

Teacher narratives on evaluation: how to evaluate the student without reducing final numbers?

*Narrativas de professores sobre avaliação:
como avaliar o estudante sem reduzi-lo a números finais?*

*Narrativas de profesores sobre evaluación:
¿cómo evaluar el estudiante sin reducir a números finales?*

Carla Melo da Silva² 

Mônica da Silva Gallon³ 

Zulma Elizabete de Freitas Madruga⁴ 

Abstract: Classroom assessment is an intrinsic component of the teaching and learning process, and cannot be dissociated or ignored. It is a controversial aspect, since it depends on the conception that each teacher carries, related to their conception of education. To analyze how teachers from different areas of knowledge attending a second teaching graduation understand the process of evaluation in the classroom. In order to do so, we broadened the narratives of 18 teachers into four groups: **Evaluation as a process in the day-to-day classroom; Evaluation as a possibility of reflection of the teaching action; Different evaluation strategies;** and **Qualitative versus Quantitative Evaluation**. It was observed that teachers conceive evaluation as a continuous process, considering that it is necessary to rely on theoretical knowledge incorporated in practice, because only then will it will be possible to carry out the difficult task of evaluating in an inclusive, participatory and emancipatory way.

Keywords: Evaluation. Narratives. Teacher Training.

Resumo: A avaliação em sala de aula é um componente intrínseco ao processo de ensino e aprendizagem, não podendo ser dissociado ou ignorado. É um aspecto controverso, pois depende da concepção que cada docente carrega, relacionado à sua concepção de educação. Objetiva-se neste artigo analisar como professores de diferentes áreas do conhecimento cursando uma segunda licenciatura, em pedagogia, compreendem o processo avaliativo no âmbito da sala de aula. Para isso, adensamos as narrativas de 18 professores em quatro grupos: **Avaliação como processo no dia a dia de sala de aula; Avaliação como possibilidade de reflexão da ação docente; Diferentes estratégias de avaliação; e Avaliação Qualitativa versus Quantitativa**. Constatou-se que os professores concebem a avaliação como processo contínuo, considerando que é necessário amparar-se em conhecimentos teóricos incorporados na prática, pois só assim será possível efetuar a difícil tarefa de avaliar de forma inclusiva, participativa e emancipadora.

Palavras-chave: Avaliação. Narrativas. Formação Docente.

Resumen: La evaluación en el aula es un componente intrínseco al proceso de enseñanza y aprendizaje, no pudiendo ser disociado o ignorado. Es un aspecto controvertido, pues depende de la concepción que cada docente carga, relacionado a su concepción de la educación. Se pretende en este artículo analizar como profesores de diferentes áreas del conocimiento cursando una segunda licenciatura, en pedagogía, comprenden el proceso de la evaluación en el aula. Para ello, adensamos las narrativas de 18 profesores en cuatro grupos: **Evaluación como proceso en el día a día de aula; Evaluación como posibilidad de reflexión de la acción docente; Diferentes estrategias de evaluación; y la Evaluación Cualitativa versus cuantitativa**. Se constató que los profesores conciben la evaluación como proceso continuo, considerando que es necesario ampararse en

¹ **Submitted:** 01 Oct. 2018 - **Accepted:** 01 July 2019 - **Published:** 29 Dec. 2019

² Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS) – Email: carlamelodasilva2015@gmail.com

³ Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul (PUCRS) – Email: monica.gallon@gmail.com

⁴ Federal University of Recôncavo da Bahia (UFRB) – Email: betefreitas.m@gmail.com

conocimientos teóricos incorporados en la práctica, pues sólo así será posible efectuar la difícil tarea de evaluar de forma inclusiva, participativa y emancipadora.

Palabras clave: *Evaluación. Narrativas. Formación docente.*

First thoughts

Evaluation in education always leads to controversies and discussions. It is evident that classroom assessment is intertwined with the theoretical conceptions of teachers and related to their knowledge about the teaching and learning processes. We consider professional experiences as relevant in understanding how classroom assessment is conceived so that it does not reduce the student to a final number.

Evaluation is intrinsic to the practice of educating, being a component of the pedagogical act. According to Luckesi (2011), evaluation does not solve anything, but in all its instances - whether in the classroom, institutional evaluation, or teaching work evaluation - it will provide a set of process quality indicators, acting as a fundamental element for decision making regarding the qualification of this educational stage.

