

POLISH JOURNAL *of* EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

ISSN 2657-3528

2019, Vol. II (LXXII)

DOI: 10.2478/poljes-2019-0006

Experiential Learning and Educational Tools for Self-assessment in Schools

Vincenzo Nunzio Scalcione¹

ABSTRACT

The school as a laboratory is the place where not only knowledge is processed, but also a set of training opportunities, to produce new knowledge and develop new skills; it therefore becomes a space for dialectical interaction, between theoretical and practical knowledge. Learning, within such a framework, becomes an active process, in which students build new ideas, and concepts based on their current / past knowledge. In the educational sphere, the concept of efficacy has assumed ever greater importance; therefore, there is a need to specify valid and reliable results indicators, capable of promoting the accountability process, to which the education system is subjected. This is also to be able to indicate the relationship between education processes and learning levels among students. In this direction, a useful tool can be represented by the self-assessment sections, capable of promoting reflection and / or revision of the goals achieved. In this regard, the conclusions of a study on Active Citizenship Education, promoted by the „Directorate-General for Culture and Education“ of the European Commission, which examined more than 100 projects in 33 countries, analyzing quality and governance factors, are used.

KEYWORDS:

Events learning, evaluation of school learning, self-assessment, skills assessment levels

The school as a laboratory is a place where not only knowledge is developed, but also a set of training opportunities, in order to produce new knowledge and develop new skills. In this sense, educational action moves from teaching to learning, or towards the processes of “learning” and reflecting on what to do, with the aim of making participants aware of the processes which they live. In this context, laboratory teaching takes

1 University of Basilicata, Italy.

E-MAIL: vincenzoscalcione@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0003-0214-3913

on a significant function, becoming an activity aimed at promoting learning, in free cooperation with others (Sofa & Venezia, 2013, p. 6).

The reference literature returns the image of the laboratory as a space of dialectical interaction between theoretical and practical knowledge, as a place in which one designs, makes, and learns, supported by practice (Paparell, 2011, pp. 45–58); a learning context that is open to problematization, investigation and continuous reconstruction; where knowledge is combined with practical action, in a prolific and advantageous manner (Frabboni, 2004, p. 12). With the philosopher and educator Dewey, we are witnessing the re-understanding of the link that exists between the elements of planning the didactic intervention and the necessary educational action. Therefore, activity is identified as the center of the educational process; however, the growth of experience is not the whole of education, since it becomes something more, that is, a constant reorganization or reconstruction of the experience (Joas, 1993, p. 28).

It is remembered how the student should be placed in a genuine situation of experience: that there is a continuous activity that interests him for himself; secondly, that a real problem develops in this situation as a stimulus to thought; thirdly, that he possesses the information material and makes the necessary observations to make use of it; fourthly, that he is able to develop in an orderly manner the solutions that come to mind; finally, that he has the opportunity to test his ideas through application in order to clarify its meaning and discover its validity to itself (Cfr.: Dewey, 1992).

The educational process is therefore a cognitive place that is able to create values and formulate ideas, in preparation for life. Life, moreover, is dynamic, and subject to constant changes; the objectives of education are therefore necessarily dynamic. Education is concerned with human life and therefore must help children meet their biological and social needs (Türer, 2008, pp. 13–27).

In recent decades, a strong link has developed between educational processes and developmental psychology, as knowledge is an important component of cognitive development. However, in the study of learning not only cognitive variables should be considered, but, rather, a multiplicity of factors, such as emotional, motivational, relational and contextual ones. Particular interest is reserved for the latter by the behaviorist model, based on the assumption that learning is a function of change, with stimuli and responses; for this model, in fact, it is not relevant to know that the learning process is taking place inside the brain, because attention is focused on learning outcomes, and therefore on the context relationships, and not on the process itself. In this context, changes in behavior that derive from stimulus-response associations are emphasized.

The implication here is that behaviorism is not about ideas, insights, goals or needs, which are in the mind of the student, but instead observable behaviors, usually experimented in the laboratory, with the generation of the stimulus-response model (Hergenhahn & Olson, 1997, p. 88).

In contrast to the setting of the behaviorist school, cognitive psychology shifts the focus of its investigation, orienting itself towards the analysis of inner mental processes, which condition learning, and studying its fundamental characteristics. Observed behavior and variables become key elements not to search for a particular meaning, but to process information (Frauenfelder & Santoianni, 2002, pp. 33–37).

