003), the professional who graduated from a higher education program can work as a teacher at the various educational levels of the country (Colombia, 2002a; 2002b).

Practices of the Pharmacy program at that same institution prescribes that the evaluation is the responsibility of the practice tutors “after review and monitoring by the Practice Coordinators of each of the Performance Fields” (UA, 2010, art. 10). Monitoring must occur, at least three times per semester (induction, monitoring, and final valuation) of academic practices and involve all actors in the process: students, tutors, and teaching tutors.

The Agreement 284 of the Universidad de Antioquia (UdeA, 2012, arts. 26-27) contemplates the evaluative role of advisors and practice centers, respectively. The evaluation of advisors implies aspects of a conceptual, pedagogical, and didactic nature, personal relationships, and formative evaluation; the evaluation of centers is the responsibility of teachers in training, advisors, and the program practice coordinator and is considered a criterion for the maintenance of agreements between the university and the institution in which the practice is carried out. It indicates, on the other hand, that the Committee for Pedagogical Practices is the body responsible for defining the qualitative and quantitative evaluation instruments for pedagogical practice advisors, in accordance with institutional regulations and to ensure their implementation (UdeA, 2012, art. 26).

The Universidad Distrital (UD), in the regulations for the pedagogical practice of the proyecto curricular de Licenciatura en Humanidades y Lengua Castellana, explicitly sets out some specific functions of the agents of pedagogical practice, such as: the final evaluation of the Teacher in Training is done by the Practice Teacher, taking into account the concept that the Titular Teacher provides about their class preparation and performance in the classroom, participation in the seminars and workshops planned, the timely delivery of management reports and the didactic proposals, research, classroom projects that arise from the Practices. The assessment must also consider the student’s self-evaluation and attendance at the various activities proposed (UD, s.d., art. 35). These same requirements are reflected in the syllabus (program) of the practices, since the responsibilities assumed by teachers in training in each of the practices (practice seminar and development in the school space) constitute criteria for assessment by the titular professor and the practice coordination, always taking into account the self-evaluation of the teacher in training.

The prescriptions set out in the institutional regulations regarding the functions of the agents intervening in the practices find their correlation in the experience of the professors who guide their development, as referred to below:

- Students must present a final work that is jointly evaluated by the principal, coordinators, teachers, and students; similarly, some co-evaluation and meta-evaluation procedures are considered since we jointly evaluate the work of our fellow students, and what is most valued is the experience that is gained (H. Ortiz, personal communication, April 20, 2020).
- The student is the protagonist of the practice and in the evaluative processes, the coordinator, the principal, the professor intervene, considering elements such as attendance or absence of the student, the commitment that the student has, the preparation of classes, which is also evaluated by the titular professor and the practice professor, and the self-evaluation is developed by the student (M.L. Araújo, personal communication, April 15, 2020).

Procedures and instruments used in the evaluative action

The regulations for the practices of the Universidad del Atlántico (UA), mention several instruments that are included in the evaluation processes: the confidential practice report (Employer Survey), prepared by the practice supervisor, which outlines the “student’s performance during the practice period at the organization”; the practice report, a document whose purpose is “to collect, by the student, information regarding the work carried out during their practice period and which is presented for their evaluation to the practice tutor” (UA, 2011. p. 5). Upon completion of the practice, the student must present to the practice tutor and the supervisor designated by the institution, a report “in which they creatively, critically, and proactively systematize their experience” (UA, 2011, p. 7); the final report is a requirement for the different practice modalities, for which its evaluation and grading “the practice evaluation jury [who] evaluates and grades the final report, and delivers the final result at the Faculty” (UA, 2011, p. 8). For its part, the regulations for the practice of the Pharmacy program (although it does not present a specific instrument) prescribes the evaluation methodology, in correlation with the general regulations of the University, and indicates that the grade is the result of the sum of three evaluative cuts, with the following percentages: First evaluation: 30%; Second evaluation, 40%; Third Evaluation 30% (UA, 2010, art. 10).

As mentioned above, the regulations for pedagogical practice at the University of Antioquia place special emphasis on the formative dimension of the evaluation of pedagogical practices; this perspective implies considering, as an essential condition, diverse forms and evaluative practices (self-evaluation, co-evaluation, and hetero-evaluation), as well as “the basic agreements reached by consensus among the actors involved: teachers in training, advisors, coordinators, and practice centers” (UdeA, 2012, art. 21).