Thus, there is no way to think about teaching and learning if we do not scale the role of assessment. This, as we have seen in our time as students, a blank paper in which we must deposit all the knowledge gained on a given subject until that moment, is still a reference in many school environments in the country.

According to Enricone (2000, p. 29): “Evaluation has profound cultural significance because it refers to the values of a culture and how these values are accepted. We can think of the evaluative function as mediation between the school function and the set of values of a given society”. Therefore, evaluation is linked to a set of factors in the cultural context. The changes that accompany education in recent years are also part of the evaluation process. It is a minefield of uncertainty, because to evaluate the other (and oneself) is to put oneself to the test.

In its multiple dimensions, the evaluation can acquire a diagnostic or classificatory character, being seen as a form of punishment or as **coronation** after an arduous process. The assessment can also serve for the teacher labeling as a **good** or a **bad** student or as a way to reflect on their daily practice and how the results of these evaluations may indicate necessary changes in their teaching action. As it was stated by Freitas *et al.* (2014, p. 7): “Assessment emerges in the classroom sometimes as a source of development, sometimes as a threat. Interestingly, it affects all actors, depending on where they are enrolled in the evaluation process, sometimes as evaluative subjects, sometimes as objects of evaluation”.

The fact is that assessment is not limited to the formal classroom environment or just to the tests. And thinking of an assessment as a continuous process alone does not guarantee success (FREITAS *et al.*, 2014). Thus, we have our research problem: **How do a group of teachers, who are students of a second teaching graduation, conceive the evaluation process in the classroom?** This article aims to analyze how teachers from different areas of

knowledge attending a second teaching graduation, understand the evaluation process within the classroom.

In this article we seek to present in the theoretical framework authors who defend different concepts about assessment in the classroom. Subsequently, we present our methodological proposal: through narratives of teachers, already active, attending a second teaching graduation, we investigated the conceptions of evaluation evidenced by them. Finally, we look for converging points in these lines, leading us to four main groups: **Evaluation as a process in the day-to-day classroom; The evaluation as a possibility of reflection of the teaching action; Different assessment strategies and qualitative versus quantitative assessment.** From this analysis, we point out some aspects that need reflection to seek coherence between our actions and our conceptions about evaluation.

Evaluating in education

The evaluation is not intended to solve problems, but to help in decision making, in the search for the desired results. “Evaluation is an act of investigating the quality of what constitutes its object of study and, therefore, portrays its quality” (LUCKESI, 2011, p. 13). The way each individual or institution perceives the assessment is that it will give its “face”. We can start from an investigation that involves only a classification, a ranking of students or the construction of a diagnosis, which reveals subsidies of how we should proceed as we find a learning disability in the students of a class.

Hoffmann (2012) states that discussing assessment is, above all, thinking of ways to improve the quality of teaching. The author states that there are many factors that make it difficult to rethink the evaluation processes, and they occurs due to the fact that educators of all educational levels perceive the classification assessment as a guarantee of the quality of a competent knowledge of students. And this belief is underpinned by a culture, maintained by the media, by advertisements, perpetuated in family conversations, where the ways of evaluating and the professionals who are part of the system are compared. Hoffmann continues (2012, p. 14): “Schools justify their fears of making changes from the serious resistance of families to such innovations, the possibility of cancellation of enrollment, for example, in private schools and the rush to find conservative schools”.

Therefore, to think about the dimensions that evaluation encompasses is also to think about cultural aspects, as well as political and ethical commitment. Grillo and Lima (2010, p. 17) state that “as a political commitment, evaluation is an instrument at the service of learning, helping the learner in the development of citizenship”. On the other hand, the ethical commitment starts from an evaluation focused on “respect, solidarity and the collective good” (GRILLO; LIMA, 2010, p. 17).

Grillo and Lima (2010, p. 19) refer to the acts of teaching, learning and evaluating as “distinct phenomena, but belonging to the same pedagogical activity, so the evaluation cannot be treated oddly or sporadically, it must be understood as a routine activity of educational action”. In this line, conceiving evaluation as an action to be performed at the end of the

teaching and learning process can be viewed as a mistake (FREITAS *et al.*, 2014). Freitas *et al.* (2014) explain that this distortion is related to the misunderstanding of the pedagogical categories, because if we usually treat teaching-learning-assessment in a decoupled manner, the evaluation process occurs at the end of the other categories. For the authors: “we need to increase our understanding of this issue and not just advocate for a procedural or continuous assessment” (FREITAS *et al.*, 2014, p. 14).