The interest devoted to the study of individual differences and to the idea that each subject “is characterized by its own cognitive style, by a tendency to prefer certain ways of processing information rather than others is therefore remarkable” (p. 33). Teaching, according to this cognitive perspective, considers the structure of knowledge and strategies for information processing, exploits the learning context, enhances the various individual differences and cognitive styles, and proposes new methods of learning inquiry. Therefore, it favours the development of appropriate cognitive processes, that is the acquisition of problem solving strategies, which are effective in facing and responding to educational challenges (pp. 36–38). In a similar perspective, didactic methodologies such as the laboratory highlight the dimensions of subjectivity and the diversity of cognitive styles: the new learning context becomes “alternative to staticity and sectorality of the disciplinary enclosure, which allows the content to be treated in a dynamic and creative environment capable of constructing a true emotional ingredient that draws knowledge (...).” The laboratory builds the color of knowledge, dragging the person into the plots of emotion that the group activity solicits in a natural and original way.

It is a true incubator of knowledge, a cradle that prepares and accompanies the complex knowledge of the world; it keeps alive the pleasure of discovery, fueling the hypothesis that it does not replicate mechanically, but is based on always different and stimulating paths that consider the person as cognitive expression” (Sibilio, 2007, pp. 19–21).

Learning within such a framework turns out to be an active process, in which students construct new ideas or concepts based on their current/past knowledge. The cognitive structure (the schema, the mental models) provide meaning and organization to the experiences, and allows the individual to go beyond the information provided. The various developments of didactic cognitivism have developed a solid intellectual and ideological framework for a school that may have felt the need to return to an almost exclusive attention on cognitive education, which has led to a decline in the development of intellectual abilities and virtual practices (Cornacchioli, 2002, p. 18).

In laboratory teaching the two dimensions, the cognitive and the relational, intertwine, creating a symbiosis between investigative and analytical practices, interactive and communicative dynamics. Wenger, in 2006, recalled how didactic teaching recalls the concept of community of practice, in which the individual relates to the research object, and this interaction induces participation and sharing among individuals, who, therefore, act to detect possible solutions to the problem to be solved: individualism is replaced by a collaborative and plural approach, an expression of multiple points of view (pp. 12–15).

The teacher's professionalism goes in the direction of a constant evolution that requires continuous and adequate training, which, underlines Marc Durand's claims that it must produce constructive effects in relation to some essential aspects: "(1) reflexivity and cognitive re-elaborations made possible and pertinent because of the actors' expression of their experience and the analysts' modeling; (2) the awareness triggered by the analysts' investigations, opening on to aspects of their activity that are usually outside the scope of their awareness; and (3) discussion by two or more actors of similar or different levels of expertise, about the controversies related to good ways to practice" (Durand, 2013, p. 6).

Learning then evolves in a highly relational, interactive and cooperative context that encourages discussion by creating fertile ground for the activation of the processes of negotiation and enrichment of the subjects' cognitive and social resources. This interchange refers to metacognition, especially when, starting from the mid-1980s, a series of studies highlighted the importance of affective and motivational aspects in cognition processes (Marzano & Vegliante, 2017, pp. 35–56). The incidence of the cognitive component of learning emerges is also an emotional-affective / socio-relational one, examining its incidence on the cognitive level (Cambi, 2004, pp. 72–73).

Events learning

"If the philosophy must be different from an idle and unverifiable speculation, it must be animated by the conviction that his theory of experience is a hypothesis that is realized only when the experience is actually modeled in accordance with it. And this realization requires that man's dispositions be made in such a way as to desire and fight for that kind of experience" (Dewey, 1979, pp. 297–312). These are the words used by John Dewey, the most significant American philosopher of education of the first half of the twentieth century, to express the intimate and vital relationship between the need for philosophy and the need for education, which becomes a "living fact" (p. 298). A careful observation emerges, aimed at assessing how much children already have in them the attitudes, motivations and interests that must be put into practice, in the activities in which they are involved: "the child's present powers and interests as something finally significant in themselves" (p. 280). However, it would be wrong to cultivate the aims and interests of children "as they occur in reality". Effective education requires that these interests be used by the teacher to guide the child towards an understanding of the sciences, history and the arts since "interests in reality are but attitudes toward possible experiences; they are not achievements; their worth is in the leverage they afford, not in the accomplishment they represent" (p. 280).

