

# EVALUATING TO SUPPORT LEARNING



MICHAËL HÉTU

Teacher  
Cégep André-Laurendeau

## OBSERVATIONS, DIRECTIONS, OBSTACLES, AND AVENUES FOR REFLECTION

In its current form, the evaluation of learning is at odds with the primary mission of schools, which is to bring each individual to know themselves and to develop their full potential.

Such was the conclusion of the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation (CSE), presented in a report on the state and needs of education in 2016–2018 entitled *Évaluer pour que ça compte vraiment* and submitted to the Assemblée nationale in February of last year (CSE, 2018). This report, which was the result of two years of research, writing, reflection, and consultations involving experts, teachers, managers, and parents at all levels of instruction, painted an appalling picture of evaluation, from preschool to the end of university. In fact, it invited teachers to completely renew their perspective; to stop evaluating the way that they themselves were evaluated, and in its place embrace a logic of evaluation rooted in feedback that better reflects and supports learning among the diversity of learners across the school system.

Although it made an essential contribution to reflections on education, the report also elicited strong reactions, mainly because it challenged firmly entrenched beliefs and practices. Following is an overview of the observations presented in this colossal research initiative regarding the evaluation of learning, the directions proposed by the CSE, the main obstacles to the change of course proposed, and a few avenues to stimulate the reflections of teachers, professionals, and administrators in the college system.

### KEY OBSERVATIONS OF THE CSE ON CURRENT EVALUATION PRACTICES

According to the CSE, the various evaluation practices observed today – which encourage competition, comparison between learners, and achievement of the best results at any cost – have harmful effects on learning, students' relationship to knowledge, physical and mental health, educational and career choices, and equitable access to education.

In terms of learning, current evaluation practices do not promote the development of responsible citizens or of the targeted competencies. More specifically, giving grades in percentage form (by tallying up marks) and calculating averages bolster the perception that grades and individual success are all that matter, to the detriment of empathy, cooperation, critical thinking, and engagement. Grading and the competition that it fosters are thus believed to have counterproductive effects.

Moreover, grades do not attest to students' learning or guarantee the development of the anticipated competencies. In fact, they provide very little information, and completely ignore individual strengths and weaknesses or elements that could help students improve. The result is that grades fuel an unhealthy relationship with mistakes, which students feel they must avoid at all costs since they come with a penalty. To the contrary, mistakes should be considered a completely normal part of the learning process, since they highlight difficulties confronting learners.

In college, the cardinal importance too many students give to the R score is a powerful example of the pernicious influence of grading and selection in learners' relationship with knowledge. The R score promotes neither motivation nor perseverance. Instead, it encourages a limited vision of learning and success, or even a utilitarian relationship to knowledge that is reflected in an impoverishment of learning. The score results in certain trends that can be observed in the majority of students:

- Only engaging in and giving value to learning 'if it counts';
- Shying away from taking risks that could result in losing marks;
- Trying to give a rote answer or the answer they think their teacher wants, instead of presenting their own understanding;
- Learning for the test, without trying to remember anything beyond what is evaluated or develop an in-depth understanding thereof;
- Feeling justified in cheating, since integrity is seen as a disadvantage.



Grading has just as many repercussions on physical and psychological health. Given that grading does not encourage the right to make mistakes as part of the learning process, repeatedly getting poor grades develops a sense of academic incompetence that impedes the learning process. Many students identify with their grades and see them as a reflection of their abilities and personal worth. This identification brings them to believe that talent is innate and that they have little or no control over their learning process, in turn minimizing their sense of empowerment and preventing them from adopting strategies that would promote their learning (Vanhulle, 2009). Even those who are successful feel negative emotions associated with this meritocratic system. More and more are suffering from performance anxiety and burnout: “They might be succeeding, but at what cost?” (CSE, 2016, p. 19, freely translated).

Socially speaking, grades cause both individuals and society to lose out. The logic of merit and selection makes out school to be a competition won by the strongest, rather than a path where all students can find fulfilment according to their talents. Competition is also connected to dropout, since it implies that some will be losers or marginalized. Why would struggling students want to participate in classes where they feel sure to lose? Furthermore, grading puts social pressure on students to enrol in elitist, limited-enrolment programs, rather than helping them choose what interests them:

“Instead of valuing different types of pathways and emphasizing that all sectors need high-achieving, competent individuals, the system inculcates the illusion that scientific fields and university studies are the only valid options and automatically lead to a better future” (CSE, 2018, p. 66, freely translated).