It is not enough to think of assessment as a process, it is necessary to understand how it is possible to put this into practice in our daily classroom, because “evaluation feeds the process by giving the teacher tips on what has been taught and learned” (FREITAS *et al.*, 2014, p. 14).

Looking at the assessment as a diagnostic tool gives the educator a chance not to think of it as a point of arrival (GRILLO; LIMA, 2010), but as a document that ensures that he directs his practice towards his student. For the authors:

Likewise for the teacher, the assessment of learning is of recognized utility, as it allows reflection on the practice - the examination of coherence between the objects sought, the teaching procedures used and the results obtained - and guides decision making that is relevant to the continuity of education (GRILLO; LIMA, 2010, p. 17).

Gatti (2003, p. 111) argues that the “exercise of teaching whose clear and consensual purposes feeds a more consistent and more integrated evaluation process towards a formative perspective”. The author states that one should not look at evaluation as a mere bureaucracy, but rather think about the actual cognitive-social learning of those involved.

Therefore, we think that discussing evaluation involves reflecting on what maintains current evaluative models, ensured by conservatism and what involves thinking for the teaching-learning-evaluating processes as inseparable. It also reflect on who is being evaluated and who learns from the assessment, because this spiral, which encompasses “power and force relations within the school: ‘symbolic power, subordinate power, is a transformed, that is, unrecognizable, transfigured and legitimized way, from other forms of power [...]’” (BORDIEU, 1989 *apud* FREITAS *et al.*, 2014, p. 9).

The telling

The act of telling, telling about something, constitutes us as human beings. Stories configure us as people, teachers and researchers. We are full of narrative fragments, decreed in historical moments of time and space, reflected and understood in terms of narrative units and discontinuities (CLANDININ; CONNELLY, 2015). Therefore, from the narratives emerge a knowledge that, when shared with others, enables the reconstruction of this knowledge. In view of this, the reader has prior understandings of what is narrated, based on his or her life experience, - either professionally or personally - and these multiple interpretations will be tightened to what is told. The narrative enables the reflection on the

lived experience and the rethinking can be a new learning and, on the part of those who read, the possibility to learn from the experience of the other.

According to Clandinin and Connelly (2015, p. 96), “it is not just the participants' stories that are retold by a narrative researcher. It is also the stories of researchers who are open to research and retell”. Narrative research is one of the many ways to do academic research, therefore, research in education and, then, research focused on teacher education. And, in this sense, Freitas and Fiorentini (2007, p. 63), highlight the role of narrative in teacher education:

[...] first, the narrative as a way of reflecting, reporting and representing the experience, producing meaning to who we are, do, think, feel and say. [...] and narrative as a way of studying/investigating experience, that is, as a special way of interpreting and understanding human experience, taking into account the perspective and interpretation of its participants.

Narrative writing is a way of documenting classroom experiences that contribute to collaborative processes of conversation, reading, writing, and rewriting in teacher education. Bruner (1991) understands narrative as a way of thinking and producing meanings, thus a way of reflecting and evaluating his classroom practice. The narrative in the Benjaminian perspective is the transmitted experience common to the narrator and the listener (BENJAMIN, 1987). “The narrative text operates as a mental instrument of reality construction” (BRUNER, 1991, p. 5). The practice of writing about their experiences is not common in teaching (NÓVOA, 1995; BOLÍVAR, 2011), but needs to be encouraged as a possibility of formation that gives meaning to everyday school situations.

When teachers are narrators of their experiences, their knowledge, they cease to be what they were, they change, and they are others. This reflective posture is a challenge to their professional understandings and re-signifies their actions (SUÁREZ, 2010). The teaching experience favors reflection, and this being narrated evidences knowledge and provides the opportunity to learn from each other. Josso (2004, p. 41) says that “if experiential learning is a powerful means of elaborating and integrating know-how and knowledge, its mastery can become an effective support for change”.

When narrating about an experience, the subject reveals his or her life experience, through events, stories and emotions. According to Dutra (2002, p. 374):

Narrative has the capacity to arouse in its listeners the most diverse emotional content and states, since, unlike information, it does not provide us with answers. On the contrary, the experience lived and transmitted by the narrator sensitizes us, reaches us in the meanings we attribute to the experience, assimilating it according to ours.