An analytical reading of the prescriptive documents on pedagogical practices for the Humanities and Spanish Language degree allows us to identify a wide range of instruments that are put into play in pedagogical practice: tutorial seminars, workshops, classroom support, classroom workshops, tutoring, socialization spaces (UD, 2016a, p. 5-7) correlated with evaluative practices such as hetero-evaluation, co-evaluation, and self-evaluation (UD, s. d., art. 53) that materialize in the practice monitoring processes (project evaluation), therefore, “it is assumed that evaluation depends on the guidelines of education in general and the conception of the pedagogical act on the part of the educational institution” (UD, 2016b, p. 8). Regarding the evaluation itself of the practice, the syllabus document states that the evaluation of student performance is subject to institutional regulations, in principle “subject to the three cuts or evaluation periods according to the academic calendar, and corresponding percentage allocation. Formats and criteria for evaluating and monitoring the performance of the teacher in training for self and co-evaluation are suggested in the annexes” (UD, 2016b, p. 8).

The voices of those who stage pedagogical practices can also be heard regarding the valuation procedures and the repertoire of instruments used with the purpose of evaluating these subjects (academic or curricular spaces), for example:

- The combination of diverse strategies and evaluation formats: I almost never look at the evaluations of my classes, but that doesn’t mean I don’t evaluate; I evaluate them in each

cut and ask them what they have to tell me about the class, what recommendations need to be made, what adjustments, but doing it the last week is not ideal (G.M. Rojas, personal communication, March 10, 2021).

- In weekly meetings, you have to generate documents, that is, you have to leave evidence of the things you are doing, then since the final objective is to make a project, it is to elaborate the project proposal (...). There is, on the other hand, the final work, it is presented and the evaluators are not us but another group, either the teacher and their students, as I manage it, and my students and I evaluate the work of the other classmates, and what is most valued is the experience that is gained (H. Ortiz, personal communication, April 20, 2021).
- I evaluate verbally, but I know that many of my colleagues have designed evaluation formats; but I also do hetero-evaluation where I privilege self-evaluation, but partial exams are also done if, let's say, partial exams have a fundamental purpose and it is to look at the incorporation of knowledge that I consider necessary for them to have (E. Hernández, personal communication, April 20, 2021).

Each institution and academic program has, in general terms, regulated the evaluative procedures and defined –with relative clarity– the evaluation instruments, for example, in terms of timeframes (cuts), percentages, and grading scales; however, under the protection of academic freedom, each teacher puts into play diverse procedures and instruments (evaluative practices) that endow the evaluative exercise with a wide range of possibilities, in order to constitute a formative dimension that will surely permeate the future teaching practice of teachers in training.

Final reflections

The normative and theoretical frameworks analyzed highlight the importance of pedagogical practices in the training process of future professionals (in education) and, considering their practical rather than theoretical nature, they are subjects that are passed or failed, unlike other subjects in the curriculum that can be validated, enabled, homologated, etc. In this context, the regulations for practices at the UPTC prescribe that, due to their theoretical-practical nature, these formative spaces are not subject to validation, enabling, homologation, or the assignment of a second grade (UPTC, 2015, art. 25), except in the case of program internationalization, after prior judgment and analysis by the program curriculum committee. The same can be read in the regulations of the University of Antioquia, since, given the characteristics of the practices, “they will not be processes subject to review by a qualifying jury”, a condition that also applies to the Degree Work (UdeA, 2012, art. 22).

It is possible to identify a correlation between the development of pedagogical practices and the implementation of research processes; or better said, practices constitute very important sources for diverse research proposals. This correlation is evident, perhaps, in the regulatory changes made from Law 30 of 1992, from the perspective of formalizing the relationship between the mission functions of HEIs (Díaz Soler, 2020). In this regard, the syllabus for pedagogical practices of the Humanities and Spanish Language Degree program at the Universidad Distrital, points out

as one of the training objectives: “To promote the design, execution, and evaluation of didactic proposals aimed at qualifying language processes as a methodological and philosophical dimension for education, from investigative and innovative perspectives” (UD, 2016a, p. 2).

There are significantly abundant references of an institutional normative nature regarding the evaluation of pedagogical practice, especially if we consider the reforms established by the Ministry of National Education that took place from 2016. With greater or lesser detail, the aforementioned regulations describe a fine filigree of evaluative practices that operate permanently on actors, institutions, instances, areas, processes, actions, procedures, timeframes, grades, levels; in short, a vast variety of knowledge, powers, and subjects relative or correlative to pedagogical practice constitute a perpetual object of and for evaluation.

Pedagogical practice has become one of the central elements of the training processes for graduates in Colombia. Moreover, if we consider the entry into force of the recent regulations issued by the Ministerio de Educación Nacional on the subject, in particular Decree 2450 of 2015 (Colombia, 2015) and Resolutions 02041 of 2016 (Colombia, 2016) and 18583 of 2017 (Colombia, 2017) through which the characteristics of quality of Bachelor’s Degree programs are established, adjusted, and regulated from the perspective of obtaining, renewing, or modifying their qualified registration.