Hence, performance and grades can be a hindrance to self-knowledge, since they influence the choices made by students very early on in their education, sometimes before they have been able to try out different fields or disciplines that could have revealed a particular interest or special talent. Finally, this bias in orientation helps perpetuate social inequalities: given the few spaces available in limited-enrolment programs, parallel offerings in the private assistance sector allow more affluent and better-informed individuals to take additional classes to raise their chances of obtaining a higher R score.

In this context, teachers often, despite themselves, maintain a system in which evaluation seems first and foremost aimed at filtering for an elite on a meritocratic basis. The disproportionate importance placed on grades impoverishes instructional practices; many teachers feel obligated to teach to the test, even if it means boiling down learning to repetitive practices or even teaching ‘recipes’ instead of carrying out a variety of activities to help students develop the targeted competencies, which would ensure genuine success. Many also adopt a defensive stance to evaluation, as they do not dare trust their professional judgment but rather limit themselves to what can be easily measured with an accumulation of proof, as opposed to addressing high-level competencies that are often more complex to evaluate.

### ► DIRECTIONS PROPOSED BY THE CSE TO ENSURE EVALUATION SUPPORTS LEARNING

To promote learning, well-being, and the development of all learners’ full potential, the CSE recommends that the education system adopt a new perspective on the evaluation of learning; **students should not learn in order to be evaluated, but should be evaluated to help them learn** (CSE, 2018, freely translated). Concretely, this shift in paradigm presupposes forging a positive relationship with evaluation and promoting qualitative (i.e., criteria-referenced and not graded) evaluation so as to bring the focus back to the purpose of evaluation: to support the learning of all learners and to more precisely attest to the development of each targeted competency.

Of course, these directions involve looking at evaluation planning differently. A point total or a single end-of-program evaluation cannot truly reflect what a student has learned. Competence is not a matter of succeeding at any one particular task but can be likened to a continuum with different levels of complexity and effectiveness that all contribute to higher overall performance (Allal, 2000). Evaluating the degree to which a student has mastered a competency would require aiming for continuous assessment based on observations, productions, conversations with the student, and the like. This equates to the teacher’s knowledge of the learner, which can be used as a basis for their professional judgment. Students’ involvement in evaluation would also play an essential role in supporting their learning and developing their capacity for self-evaluation, which is essential in exercising citizenship and achieving lifelong learning.



In terms of attesting to (or certifying) learning, these directions entail that we seriously consider the possibility of conveying evaluation results as pass/fail. To support learning or selection, this judgment should:

- Show learners where they stand in terms of the degree of competency they have developed;
- Inform learners of the depth and quality of their learning;
- Specify what students can do to improve, continue to learn, and progress; and
- Identify the strengths that set students apart.

This approach would help overcome the logic of competition and at last truly situate learners within their learning process according to the competencies to be mastered.

**Certain obstacles seem to stand in the way of adopting a conception of evaluation that is truly beneficial to learning.**

#### OBSTACLES TO A PARADIGM SHIFT IN EVALUATION

Most teachers uphold the mission of Quebec schools and would like for all students to be able to achieve lasting learning, to develop accountability for their educational path, and to develop their full potential. Yet the change in evaluation practices needed to achieve these aims is not happening. The directions set forth by the CSE are hardly new (CSE, 2018) – so why is it so hard to put these ideas into practice?

Certain obstacles seem to stand in the way of adopting a conception of evaluation that is truly beneficial to learning. Most people teaching today were not only educated in a context dominated by normative evaluation, but also did well in spite of the system's faults. Even if these teachers understand and approve of the directions suggested by the CSC, they have a natural tendency to reproduce what they experienced as students. Essentially, the stumbling blocks come down to mistaken perceptions, deeply entrenched beliefs, and unfounded fears. Six obstacles can be defined:

#### First Obstacle

#### A BELIEF IN THE OBJECTIVITY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS OF GRADES

The evaluation system based on percentages and letter grades has widespread credibility and legitimacy in society. It gives the illusion of an objective measure, which is strongly associated with validity and fairness (Nizet, 2015). Contrary to popular belief, however, a number grade is no more objective than any other symbol: it is just one way among many others to express the teacher's judgment about the student's degree of competency. This verdict can also take the shape of comments, a pass/fail decision, a place assigned along a scale of competency mastery, etc. In all cases, evaluation remains a subjective act (Louis & Bédard, 2015).