In teaching practice, narratives can act as a **reflection** tool, the value of the experiences that narratives bring, cooperate so that the subjects are constituted, enriching each other. For Galvão (2005), the investigation by narratives has social and explanatory character of something personal or characteristic of an era. Thus, the narratives in education emerge as a possibility of methodology to mean what is produced. This makes the narrative an instrument capable of promoting teacher education and not just as a research methodology.

Therefore, “we take the narrative as a reference term to a quality that structures the experience to be studied and a research pattern to be used for the study of experience” (ARAGÃO, 2004, p. 18).

For Benjamin (1987, p. 205), “the narrator's imprint is imprinted on the narrative”, because the narratives have the marks of the narrator, it brings the life story and experiences of the narrator. By studying the narratives of the participants of this research, with this understanding suggested by Benjamin, we do not intend to explain what these subjects understand about evaluation, but to point out in the narratives the view of the present, understanding the conceptions of these teachers through the relevant marks and meanings that were evidenced in their narratives.

Narratives attempt to give meaning to what they carry about evaluation and in the light of theorists to deepen these meanings so that they may serve as possibilities for new understandings in pedagogical practice. For Benjamin (1987, p. 11), the narrative is like knowing how to advise:

The one who tells conveys knowledge, a wisdom that his listeners can profitably receive. Practical wisdom, which often takes the form of a moral, a warning from a council, things we don't know what to do with at the present, so isolated that we are, each in his own particular and private world. [...] the advice is not to intervene from the outside in another's life, but to make a suggestion about the continuation of a story that is being narrated.

Benjamin (1987) refers to the advice not to intervene in people's lives, but to suggest something so that it can continue what is narrated. From Benjamin's perspective, the narrative contains experiences that pass from person to person. It is a process of socialization. The one who expresses the narrative is the narrator, the one who tells the story. The act of narration can be seen as an art, without explanations about what is said, but that can reach meanings that are not contemplated in writing. This will depend on the knowledge each reader carries and how relevant this advice may become.

Research ways

This study presents the narratives of 18 teachers from different areas of knowledge who were attending the second teaching graduation at distance in a private institution in southern Brazil. Survey participants had their names replaced by fictitious¹ names at random in order to preserve anonymity.

These were teachers working in the final years of elementary school of different curricular components, such as: Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics, Portuguese Language, History, Geography and Philosophy, mostly working in public schools, with an average of 12 years. Their written narratives were published in an online forum on the subject Teaching Systems and Educational Policies. In this forum a discussion was proposed with the following question: **How to make the evaluation without reducing it to final numbers?**

These narratives were taken from the full online forum, becoming the field text condition (CLANDININ; CONELLY, 2015). These writings have been read exhaustively because, according to Chizzotti (2008), the focus is on the interpretation of the significant aspects of the text. We perform this interpretation with the research problem as axis, thus, we seek the convergence of meanings in the different texts.

At first, we use keywords/terms to identify similarities in narrative meanings, namely: qualitative versus quantitative; reflection; settlement of scores; different strategies; evaluation is the daily life; and, evaluation is process and not the end. These meanings, pointed out in keywords/terms, had one more careful reading by the researchers, enabling a greater ordering of these narratives, generating four axes of analysis that encompass what these narratives carry meaning, namely: **Evaluation as a process in the classroom daily life; Evaluation as a possibility of reflection of the teaching action; Different evaluation strategies; Qualitative versus Quantitative Evaluation.**

The elaboration of these axes of analysis aims to intertwine the meanings that narratives carry with what evaluation theorists defend, which will be presented in the next section of this text. As stated earlier, we analyze narratives from the **Benjaminian** perspective, where we seek to give voice to the narrated experience, “without giving definitive explanations and that history admits several different interpretations” (BENJAMIN, 1987, p. 13). Therefore, we do not aim to explain their meanings, but to leverage them with what evaluation theorists say so that readers can understand them as an **advise**.

What narratives tell us

In this section, we explain the statements of the research collaborators, intertwined with the theory about the subject.

Evaluation as a process in the classroom day-to-day

The assessment of teaching and learning should be seen as a systematic and continuous process, during which information and manifestations about the development of teaching and student activities are being obtained. According to the narratives, the participants agree that the assessment should be procedural and constant in the classroom, not reduced to final numbers, which is evident in the excerpts:

Assessment needs to be constant in the classroom that is thought through in various ways, passing through the student's reality, his or her growth history and difficulties at school, his or her interests (Gabriela).