Higher education institutions and, within them, academic programs or curriculum projects (as they are called at the UD), as a result of their curriculum implementation processes, have put into practice multiple experiences related to the training processes of students (in Bachelor’s Degree programs). These processes are called—among many other ways—formative practices, pedagogical practices, professional practices, intensive practices, research practices, etc., and these have come to constitute the backbone of the training of future teachers.

Finally, it should be noted that the descriptive-exploratory study, the reason why emphasis is placed on what is effectively said in institutional and national normative documents, as well as on the personal experience of informants (professors who guide practices in different academic programs); consequently, an analysis related to the subjectivity implicit in the evaluative processes of pedagogical practices, escapes the purposes of this article and could be the subject of further investigations.

References

APOLINAR, Ginna; ZAPATA, Lady. *Evaluar la práctica pedagógica que desarrollan los estudiantes de la Licenciatura en Psicología y Pedagogía de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional*, Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, 2013. <http://repository.pedagogica.edu.co/bitstream/handle/20.500.12209/2165/TE-15722.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

CASANOVA, María Antonia. *Evaluación de la calidad educativa*. Espanha: La Muralla, 1988.

CAVALLI, Ada Beatriz. La evaluación de la práctica pedagógica. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*. [s.d.] <https://rieoei.org/historico/deloslectores/877Cavalli.PDF>

COLOMBIA. Presidencia de la República. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. *Decreto No. 2450 de 2015*. Por el cual se reglamentan las condiciones de calidad para el otorgamiento y renovación del registro calificado

de los programas académicos de licenciatura y los enfocados a la educación, y se adiciona el Decreto 1075 de 2015 (p. 25). Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2015.

https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1759/articles-357048_recurso_1.pdf

COLOMBIA. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. *Resolución N.º. 02041 de 2016*. Por la cual se establecen las características específicas de calidad de los programas de Licenciatura para la obtención, renovación o modificación del registro calificado. Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2016.

https://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1759/articles-356982_recurso_1.pdf

COLOMBIA. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. *Resolución N.º. 18583 de 2017*. Por la cual se ajustan las características específicas de calidad de los programas de Licenciatura para la obtención, renovación o modificación del registro calificado, y se deroga la Resolución 2041 de 2016. Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2017.

https://www.icbf.gov.co/cargues/avance/compilacion/docs/resolucion_mineducacion_18583_2017.htm

COLOMBIA. Presidencia de la República. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. *Decreto No. 1278 de 2002*. Por el cual se expide el Estatuto de Profesionalización Docente (p. 1-17), (2002a). Ministerio de Educación Nacional.

COLOMBIA. Presidencia de la República. Ministerio de Educación Nacional. *Decreto No. 1279 de 2002*. Por el cual se establece el régimen salarial y prestacional de los docentes de las Universidades Estatales, (2002b).

<https://tinyurl.com/2cc379yq>

DÍAZ SOLER, Carlos Jilmar. La práctica pedagógica: ¿un problema? En: ZAMUDIO, Guillermo Bustamante; AHUMADA, Germán Carvajal; SOLER, Carlos Jilmar Díaz; RIVERA, Jerson Dubán Ramírez. *Metodología e investigación. Una discusión a propósito de la teoría de campo*. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, 2020. p. 143-162. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv14rmpg5.1>

FIGUEROA, Claudia. Orígenes, Formación y proyección de las Facultades de Educación en Colombia 1930 - 1954. *Revista Historia de la Educación Latinoamericana*, v. 8, p. 201-220, 2015.

<https://tinyurl.com/29az2msv>

MATERÓN, Solangel; LIZARAZO, Roxana; MORA, Diana. *Evaluación de las prácticas pedagógicas adoptadas por los docentes en formación de las facultades de educación, filosofía y teología de la universidad de San Buenaventura, sede Bogotá: una propuesta educativa para mejorar la calidad de los futuros profes* [Universidad San Buenaventura], 2006. <http://biblioteca.usbbog.edu.co:8080/Biblioteca/BDigital/38000.pdf>

PACHECO, Teresa; DÍAZ-BARRIGA, Ángel. (Coord.) *Evaluación académica*. México: CESU-UNAM/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2000.

TORO, Juan Quevedo. La evaluación y la practica pedagógica del docente. *Praxis*, v. 1, p. 30-34. 2001.

<https://revistas.unimagdalena.edu.co/index.php/praxis/article/view/496/478>

STUFFLEBEAM, Daniel; SHINKFIELD, Anthony. *Evaluación sistemática, guía teórica y práctica*. Espanha: Paidós, 1995.