From these considerations it follows that the school must be articulated respecting the psychological characteristics of the evolutionary stages of the child, and making sure that one always starts from the vital and personal experience of the children and their problems and interests, spread through a work of school education, in a renewed school organized as a workshop aimed at stimulating individual activity (Cambi, 2005b, pp. 62–64). The rejection of a crystallized conception of interpersonal relationships and teaching design methods emerges, which take on the features of a “democracy in progress” (Cambi, 2004, pp. 17–24), since “adaptation to the environment is crucial for the survival of any organism” (Baldacci, 2012, p. 95).

In this sense, the school must promote a child-centered approach to education, based on several key principles: education is a necessity of life; a social process of continuous change and reconstruction of individual experience (Dewey, 1974, pp. 425–439). Being interpreted within the concept of development, education is a life process and not a preparation for future life. The school is an embryonic form of community life and a tool for change and social progress. This means that school life comes from all aspects of social life and that the child’s experience develops in relation to the community in which she lives. Activity is the fundamental characteristic of the child’s nature, which is expressed through his instincts, experience, interests and individuality. It represents an enormous educational potential and a starting point for the learning process, but it is not an end in itself: it must be controlled and guided towards the realization of predetermined objectives, with previously defined goals designed according to needs that have emerged.

These are the conditions that can allow schools to be social reform agencies, rather than social reproduction agencies.

Self-assessment in schools

In the educational field the concept of effectiveness, which can be considered as obtaining certain outputs with reference to the use of specific inputs and processes, has become increasingly important, highlighting the need to specify valid and reliable results indicators, able to support the accountability process to which the education system is subjected (Shagen & Hutchison, 2003, pp. 749–765).

The aims of laboratory teaching, which we identify in the construction of knowledge capable of motivating the subject in learning, are consistent with the aims of evaluation aimed at promoting the improvement of the school system. The subject that participates in teaching is in fact the same that expresses judgments, even at a methodological level, and that will evaluate the quality of the planned educational offer, in a virtuous process, which becomes circular. In fact, “a single point of view is

not enough to understand our object of analysis, we must observe it from multiple perspectives” (Castoldi, 2006/2007, pp. 9–11).

According to the added value model,² it is possible to identify three guiding questions, that are able to define how the education processes have influenced the growth of the students’ learning levels:

- in which portion the variance observed in the results achieved by the students can be attributed to the school or individual teacher?
- How effective is a single school or teacher is in making a gain in terms of school improvement?
- What institutional features or practices can be associated with an effective school? (Doran & Lockwood, 2006, pp. 205–230).

These are questions that show how self-assessment is very useful in defining the effectiveness of the teaching proposal. Self-assessment is one of the areas of competence assessment, divided into objective evaluation, peer evaluation and then self-evaluation. It is difficult to distinguish self-evaluation from peer evaluation, and also from objective evaluation. These three areas are in fact connected to each other and influence each other. To formulate an opinion in one area, we must also consider others.

Scheme 1. Rubric of skills assessment levels (Ibidem)

subjective	intersubjective	objective
Personal meanings	Observable evidence	Approved criteria
SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTANCE	EMPIRICAL INSTANCE	SOCIAL INSTANCE
question: how do I see myself?	question: how do they see me?	question: what can I do?

In the elaborated model, the subjective level concerns everything that the student thinks about the process and the specific tasks, it implies a documentation of the processes, a critical reflection, that is the design of self-evaluation tools. The intersubjective level concerns the system of implicit and explicit expectations that the social context expresses in relation to the subject’s ability to respond to the task, therefore all

² The OECD provides a precise definition of these models (value-added model) and the concept of value-added, in a report published in 2008 centered entirely on this issue. “The Value-added contribution of school is defined as: the school’s contribution to students”. Progress towards stated or prescribed education objectives (e.g. cognitive achievement). The contribution is net of other factors that contribute to students’ educational progress. From this definition of Value-added it is possible to define value-added modeling as: to a class of statistical models that have been established or prescribed education objectives (e.g. cognitive achievement) measured at least two points in time” (See OECD, 2008, p. 17).

the relationships of the people next to the child such as the teachers, the students and the parents; imply peer evaluation. Finally the objective level recalls the information observable from the performance of the task.

Within the levels, as indicated above, self-assessment is a review process that “allows the student to reflect on past experience, try to remember and understand what happened, try to come up with a clearer idea of what he has learned or of the goal he has achieved, sharing the responsibility in organizing the work, taking note of the activities undertaken, making decisions about future actions and goals” (Weeden, Winter & Broadfoot, 2009, pp. 91–98). It is a complex tool that brings different elements into play, as it allows the student to be really involved in his own learning. The aspect of self-assessment focuses more on evaluation for learning, because “it is an evaluation that is used as a process to improve students’ learning” (Ibidem).