I evaluate my students every day, not just for finals. The student has to be observed in the activities done in class, their frequency and their behavior are linked in my thinking to evaluate, students who miss a lot, but in the tests get a high grade; on the other side a student who got a low grade, but there are no absences, and he is well

behaved and participatory, so in my way of evaluating, I review the behavior, frequency and participation in the proposed activities and not just the final exam grade (Roberta).

The evaluation may not be reduced to final numbers. It should be done daily throughout the whole process in the classroom, evaluating the student in his daily life, in all educational moments and not just in a quantitative test (Katia).

Evaluating the student day by day continuously, because the evaluation proposal, in my opinion, should not be an idea of the measure of knowledge that the student has, but an exercise that complements and promotes understanding. It should be more like learning the final chapter of a lesson and not classifying knowledge capacity. Assessment should be a way for the student to prepare for problem solving, and this should take place permanently in the classroom (Tatiana).

From what we can observe in the narratives, the teachers are concerned with the monitoring of students in the classroom, which meets Luckesi's (2011, p. 172-173) ideas about follow-up assessment, or operational evaluation, which “investigates the quality of ongoing results successively, first under the formative focus - process - and second under the final focus of an action - product”. For the author, the evaluation as follow-up of an action in process requires, at first, the diagnosis and, then, the intervention to correct the directions of the action.

Luckesi (2011) points out that the way teachers evaluate and explain their learning theories and beliefs needs to be in line with what they call the pedagogical project of action, that is, the theory behind action.

[...] we cannot practice the evaluation without having clear clarity of the pedagogical project of action - of the theory - that offers the contours of our evaluative act. Under these circumstances, if we have a theory of learning based on behaviorism - according to which the human being acts on the basis of the external conditioning of his conduct - the evaluation will be at her service. However, similarly, if the theory that underpins our project of action is emancipatory - elaborated, for example, based on the proposals of Professor Paulo Freire - our evaluation practice will be at the service of the understandings of this theoretical formulation (LUCKESI, 2011, p. 274).

In this sense, we realize that the ideas presented in the evaluation narratives can be classified in the innovative paradigm (BEHRENS, 2011), which aims at the production of knowledge. According to Behrens (2011), this paradigm can be presented in three approaches: **systemic** - the evaluation aims the gradual growth in the process; **progressive**ⁱⁱ - continuous, procedural and transformative assessment; and **teaching with research** - continuous, procedural and participatory evaluation. According to the narratives:

The evaluation needs to be continuous and diversified, with the intention of completeness about the knowledge taught and in fact introjected by the student, as a perspective of interaction with their world. Evaluation is an instrument capable of re-elaborating the construction of knowledge by the student, as a process, and not only as quantification of knowledge (Fernando).

The importance of evaluation in the process of knowledge acquisition should be emphasized, but above all, to absorb evaluation as a 'process' and not as a purpose (Maiara).

The presence of traditional ways in the midst of teaching and assessment is still strong (Robson).

It is clear that the official education documents have already led the teacher to verify qualitatively the best types of assessments to be made. In this sense, the main recommendation is that this assessment be done continuously, that is, daily; the teacher should be observing the student's manifestations in the classroom in order to observe carefully the deficiencies to be remedied and the achievements diagnosed to measure the knowledge learned throughout the school year (Deise).

The official documents indicate the procedural evaluation, as mentioned by one of the teachers. The National Common Curriculum Base (BNCC), for example, presents the idea of formative assessment, indicating that teachers should “build and apply formative process or outcome assessment procedures that take into account learning contexts and conditions, taking such records as a reference to improve school, teacher and student performance (BRASIL, 2017, p. 15).

Evaluation as a possibility of reflection of the teaching action

Thinking about the assessment of learning in an educational project, Hoffmann (2012) states that the act of assessing is part of every moment of human life, thus, it is also present in every moment lived in the classroom. According to the author, effective evaluation occurs during the process, in the dynamic classroom relations that guide decision making. According to Hoffmann (2012), from these interactions more effective conditions are emerging for teachers and students to be able to self-assess, evaluate the content in question and make decisions about the continuation of the teaching and learning process.