UdeA - UNIVERSIDAD DE ANTIOQUIA. *Acuerdo 284 de 2012*. Por el cual se deroga el Acuerdo 148 de 2004, y se define el Reglamento de Prácticas Académicas para los programas de pregrado de la Facultad de Educación de la Universidad de Antioquia de la sede Medellín y las sedes Regionales. Medellín: Universidad de Antioquia, 2012. <http://www.udea.edu.co/wps/portal/udea/web/inicio/unidades-academicas/educacion/practicas-pedagogicas/estudiantes/reglamento-practicas>

UA - UNIVERSIDAD DEL ATLÁNTICO. Facultad de Química y Farmacia. *Reglamentación de Prácticas Académicas Estudiantiles Programa de Farmacia*. Atlántico: Universidad del Atlántico, 2010. p. 22.

UA - UNIVERSIDAD DEL ATLÁNTICO. *Procedimiento para el desarrollo de Prácticas Académicas*. Atlántico: Universidad del Atlántico, 2011. p. 10. <http://apolo.uniatlantico.edu.co>

UD - UNIVERSIDAD DISTRITAL Francisco José De Caldas. Facultad de Ciencias y Educación. Comité de Práctica Docente, P. C. de L. en E. B. con É. en H. y L. C. *Reglamento de Prácticas Docentes*. Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas. Facultad de Ciencias y Educación. Comité de Práctica Docente Proyecto Curricular de Licenciatura en Educación Básica con Énfasis en Humanidades y Lengua Castellana, (s.d.).

UD - UNIVERSIDAD DISTRITAL Francisco José de Caldas. Facultad de Ciencias y Educación. Proyecto Curricular de Licenciatura en Educación Básica con Énfasis en Humanidades y Lengua Castellana. *Acuerdo de cooperación académica. Práctica Pedagógica I y II-2016*. IED. Antonio José de Sucre. No publicado, 2016a.

UD - UNIVERSIDAD DISTRITAL Francisco José de Caldas. Facultad de Ciencias y Educación. Proyecto Curricular de Licenciatura en Educación Básica con Énfasis en Humanidades y Lengua Castellana. *La práctica educativa en el Proyecto Curricular de Licenciatura de Educación Básica con Énfasis en Humanidades y Lengua Castellana*. No publicado, 2016b.

UPN - UNIVERSIDAD PEDAGÓGICA NACIONAL. Consejo Académico. *Acuerdo N° 018 de 2013. Por el cual se expide el Reglamento de Práctica Pedagógica del Proyecto Curricular de la Licenciatura en Recreación*. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, 2013.

UPTD - UNIVERSIDAD PEDAGÓGICA Y TECNOLÓGICA DE COLOMBIA. Consejo Académico. *Resolución 37 de 2015. Por la cual se establecen los lineamientos para las Prácticas Pedagógicas Investigativas de los Programas de Licenciatura Presencial y a Distancia de la UPTC*. Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, 2015. p. 18.

www.uptc.edu.co/secretaria_general/consejo_academico/resoluciones_2015/index.html

TOMÁS SÁNCHEZ-AMAYA

PhD in Social Sciences, Childhood and Youth, Universidad de Manizales (UManizales), Manizales, Caldas, Colombia; full professor, University of Distrital Francisco José de Caldas (UD), Bogotá (Colombia).

LUISA CARLOTA SANTANA-GAITÁN

PhD in Education, Universidad Santo Tomás (USTA), Bogotá, Colombia; associate professor, Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas (UD), Bogotá, Colombia.

MARTHA JANET VELASCO-FORERO

PhD in Higher Education, Universidad de Palermo (UP), Buenos Aires, Argentina; associate professor, Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas (UD), Bogotá, Colombia.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1 – Conception and design of the research; construction and processing of data; analysis and interpretation of data; collaboration in the preparation of the final text.

Author 2 – Conception and design of the research; construction and processing of data; analysis and interpretation of data; collaboration in the preparation of the final text.

Author 3 – Conception and design of the research; construction and processing of data; analysis and interpretation of data; collaboration in the preparation of the final text.

SUPPORT/FINANCING

Not applicable.

AVAILABILITY OF RESEARCH DATA

Not applicable.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

SÁNCHEZ-AMAYA, Tomás; SANTANA-GAITÁN, Luisa Carlota; VELASCO-FORERO, Martha Janet. Evaluation of pedagogical practice in the context of higher education in Colombia. *Educar em Revista*, Curitiba, v. 40, e94436, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-0411.94436>

The article was translated by Andrés Felipe Morantes – E-mail: amorantes@unal.edu.co. After being designed, it was submitted for validation by the author(s) before publication.

Received: 02/14/2024

Approved: 07/25/2024

Este é um artigo de acesso aberto distribuído nos termos de licença Creative Commons.