The fundamental problem with grades, then, is how they are constructed. In current evaluation practices, what does a grade really reflect? Constructing an evaluation based on tallying marks serves as a way to keep track of a student's mistakes, from class one, in the final outcome – instead of reflecting the student's learning. Assigning marks to an educational activity offers a way to make mistakes 'count'. At the end of the day, such grades do not attest to real learning; instead, they show the learner's difficulty or ease in completing a learning activity or achieving a targeted degree of competency. Moreover, the factors taken into account in the evaluation sometimes have nothing to do with the knowledge to be learned or the competencies to be developed. For example, evaluation is sometimes used to encourage effort, attendance, participation, certain behaviours, compliance with instructions, etc. rather than attesting to a student's learning (CSE, 2018).

What learning, persistent misunderstandings, strengths, weaknesses, abilities, interests, or dis-interests might lie concealed behind a grade (whatever it may be)? Special attention should be paid to the construction of an evaluated judgment and to the way it is conveyed so that evaluation can fully play its informative role.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In addition to its advantages for learning, the informative nature of criteria-based evaluation appears to be perfectly suited to selection processes, since it helps establish a better correlation between a candidate's individual abilities and the field of studies they are interested in pursuing. On this topic, see the section "The R score doesn't reflect ability."



### Second Obstacle

#### CONFUSION BETWEEN EVALUATION AND GRADING

Some teachers are not entirely clear on the difference between evaluating learning and giving a grade. For some, not giving a grade would mean marking less or not at all. For others, it would imply trusting only a final test to show a learner's degree of competency development. Both of these conceptions are false.

**Behavioural and interpersonal skills are at least as important as cognitive skills for performing and succeeding in life.**

In a competency-based approach, teachers correct no more or less than in a normative approach. They still have to have students complete exercises, projects, productions, and various other items, and then give feedback on their work. What changes is how they look at these activities. Instead of seeking to give marks or to weigh them so as to be able to add them up later, they use them to inform students of what they understood well (or not), and what they can do to

improve. They also use these activities to sketch a portrait of the student's competency development and mastery so that they can give a determination to this effect at the end of the term.

According to the CSE, this judgment should ideally simply be expressed as a pass/fail. In today's context, where R scores remain the rule, this judgment could still be given as a grade. However, it would not be based on adding up points but rather on all the information gathered throughout the term, including what a student has mastered and what difficulties have been encountered and successfully overcome or not (among other things). Of course, for teachers, some tasks or assignments are more significant than others in supporting their professional judgment and soundly evaluating a student's learning, if only because they are more representative of the targeted competencies.

Such a shift would profoundly change how learners look at the activities they are asked to complete. This approach to teaching and learning could help eliminate students' tendency to make an effort only when and where it counts, and, in so doing, lower performance anxiety, foster accountability in learning, and bring students to self-evaluate and self-regulate, as they must do in other areas of their lives and as they will have to do on the job market.

#### THE R SCORE DOES NOT REFLECT ABILITY

Quebec universities have long known that the R score is not representative of student learning or ability, and that students can succeed quite well by memorizing or applying 'recipes'. To resolve this issue in the selection of candidates for limited-enrolment programs, a number of the province's universities are now using interviews, hypothetical situations, and qualifying tests to spot candidate qualities and abilities that are considered necessary to succeed in a program or practice (Faculté de médecine de l'Université de Montréal, 2017). To improve their procedures, many health faculties broke out in a new direction in 2017 with the launch of a candidate evaluation process called the Test d'évaluation des compétences transversales (TECT), which takes students' attitudes into account. The weight of this test in the selection process ranges from 20% to 50% of the overall score used for admission, depending on the faculty (Université de Montréal, 2017).

These innovative procedures show that behavioural and interpersonal skills are at least as important as cognitive skills for performing and succeeding in life (Linkins et al., 2014). These universities want to know how students have developed as individuals, i.e., what sets them apart (strengths, weaknesses, personality profile, etc.) and how they might go about pursuing a given area of study and work as part of a team or within the culture of a prospective employer. This approach seeks to transform the vision of evaluation focused on mistakes and shortcomings, looking instead at what each student can bring to others and to society.