Complementing Hoffmann's ideas (2012), we can highlight that the possibility to reflect on this process also emerge from the evaluations. Through the evaluation process, teachers and students have the opportunity to understand their actions, in a reflection movement about the evaluation results. About this reflective practice, the narratives show that teachers are aware of its importance:

Assessment is not always a method in which the teacher will evaluate everything the student has actually learned. There are many ways to check what the student has already assimilated or not, the assessment must be reflective in which the teacher can use it to find out what are still the difficulties the student has and what he needs to deepen for him to learn. It must be processual and continuous, taking into account everything he has already learned (Denise).

According to the pedagogical political project of the school that I work, the evaluation is a substantially educational action, related to the analysis and the permanent and global reflection of the educational processes. In this sense, it will occur throughout the training process and will be diagnostic, continuous and cumulative, enabling the monitoring of the development of the intended competences (Jean).

I believe that making the assessment without reducing it to final numbers is related to the reflective character of the teacher. It is important to think of assessment as one that evaluates not only student learning but also teacher methodological

practice. Assessment should be a diagnosis of what needs to be (re) taught and what needs to be (re) thought in educators' educational practice (Marcelo).

Reflection implies the conscious immersion of the person in the world of his experience. The concept of reflective practice emerges as a possible way for teachers to question their teaching practices. Reflection makes it possible to revisit events and practices.

The term **reflective teacher** was coined by Donald Schön (2000), based on John Dewey, proposing a vocational training based on an epistemology of practiceⁱⁱⁱ. This action provides for the valuation of professional practice as a moment of knowledge construction, through its reflection, analysis and problematization, and the recognition of tacit knowledge^{iv}, present in solutions and also in the results of the evaluations that professionals find in their actions.

Different evaluation strategies

Evaluation is not simply expected to be an end result, but it is analyzed throughout the process; that is why all actions must be planned before they are started, defining each objective in terms of the results expected to be achieved, and which in fact may be attainable by the student.

Activities need to be consistent with the proposed objectives to facilitate the evaluation process, and appropriate tools and strategies for verifying results should be developed. The assessment is complex because it is linked to the teacher's practice, which increases the responsibility for developing effective planning.

To evaluate, instrumental measurement procedures are used, such as: observation, tests, theoretical and practical exercises, tasks that provide qualitative and quantitative data. It is through evaluation that it is possible to show that the action produced some difference to the student's development, that is, it generated learning. The teachers participating in this research understand that:

Evaluation should be involved in a continuous process, another valuable time for learning. There are several strategies that teachers can use to ensure this learning, especially seeking the approximation of curriculum content and the reality in which the student is inserted, as well as their skills (oral participation, debates, seminars...) are some engagement activities that can be used as a learning verification tool (Bruna).

It is necessary to formulate diversified evaluations that are made throughout the school period, not only at a specific time and, if necessary, to adapt them to new evaluation methods (Gerusa).

An assessment to be made without reducing it to final numbers can be carried out in group work, behavioral manifestations, responsibility, ethics, companionship, active participation among other diverse constructive views of the integral formation that the student is presenting in and outside the classroom (Deise).

Through diagnostic, training and self-assessments it is possible to identify progress and difficulties of students by redesigning learning situations (Joanna).

As it is an institution that works with professional education, the evaluation must be performed based on objectives defined in accordance with the competences of the professional profile of completion, considering the performance standards established therein, within a perspective of their progressive integration, in line with the curriculum design and proposed methodology. Students will be assessed throughout each subject through theoretical and practical activities such as tests, self-assessment, problem solving, practical tests, case studies, among others to determine the achievement in the course (Jean).

Luckesi (2011) warns about the practice of **examining**, stating that it simplifies the complex variables involved in an evaluation process^v. These exams focus on the observation on, “on the one hand, the educator, who prepares an instrument, applies and corrects it, and on the other, the student who is present in the classroom and responds to the instrument placed in front of him/her. As this is all” (LUCKESI, 2011, p. 191). The author goes on to state that the act of **evaluating** learning at school, on the contrary, is aware of the complexity of reality.

Being focused on improving student’s performance, it takes into account the complexity of the variables that intervene in the production of results considered intermediate or final, because only acting on them and reducing their effects can learning be satisfactory (LUCKESI, 2011, p. 191).

Qualitative versus Quantitative Evaluation

As stated by Luckesi (2011, p. 417), “there is no quantitative but only qualitative assessment, because, constitutively, quality is attributed based on quantity”. To explain this statement, the author uses the concept of evaluation:

First, we must be aware that the term *evaluation*, etymologically, has to do with quality. It comes from two Latin components - *a e valere* - which together mean ‘to value something’, that is, to attribute quality to something. Secondly, we have to take the very concept of operational evaluation [...] ‘a quality judgment on relevant data for decision making’ (LUCKESI, 2011, p. 417, emphasis in original).