Among the so-called transversal key competences it is possible to identify in the social and civic competences³ an intervention tool to favor evaluation and self-evaluation practices in the school; in particular, it is possible to observe the methods used to include education for citizenship in schools (a subject that is separate and integrated into other disciplines): a level that we could define as formal, structured at both national and educational level. The development of a similar competence / discipline must be considered as wide-ranging: in fact it is a didactic activity that is also expressed in the non-formal arena, in what is defined as the transversal dimension, and which concerns the democratic procedure of class participation, the rules, the climate that reigns in the classroom and above all what happens extra muros, with projects, exchanges, commitment.

And again, as mentioned, there is the informal, undeclared plan, which corresponds to the so-called hidden curriculum, that is the whole implicit learning part, in which the mass media play a particularly important role (Conseil de l’Europe, 2005, p. 41).

From the non-formal point of view, the democratic climate of the class, in which pupils are encouraged to express their point of view, is one of the most important aspects for defining the “civic level” of a learning environment.

In terms of an active pedagogy, stimulating dialogue, dealing with topics of interest to the student, should constitute the substance of every schools’ teaching; after all, many events, external or internal to the school, are opportunities to open a dialogue, support positions and make decisions.

3 On December 18, 2006, the Official Journal of the European Union published the Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on key competences for lifelong learning. The document defines 8 macro-competences (often called colloquially, or for brevity, European Competences) and invites Member States to develop their offer within their lifelong learning strategies (which explicitly includes education and initial training, or scholastic). The Council Recommendation of May 22, 2018 contains the key competences for lifelong learning: social and civic competences are the seventh of the eight key competences.

Rules are another important element of the non-formal curriculum: in the classroom the norms that pupils must comply with and the behaviors deemed acceptable or not are defined. Since childhood rules accustom children to organize time and space and to accept institutions', dominating impulses. The formation of the citizen is also made in the relationship between the school and the outside, in a model that places belonging at various levels: from the class to the school, to the territory, to the nation, in Europe and even in the world.

And in addition, in consideration of the elements that can define the criteria to proceed with a self-assessment of the activities carried out according to the laboratory teaching methodology, the territory, that is the place within which the activities are carried out and the goals are achieved, must be highlighted. It is, as is inevitable, physical contexts populated by associative groups, which exercise citizenship in politics, in volunteering, in ecological commitment, as the most valid civic experiences such as participation in social, environmental and political projects in the broadest sense.

Instead, on an informal level, a school curriculum that includes citizenship will be all the more transparent and effective the more it can clarify the rules that govern it. We refer to the words "hidden curriculum" when dealing with the real, not just formal, plan of what happens at school. The hidden curriculum is that part of learning not explicitly programmed by the educational institution (Perrenoud, 1993, pp. 61–63). It is necessary to consider in fact, how teaching materializes through a didactic transposition and is modified according to the context and the individuals who learn. Therefore, a compromise is always made with the reality between the words of the program and the teacher's doing.

In the field of citizenship education, the hidden curriculum assumes particular relevance, if they consider, for example, the implicit messages communicated by the school to the students: the discipline, the group, the judgments of the teachers, the evaluation. It is precisely through the evaluation process that transparency in the school can be enhanced: adopting evaluation criteria, which do not correspond to differences in performance, is equivalent to transmitting negative values, communicating the idea of arbitrary decisions and increasing distrust of educators. This orientation implies a complete revision of the school structure at all levels: life and climate of the class, participatory bodies, educational relationships, relationship with the territory.

In this direction, the conclusions of a study on Active Citizenship Education promoted in 2007 by the European Commission's "Directorate General for Culture and Education", which examined more than 100 projects in 33 countries to analyze the quality factors, shows that the basic problem of citizenship lies in the governance of the institution as a whole: "governance is the key theme for the success of education for active citizenship: many methods used in projects require the involvement of participants in a democratic way and include aspects of self-regulation" (see: Sitography,

p. 5). The evaluation from the outside of these indicators would therefore be in contradiction with the very idea of citizenship.

Of particular interest, therefore, is the orientation of European research towards school self-evaluation.

A team led by Cèsar Birzea proposed, in this regard, a self-assessment tool for schools to verify the quality of citizenship (Conseil de l'Europe, 2015).