### Third Obstacle

#### A SIMPLISTIC VISION OF PERFORMANCE

The debate around the idea of eliminating grades and averages shows how deeply the current system is rooted in a reductive vision of performance. As mentioned above, grades alone are not very useful in determining a learner's strengths and weaknesses. An average does not tell us whether a student is progressing normally or where they are situated in their learning, but rather whether they had an easier time than the average student with learning a particular element over a given period of time.

Is students' ease or difficulty with learning in their educational pathway representative of the abilities they ultimately developed or of individual potential? Not really. Yet the school system and society at large hold up grades and deviation from the mean as if they were indeed a reflection of individual ability. While getting good grades can open many doors – regardless of subsequent performance – getting a bad grade creates an obstacle that does not even give someone a chance to show what they are capable of. This rigid vision of learning is fundamentally problematic, since, when one gets a bad grade:

“All your life, people will consider that your skills, abilities, behaviour, and motivation have not changed in 10 or even 20 years, and that you are still the same person you were then” (Izquierdo Prindle, 2018, freely translated).

Yet many students considered to be promising based on their academic results will never distinguish themselves on the job market, and, conversely, many looked upon as weak students will go on to pursue high-level careers.

In addition, performance is commonly associated with the continuously linear path of schooling. Even if this model continues to be prized, it is no longer really representative of reality; less than 40% of college students complete their studies within the timeframes established for the program (MEESR, 2015). What about the other 60%? Does this mean they are lacking in ability? Is it abnormal at this age for someone to be in a search for self-identity, switching programs, experiencing more difficult living conditions, working (as a choice or out of necessity), leaving the family home, or lacking motivation or maturity? Students with personal circumstances that do not allow them to devote all their time to their studies or to follow this set linear pathway are automatically at a disadvantage in getting into a limited-enrolment program and are disqualified from scholarships, which are granted to the top performers in this meritocratic system.

### Fourth Obstacle

#### THE BELIEF THAT COMPETITION BREEDS SUCCESS

For some people, abandoning averages and selection based on anything other than the best grades would amount to naive egalitarianism or a lowering of standards. In spite of the detractors, however, adopting the directions suggested by the CSE would actually mean looking to develop and promote excellence among all students. According to the Harvard Graduate School of Education, the logic of competition and selection hinders society's evolution and future, depriving it of the contributions and potential of learners from a variety of economic backgrounds (Weissbourd et al., 2016). The organizations and countries that develop the best and have the highest indices of well-being are not those focused on the excellence of a handful of individuals, but those with the smallest gap between their elite and the rest of the population. The core problem is thus the individual vision of performance.

Clinging to the average also reflects a belief that competition is key to success. While the average can serve as a source of extrinsic motivation for the highest-performing individuals, it can be demotivating for everyone else, especially those who are struggling with their learning. Interestingly, extrinsic motivation does not require comparison with peers. It can be just as effective for learning when based on an individual achieving or exceeding a target set by themselves. On the job market, professionals are not expected to perform better than their coworkers, but to help push back the limits of knowledge; come up with innovative or novel solutions to problems; improve processes; or enhance the quality of a product, service, or people's lives. When people develop and learn – both personally and socially – through information-sharing, conversation, the clash of ideas, and dialogue, the entire community benefits.<sup>2</sup>

### Fifth Obstacle

#### THE FEAR THAT THE BEST WILL NOT BE RECOGNIZED OR THAT THEIR TALENT WILL BE WASTED

The attachment to grading and averages also reveals a fear that the best students will not be recognized or rewarded. Once more, this is a simplistic perception of reality. On the job market as in personal life, individuals distinguish themselves not by their grades, but by their actions, their personal skills,

<sup>2</sup> The section “Excellence does not necessarily lie with the elite” gives an insightful example of collaboration leading to significantly higher degrees of achievement.



their work, and their degree of competence in a given field. In the current context, competition and grade-based selection leaves no room for a guidance-based approach in schools or for matching an individual's profile of competencies with what is expected in a given field and setting.