In this sense, we can say, based on Luckesi (2011), that evaluation is qualitative, not quantitative, not only because the term evaluation has to do with quality, but mainly because the “act of evaluating operationally works with quality assigned on the basis of ‘quantity’ - student performance, which is presented with measurable characteristics; that is, a certain amount of learning” (LUCKESI, 2011, p. 19). Excerpts from teachers' narratives show concern for quality over quantity:

At different times, continuously, it is necessary to evaluate throughout the process taking into account qualitative aspects (Joanna).

The assessment should not always be only quantitative so that it will only select the student, through a questionnaire, where all their learning will be evaluated only at that moment, not taking into account their overcoming and progress, which should be continuously and procedural, respecting the limits and difficulties of each (Ieda).

It is necessary to think more qualitatively than quantitatively (Marcelo).

The student needs to be evaluated at all times in the classroom, our role as an educator is not to summarize the written assessment, seeking only numbers, we must evaluate the student throughout the teaching-learning process, evaluate all their participation in the classroom. In this way, it will be possible to understand how our students really evolve and learn, without taking into consideration only the grade they take in the written test or going on the report card, but evaluate it at all times we interact and exchange learning (Amanda).

I evaluate class participation much more than written assessment. We have to take into account the child's moment at the time of the test. I also offer oral, written, practical assessment, with questions to tick and also to answer. So, I evaluate the student in a general and constant way (Iria).

According to common sense, quantitative assessment is represented by numerical data, while qualitative assessment is not measurable. However, for Luckesi (2011, p. 19), “the act of evaluating is an act of attributing quality, based on quantity, which implies constitutively qualitative evaluation”.

Final thoughts

This article aimed to analyze how teachers from different areas of knowledge attending a second teaching graduation understand the evaluation process in the classroom. The analysis sought to understand the speech of these teachers, the way they express the results of their evaluation processes, without reducing students to final numbers.

In our understanding process, we look for elements in their narratives, through the **Benjaminian** perspective, in which the narrator is someone who has knowledge and this, thickened with the reader's existing knowledge, will turn into an advice. Not to intervene in their lives, but to enable them to rethink, to learn from the experience of others.

We realize that these teachers think that evaluation is a process in everyday classroom, as well as consider that the actions in this educational environment go through a constant act of constant assessment, and that this is not restricted to assigning a final result. On the other hand, these teachers demonstrate the understanding that assessment, being an important process in the complex action of teaching and learning, must be based on learning theories, since this will subsidize the evaluative actions and, thus, the practice tends to be inclusive, emancipatory and participatory. Therefore, it will allow teachers to think of different assessment strategies that address the diversity in which the classroom is formed.

The narratives that consider the evaluation process as a moment of reflection of the teaching action lead us to a possibility of formation promoted among the peers. Since the pedagogical knowledge generated by teachers can emerge through the reports of experiences, the reflection on their practices allows the protagonism of these subjects, in a collaborative and dialogical context. This also goes beyond the institution's assessment as a provider of knowledge that is shared in order to achieve significant results in the teaching and learning processes.

The reflection on the act of evaluating should not be an exercise only of the teacher, but also of the student, as this is not expected to be an aid to the process. Classroom

assessment should be shared as a daily exercise, constituting a self-assessment process to analyze its results. It is also worth pointing out that this evaluative action as a shared practice should be encouraged throughout the school process, so that a teaching graduate as a future teacher does not see assessment as a dilemma or injustice.

This article does not intend to exhaust the discussions about the evaluation processes that permeate the classrooms; however, we seek to allow the different conceptions of readers and narrators to intersect and to allow them a new look on the subject, what is done with an advice, the act of **advising**, a search in itself about the evaluation.

References

ARAGÃO, Rosália Maria Ribeiro de. Compreendendo a investigação narrativa de ações escolares de ensino e aprendizagem no âmbito da formação de professores. *In: 27ª Reunião Anual da ANPEd. Anais...* Minas Gerais: Caxambu, 2004. p. 18-33.

BEHRENS, Marilda Aparecida. **O paradigma emergente e a prática pedagógica**. 5 ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011.

BENJAMIN, Walter. **Obras escolhidas I: magia e técnica, arte e política**. Ensaios sobre literatura e história da cultura. 3 ed. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense, 1987.