Scheme 2. Evaluation rubric (Birzea et al., 2005, p. 51)

Areas	Quality indicators	Subject matter
Curriculum, teaching and learning	Indicator 1. Is there evidence of adequate space for EDC in the school's objectives, policies and plans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School policies on EDC - School development planning in the EDC - EDC and the school curriculum - Coordination of EDC
	Indicator 2. Is there evidence of students and teachers gaining understanding of EDC and applying EDC principles to their daily practice in schools and classrooms?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning outcomes in the field of EDC - Methods and processes of teaching and learning - Monitoring of the EDC
	Indicator 3. Is the conception and practice of evaluation within the school consistent with EDC?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transparency - Correctness - Improvement
Ethics and school context	Indicator 4. Does school ethics adequately reflect the principles of EDC?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Application of the principles of EDC in everyday life - Relationships and authority schemes - Opportunities for participation and self-expression - Procedures to resolve conflicts and manage violence, bullying and discrimination
Management and development	Indicator 5. Is there evidence of effective school leadership based on EDC principles?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leadership style - Decision-making power - Shared responsibility, collaboration and teamwork - Responsiveness
	Indicator 6. Does the school have a viable development plan that reflects EDC principles?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation and involvement - Professional and organizational development - Resource management - Self-evaluation, monitoring and assumption of responsibility

It is a tool that aims to structure and facilitate the evaluation of EDC in a school: this is done by describing which elements of a school's work should be evaluated in this area. In general, the indicators are the basic elements subject to evaluation. To cover what happens in a school, different national indicator systems would structure them in four main areas: input, processing, output and context. This tool should not be considered as a completely exhaustive checklist. A school can choose one, many or all the indicators to evaluate their work. In principle they reflect the decision that all concerned can or must be involved in the process of self-assessment and improvement of a school's work. In particular, the indicators can be used for the internal evaluation of schools, as for an external evaluation, for example by inspectors (Ibidem). The tool, translated and tested in various Italian schools, proposes a self-assessment for schools thematically structured in three main areas (curriculum, teaching and learning; classroom climate; management and development), divided into six quality indicators and twenty-two specific descriptors. It is therefore a matter of structuring a rubric, as a "general assessment tool used to evaluate the quality of products or services in a given area or a list of guidelines that specify the elements that distinguish the quality of a service" (Comoglio, 2002, p. 100). In this perspective, the objective of the evaluation is no longer limited to a numerical graduation, but takes on a formative purpose; a similar re-signification of the evaluation practice is declined with new tools, used for this purpose: the interview, the recording (and video-recording), the reality tests, the observation grids (and mutual observation), the logbooks, observations with checklists (and at time intervals), the story, self-assessment, exercises and reflexivity tests.

At the same time, reflexivity is a cogent element, able to favor self-assessment that is promoted through the use of the methodological action of action research, able to provide, through feedback generated by participation in an interested observation, elements to allow the subject an advancement and an improvement during his learning journey (Cfr.: Scalcione, 2019).

Although tests require short answers, and oral questioning in class, they can provide some insight into the student's understanding, and it is still necessary to go deeper. In this regard, new and unfamiliar problems, "followed by open interviews or careful observations, are the best way to establish the level of understanding the student has reached" (Gardner, 1991, pp. 117–145).

Through the self-assessment carried out with this tool, the schools, as shown by the PRIN-MIUR 2006-08 project of the Universities of Sassari, Verona, Cattolica of Milan and Basilicata, can identify change strategies aimed at activating a real improvement process, reviewing critical issues, changing established practices, strengthening and enhancing strengths (Cfr.: Calidoni et al., 2008).

Scheme 3. Rubric with examples of questions based on EDC indicators (Birzea et al., 2005, pp. 70–72)

Indicator	Subject matter	Examples of questions
Indicator 1. There is evidence / signals of the existence of adequate placement of the EDC within the school goals, programmatic lines of the school and plans curricular?	Program lines of the EDC school	Is there a document of the school's policy lines specifically referring to EDC? It is accompanied by measures of implementation?
	EDC and school curriculum	How much time is reserved for EDC? It's enough?
Indicator 2: There are signs of students and teachers who have become familiar with the EDC and apply them principles in everyday practices, both in the classroom and in the school environment in general?	Learning outcomes	The students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – develop trust in their personal qualities, reflect on their own experiences and acquire a growing sense of self-worth? – do they learn to be patient and tolerant towards each other in relationships? – are respectful of differences and learn to enhance them in their peers and more widely, within the community? – live meaningful experiences that involve conscious decision-making processes and practical actions?
	Learning and teaching methods and processes	Teachers refer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – events at local level, events and initiatives? – areas of interest for students, eg, events that affect the lives of individuals and the community? – news and current events?
Indicator 4. The school's ethos adequately reflects the principles of EDC?	Application of the principles of EDC in everyday school life	What is the tone and style of the considerations?
Indicator 5. Are there signs of adequate school leadership based on the principles of EDC?	Shared educational responsibility, collaboration and teamwork	Who is involved in the drafting of school policies and practices in general and in particular of EDC?

