



Texto 1

Summative and Formative Assessment

MADDALENA TARAS

Assessment is critically important to education both for accreditation and to support learning. Yet the literature dealing with formative and summative assessment definitions and terminology is not aligned. This article reports an empirical small-scale study of lecturers in Education at an English university. The research posits that these lecturers, owing to the inconsistencies and infelicities in the literature, will have an incomplete and unharmonious understanding of summative and formative assessment and the relationship between the two. The results show that lecturers' understanding of assessment terminology and relationships reflects the fragmented theoretical and practical frameworks available. This study would seem to signal the need for us all to examine our assessment processes in order to (i) be clear and explicit on what we do, (ii) understand how assessment processes relate to each other, and (iii) evaluate how they impact on our practice and our students.

Assessment vies with learning for supremacy at the heart of the educational experience. This is reflected in the tension between formative and summative assessment functions, that is, assessment to support learning and assessment for validation and accreditation, although these are not separate or fixed paradigms (Wiliam and Black, 1996). Given this, it is incongruous that the education community has not prioritized the harmonization of the two processes.

The work of Black and that of Wiliam (Wiliam and Black, 1996; Black and Wiliam, 1998; Wiliam, 2000; Black, 2003b; Black, 2003c; Black et al., 2003; Wiliam et al., 2004) has promoted and developed formative assessment practice in schools as has that of Torrance and Pryor (1993; 1998; 2001); the assessment for learning movement has been fundamental in prioritizing formative assessment for learning over summative assessment for validation and accreditation despite the "tension" between these two functions. In the higher education and staff development context, Boud (1995) and Cowan (1998) have promoted student self-assessment with a comparable formative aim. In all cases, pertinent feedback has been the essential element to promote learning. In the compulsory sector, the tension is exacerbated by the current separation of teacher and classroom assessment (denoted formative assessment) from external and often national assessment (denoted summative assessment).

In the higher education context, it is easier to reconcile the two, and easier perhaps as a consequence, to analyse the theoretical framework, since all assessment is controlled and is the responsibility of the lecturers. However, given that lecturers, particularly those in Education departments, are those who support and help train teachers, the two contexts cannot sensibly be separate or separated. We are still at a stage where co-ordinating higher education and school issues is difficult, but cross analysis could be a key factor in helping to resolve these problems.

Extraído de: Maddalena Taras. Summative and formative assessment. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, SAGE Publications, 2008, 9 (2), p. 172-192.

Texto 2

Exploring Relations Between Formative and Summative Assessment

J. DOLIN, P. BLACK, W. HARLEN, A. TIBERGHIEEN

All assessment involves the generation, interpretation and communication of data (Harlen 2013). The same processes are involved whether the purpose is primarily formative or summative, and the main purpose of these processes is to provide inferences about the knowledge, skills and competencies that students possess. It is the way in which these processes are carried out, and the way that inferences are drawn that determine the quality of an assessment. Assessment quality is generally described in terms of two concepts – validity and reliability. Superficially we could say that validity has to do with the “what” and “how” of assessment, while reliability has to do with “how well”.

Although it is desirable for summative assessment to be both highly reliable and valid, in practice there is a limit to optimising both. Normally, there is a conflict between high reliability and high validity, so that it is necessary in practice to adopt a compromise between them. An assessment which is highly reliable (like a simple multiple-choice test) is often low in validity. This is especially true for assessment of competencies and more advanced skills. Assessing complex demands validly is complicated and time-consuming, meaning that it is difficult to do in a reliable way. However, if an assessment is low in validity, it can have damaging effects, because those using the results will make incorrect inferences about the learner’s capability.

Extraído de: Dolin, J., Black, P., Harlen, W., & Tiberghien, A. (2018). Exploring Relations Between Formative and Summative Assessment. In J. Dolin & R. Evans (Ed.), *Transforming Assessment* (Vol. 4, p. 53 80). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Responda às questões 1 e 2 a seguir, com base no texto 1 dado.

Questão 1. Como a autora explica a tensão existente entre as funções das avaliações formativa e somativa?

Questão 2. Cite as razões que levam a supor que é mais fácil conciliar os dois tipos da avaliação na Educação Superior.

Responda à questões 3 e 4 a seguir, com base no texto 2 dado.

Questão 3. Segundo os autores, quais são os objetivos das avaliações formativas e somativas? Quais os fatores que determinam a qualidade de um instrumento de avaliação?

Questão 4. Elabore uma versão em português do texto 2.