**On the job market as in personal life, individuals distinguish themselves not by their grades, but by their actions, their personal skills, their work, and their degree of competence in a given field.**

The idea of wasted talent is just as pernicious, as it is detrimental to individuals' aspirations and well-being. Some who lack motivation, ability, or interest in advanced university studies or scientific fields nevertheless feel social pressure to pursue these avenues even if they are not right for them. Others have the abilities, motivation, and interest for advanced studies, but have a passion for fields that require a diploma of vocational or technical studies. In either case, many first go through college or university, only to come back to vocational training, which proves to be a closer fit to their fields of interest or their abilities (CSE, 2018). This is without counting those who, after completing their studies, stay in jobs that are not suitable for them, in order to conform to someone else's definition of success.

by their actions, their personal skills, their work, and their degree of competence in a given field. In the current context, competition and grade-based selection leaves no room for a guidance-based approach in schools or for matching an individual's profile of competencies with what is expected in a given field and setting.

The idea of wasted talent is just as pernicious, as it is detrimental to individuals' aspirations and well-being. Some who lack motivation, ability, or interest in advanced university studies or scientific fields nevertheless feel social pressure to pursue these avenues even if they are not right for them. Others have the abilities, motivation, and interest for advanced studies, but have a passion for fields that require a diploma of vocational or technical studies. In either case, many first go through college or university, only to come back to vocational training, which proves to be a closer fit to their fields of interest or their abilities (CSE, 2018). This is without counting those who, after completing their studies, stay in jobs that are not suitable for them, in order to conform to someone else's definition of success.

This idea of wasted talent deprives fields considered less prestigious (such as the food, agriculture, and retail industries; entrepreneurship; etc.) of outstanding individuals who might have a passion for these fields in a time when our problems require a complete overhaul of our relationship to the world and to consumption.

### EXCELLENCE DOES NOT NECESSARILY LIE WITH THE ELITE

Google, originally known for its elitist approach to recruitment, came to an unexpected conclusion after conducting an internal evaluation to identify its most innovative and productive teams. The results showed that the elite A-teams with the top, highly specialized scientists who were able to deliver projects at the cutting edge of science were not the leading performers. Instead, the study uncovered that the most interesting, productive, and promising new ideas for the company came from its B-teams, made up of employees who were not necessarily part of the elite, but who worked effectively in teams (Strauss, 2017). The secret of their performance was found to reside in equality, generosity, curiosity about others' ideas, empathy, emotional intelligence, and emotional security. Each member of such teams knows they can speak up and be heard, and is allowed to make mistakes (ibid.).

Another Google study supported these observations. In reviewing the effectiveness of its hiring criteria (by compiling data on hiring, firing, and promotions since the company's incorporation in 1998), the authors concluded that the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics skills the company had initially focused on actually ranked as the eighth and least important skill among the best-performing employees. The most important were soft skills, such as being a good coach, communicating well, listening to others, having insight (understanding and considering others' values and points of view), possessing empathy, supporting colleagues, being a critical thinker, and having the ability to make connections across complex ideas (Strauss, 2017). These skills form the well-known '21st-century skills' expected of citizens and professionals in order to keep up with the evolution of society today (CSE, 2018).



## Sixth Obstacle

### TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF POWERLESSNESS

Many teachers tend to think that the conditions that would enable them to evaluate differently are not currently in place. It is true that, for now, it is impossible to stop giving grades. Some changes, such as abolishing the R score, would require a political will that goes beyond the role of the teacher in the classroom.<sup>3</sup> However, colleges do have some unused latitude in the form of institutional policies on the evaluation of learning (IPESA), departmental policies on the evaluation of learning (PDEA), and departmental frameworks, which are voted on by their members.

On a smaller scale, teachers can transform their everyday evaluation practices in their classes, and, in doing so, contribute to changing the face of evaluation. Nothing prevents teachers from acting upon how grades are calculated or exploring other ways of giving grades, either during an academic term or on the side, so as to become familiar with these approaches, explore what they have to offer, and examine their limitations and their effects on learning.

### IDEAS FOR EVALUATION THAT SUPPORTS LEARNING

Students quickly learn that, to succeed, they must comply with the evaluation practices in place. If they are asked to provide knowledge they learned by heart, but that lacks internal links or connections with the topic, or they are asked to settle for meeting the minimum requirements, this unfortunately prevents them from truly appropriating knowledge, from thinking and understanding the complex dialectics on which it is based, and from developing the targeted competencies (Cariou, 2006 ; Vanhulle, 2009). Indeed, the pedagogical practices and evaluation methods established by teachers significantly influence the quantity and quality of students' learning (Tardif, 1997).

If we want all students to achieve lasting learning, to develop the anticipated competencies, and to become autonomous in their education, it is important for evaluation practices to lead them in the direction of these goals. Following are a few suggestions to try out or simply to ponder.