BOLÍVAR, António. O esforço reflexivo de fazer da vida uma história. **Revista Pátio**. São Paulo, n. 43, ano XI, p. 12-15, ago./out. 2011.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**. Educação é a base. Brasília: DF, 2017.

BRUNER, Jerome. A construção narrativa da realidade. Tradução de Waldemar Ferreira Netto. **Critical Inquiry**. Chicago, v. 18, n. 1, p. 1-21, 1991.

CHIZZOTTI, Antonio. **Pesquisa qualitativa em ciências humanas e sociais**. 2 ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2008.

CLANDININ, Jean; CONNELLY, Michael. **Pesquisa Narrativa: experiência e história em pesquisa qualitativa**. 2. ed. revisada. Uberlândia: EDUFU, 2015.

DUTRA, Elza. A narrativa como uma técnica de pesquisa fenomenológica. **Estudos de Psicologia**. Natal, v. 7, n. 2, p. 371-378, jul. 2002.

ENRICONE, Délcia. Pressupostos teóricos sobre a prática avaliativa. *In: ENRICONE, Délcia; GRILLO, Marlene Correro (org.). Avaliação: uma discussão em aberto*. 1 ed. Porto Alegre/RS: EDIPUCRS, 2000. p. 27-42.

FREITAS, Luiz Carlos de *et al.* **Avaliação educacional: caminhando pela contramão**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2014.

FREITAS, Maria Teresa Menezes; FIORENTINI, Dario. As possibilidades formativas e investigativas da narrativa em educação matemática. **Horizontes**. Itatiba/São Paulo, v. 25, n. 1, p. 63-71, jan./jun. 2007.

GALVÃO, Cecília. Narrativas em Educação. **Ciência & Educação**. Bauru/São Paulo, v. 11, n. 2, p. 327-345, 2005.

GATTI, Bernadete Angelina. O professor e a avaliação em sala de aula. **Estudos em Avaliação Educacional**. São Paulo, n. 27, p. 97-114, jan./jun. 2003.

GRILLO, Marlene Corroero; LIMA, Valdevez Marina do Rosário. Especificidades da avaliação que convém conhecer. *In*: GRILLO, Marlene Corroero; GESSINGER, Rosana Maria (org.). **Por que falar ainda em avaliação?** 1 ed. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 2010. p. 15-21.

HOFFMANN, Jussara. **Avaliação mediadora**: uma prática em construção da pré-escola à universidade. 20 ed. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2012.

JOSSO, Marie-Christine. **Experiências de vida e formação**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2004.

LUCKESI, Cipriano Carlos. **Avaliação da aprendizagem**: componente do ato pedagógico. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

NÓVOA, Antônio. **Vida de professores**. Porto: Porto Editora, 1995.

SCHÖN, Donald A. **Educando o professor reflexivo**: um novo design para o ensino e a aprendizagem. Tradução de Roberto Cataldo Costa. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2000.

SUÁREZ, Daniel Hugo. Documentación narrativa de experiencias pedagógicas: indagación-formación-acción entre docentes. *In*: PASSEGGI, Maria da Conceição; SILVA, Vivian Batista da (org.). **Invenções de vidas, compreensão de itinerários e alternativas de formação**. São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica, 2010.

TARDIF, Maurice. **Saberes docentes e formação profissional**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2002.

Notes

ⁱ Even though the participants authorized and signed a free and informed consent term, all names were replaced to preserve their identities.

ⁱⁱ It should be noted that in Brazil, the great creator and defender of the progressive approach was Paulo Freire, who argued that man is an active subject in his own education, with the student being a critical and creative subject and the teacher, a mediator, who teaches by learning and learns by teaching. Evaluation is a consequence, carried out continuously, including self-evaluation and group evaluations (BEHRENS, 2011).

ⁱⁱⁱ Direction opposite to technical rationality. It aims to reveal knowledge that encompasses knowledge, skills and attitudes, what has often been called knowledge, know-how and know-how. In other words, study of the set of knowledge used by teachers in their work spaces to develop all tasks (TARDIF, 2002).

^{iv} The one that the person acquired throughout life, through experience, is generally difficult to formalize and express.

^v For example, behind the student are the education system with its own determinations; the families of the students with their own wishes; and social beliefs about the meaning of the school in everyone's life and in collective life (LUCKESI, 2011).