### Evaluating consistent with the competency-based approach

Given that competencies are developed along a continuum, evaluation practices should be consistent with this approach. Teachers can:

- Consider evaluation from the standpoint of the feedback it allows; this entails criteria-based evaluation that tells students where they stand with respect to the competency to develop, and what means they could use to progress;
- Base their judgment on multiple traces of learning distributed throughout the term (abandoning mark totals);
- Correct errors without penalizing for them;
- Use mistakes as tools for learning;
- Explore the evaluation of high-level competencies;
- Question the factors that go into the marks and grades they give;
- Involve students in evaluation;
- Consider giving pass/fails;
- At the end of a learning sequence or term, ask themselves: Did the student master what they need to in order to go onto the next step in their learning?

### Giving students latitude in expressing their understanding during evaluations

Currently, evaluations often target how a response is framed and fits into a well-defined norm. Instead, evaluation should reveal what students have understood about a given phenomenon or the competency they developed. Why not go out on a limb and give open instructions, such as, "Using the means of your choosing (words, video, drawing, theatre, etc.), show what you learned / what you understood about..."? Such evaluations make it impossible to simply repeat something learned by rote. Students must show that they have given meaning and depth to what they learned. Such instructions can be applied to a concept, a notion, a competency, the content of an academic term, etc. Although destabilizing for students who are used to repeating things they learned by heart, this approach promotes a genuine appropriation of the material. Of course, it requires some flexibility and the use of professional judgment on the part of the teacher. The difficulty of evaluation often comes from a lack of solid guideposts, whether in the form of observable

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that universities are already challenging the use of the R score in admissions (see the section on this topic). This state of affairs suggests an openness to change in the future.



performance criteria, or, at the least, conceptualized knowledge. Developing appropriate correction tools such as criteria-referenced grids (marking rubrics) therefore becomes a crucial step.

## CONCLUSION

As the CSE's 2016–2018 report on the state and needs of education shows, it might be time to abandon the competitive vision of education and dare to explore a different approach that is more inclusive, more mindful of the contributions to society offered by different individuals' profiles, and more consistent with the primary mission of schools. We have much to gain, both individually and collectively.

The obstacles to change are deeply rooted in beliefs, values, fears, and representations that are sometimes difficult to change. Nevertheless, a shift in evaluation practices is possible. The publication of the CSE report is an opportunity for us to reflect on our evaluation practices and how they affect our students' learning, so that we can 'evaluate so it truly counts'.

## REFERENCES

- ALLAL, L. "Acquisition et évaluation des compétences en situation scolaire", in DOLZ, J. and E. OLLAGNIER (Ed.). *L'énigme de la compétence en éducation*, Brussels, de Boeck Université, 2000, p. 77-94.
- CARIOU, D. "Le contrôle de la pensée naturelle en situation didactique", in HAAS, V. (Ed.). *Les savoirs du quotidien. Transmissions, Appropriations, Représentations*, Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2006, p. 119-130.
- CONSEIL SUPÉRIEUR DE L'ÉDUCATION. *Évaluer pour que ça compte vraiment. Rapport sur l'état et les besoins de l'éducation 2016-2018*, Québec, 2018 [cse.gouv.qc.ca/lp/rebe/evaluer-compte-vraiment/index.php].
- CONSEIL SUPÉRIEUR DE L'ÉDUCATION. *Remettre le cap sur l'équité. Rapport sur l'état et les besoins de l'éducation 2014-2016*, Québec, 2016.
- FACULTÉ DE MÉDECINE DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL. *L'entrevue de sélection*, 2017 [medecine.umontreal.ca/etudes/doctorat-en-medecine/futurs-etudiants/lentrevue-de-selection].
- IZQUIERDO PRINDLE, T. "Un pardon pour le dossier "criminel scolaire"", *La Presse+*, March 11, 2018.
- LINKINS, M. et al. "Through the lens of strength: A framework for educating the heart", *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, February 21, 2014 [dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.888581].
- LOUIS, R. and D. BÉDARD. "Les tendances en évaluation des apprentissages en enseignement supérieur", in LEROUX, J. L. (Ed.). *Évaluer les compétences au collégial et à l'université : un guide pratique*, Montreal, Association québécoise de pédagogie collégiale, 2015, p. 23-63.
- MINISTÈRE DE L'ÉDUCATION, DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR ET DE LA RECHERCHE. *Sanction des études collégiales 1993-2011*, ensemble du réseau collégial, May 6, 2015.

NIZET, I. "Les pratiques évaluatives au quotidien : enjeux culturels et identitaires", in LEROUX, J. L. (Ed.). *Évaluer les compétences au collégial et à l'université : un guide pratique*, Montreal, Association québécoise de pédagogie collégiale, 2015, p. 105-128.

STRAUSS, V. "The surprising thing Google learned about it's employees – and what it means for today's students", *The Washington Post*, December 20, 2017.

TARDIF, J. "La construction des connaissances", *Pédagogie collégiale*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1997, p. 14-19.

UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL. *Guide d'admission et des programmes d'études*, 2017 [admission.umontreal.ca/admission/1er-cycle/tect-en-ligne].

VANHULLE, S. *Des savoirs en jeu aux savoirs en "je" : cheminements réflexifs et subjectivation des savoirs chez de jeunes enseignants en formation*, Berne, Peter Lang, 2009.

WEISSBOURD, R. et al. *Turning the Tide. Inspiring Concern for Others and the Common Good through College Admissions*, Cambridge, 2016.

Michaël Héту is a French teacher at Cégep André-Laurendeau, a lecturer in the short program in higher-education pedagogy (PCPES) at Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM), and a doctoral student in education at UQAM. His areas of interest include teacher education, especially from the standpoints of evaluation, reflective practice, representations of knowledge, and the transfer of knowledge to teaching practices. He was a member of the committee that produced the report on the state and needs of education in 2016–2018, and has been a member of the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation since August 2018.

michael.hetu@clairendeau.qc.ca

The Conseil supérieur de l'éducation (CSE) is an independent organization separate from the Ministère de l'éducation et de l'enseignement supérieur. It serves as a platform for consultation and critical reflection within democratic institutions and is immune to advocacy groups. Its purpose is to advise the ministry on educational issues. To this end, every two years, the CSE must produce a report on the state and needs of education. The theme of the report is chosen by the CSE's members. The content stems from the critical reflections and consultations of a committee made up of teachers, professors, administrators, professionals, parents, and students from different levels of instruction, as well as representatives of society from outside the world of education.





## FIND OUT MORE

EDITOR'S NOTE: Readers interested in finding more evaluation tools with a view to supporting learning and competency development are invited to consult a series of articles on the topic in *Pédagogie collégiale*:

- BRIÈRE, M. *Errors for Learning: Studying Students' errors, an innovative process to analyze your methods and teach better*, vol. 31, no. 2, winter 2018, p. 31-37 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/briere-vol.31-2\_eng.pdf].
- CHAUMONT, M and J. L. LEROUX. *The Subjectivity, Cognitive Bias and Postures of Teachers*, vol. 31, no. 3, spring 2018, p. 27-33 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/chaumontleroux-vol.31-3.pdf].
- \*CÔTÉ, F. *Learning Assessment at the College Level: A Concept Map for Assessment Practices*, p. 3-9 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/cote-vol.30-4\_eng.pdf].
- Special issue "Évaluer les apprentissages", summer 2017 (vol. 30, no. 4):
  - \*BAUDRY, P. "Too bad we can't do that on the exam!" *When the summative assessment forms an integral part of the learning process: the revisited case method*, p. 43-48 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/audry-vol\_30-4.pdf].
  - BÉLEC, C. *Why assess?*, p. 10-16 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/belec-vol.30-4\_eng\_0.pdf].
  - CÔTÉ, F. *Learning Assessment at the College Level: A Concept Map for Assessment Practices*, p. 3-9 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/cote-vol.30-4\_eng.pdf].
  - HOWE, R. *The analysis and consistency table- to ensure educational consistency between learning objectives and learning assessment*, p. 29-35 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/howe-vol\_30-4.pdf].
  - MASTRACCI, A. *Formative assessment: Assessment for learning*, p. 22-28 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/mastracci-vol.30-4.pdf]. English version available at [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/mastracci-vol.30-4\_eng.pdf]
  - MORIN, C. and M. PAGÉ. *An approach to planning a course final assessment that considers all skills*, p. 36-42 [aqqc.qc.ca/sites/default/files/revue/morin\_page-vol\_30-4.pdf]

\* Articles containing examples of descriptive or criteria-referenced grids.