Such internal evaluations serve, for the individual school, as a control, regulation, training planning device, and, at the level of the national education system, as a means of ascertaining the overall stability of the public school service, as well as of orientation

for its evolution (Pastore, 2015, p. 81). Finally, such a design and evaluation process finds a clear coherence even within the more general evaluation of competences, which cannot be separated from the student's self-evaluation process, through which he learns to know himself, his limits and own capabilities. At the end of the process, in fact, "the pupil will have built within himself a cognitive biography (...), which is better explained if it is the pupil himself who tells it" (Ministry of Education..., 2015, p. 6).

Through the activation of the student the learning assumes a new significance, made possible by the teaching of research, by the recognition of the educational role of evaluation, by the re-elaboration of knowledge (Cfr.: Wiggins & McTighe, 2004). At the same time, the aims of a democratic school are achieved, which must contribute to transforming the face of the social economy, through all its practical and experiential activities. Providing the school with tools for promoting self-evaluation means, in a sense, "reorganizing the democratic society of the time, severely tested by the industrial revolution and ugly with strong social inequalities" (Baldacci, 2012, p. 78). As the Laboratory School was important as an expression of its ethics and its democratic theory, "so the school we inherit from the designed teaching practices can be considered above all an educational experiment for democracy" (Mayhew, Camp & Camp, 1966, p. 467).

Moreover, in the course of history, the school has undergone profound and radical transformations and, through a series of reforms, focuses attention on the problem of the person and his education which is "revealed as a life project that involves the existential dimensions of the person such as family, work, social commitment, that is all the human potential involved in the training process" (De Luca, 2008, p. 118). According to this logic, the evaluation cannot be only a phase of the training process (conception, design, realization and, indeed, evaluation) and therefore an action mainly for the teacher, but also a dimension to be formed in the subjects (Cfr.: Plessi, 2004); self-evaluation, combined with forms of hetero-peer evaluation, urges the individual student to evaluate himself at the end of an audit; stimulates the expression of a motivated judgment, even on the part of other comrades, at least on certain dimensions of the service.

The growing attention paid to the topic of evaluation starts from the conviction that it represents a strategic lever to re-launch the education and training system. Starting from the Nineties, several institutes have given life to projects aimed at experimenting with self-evaluation paths in order to improve school effectiveness; of the models developed, self-assessment, understood as a systematic process of examining and revising the practices implemented by a professional community, presents itself as a moment of analysis, problematisation and individual and common reflection on the meanings of the actions, on their degree of sharing and on the possible deviations between the plan of the declared project and that of daily action, thus the reflection

process thus feeds a virtuous circle along the professional development of the teachers (Cfr.: Pollard, 2014).

Transaction-centered approaches focus attention on the analysis of processes and underline the need for the evaluator to immerse himself in the experience and relational environment that he intends to analyze in order to grasp the complexity of the problems and processes implemented. The formative function of evaluation is highlighted, giving space to self-evaluation and foreseeing the “triangulation” of methods, sources and observers. “A reality investigated from different angles and points of view, highlighting concordances and discrepancies. In this perspective, the evaluation is understood essentially as dialogue and comparison between the different subjects involved, that is, as the construction of a dialogical and methodological context in which the different points of view can interact” (Bondioli & Ferrari, 2004, p. 369).

References

- Baldacci, M. (2012). *Trattato di pedagogia generale*. Roma: Carocci.
- Birzea, C., Cecchini, M., Harrison, C., Krek J., & Spajic-Vrkas, V. (2005). *Strumento per l'Assicurazione di Qualità dell'Educazione alla Cittadinanza Democratica nelle Scuole*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Bondioli, A., & Ferrari, M., (Eds.). (2004). *Verso un modello di valutazione formativa. Ragioni, strumenti e percorsi*. Bergamo: Ed. Junior.
- Calidoni, P., Manca, G., Dettori, F., & Pandolfi, L. (2008). *Educazione alla cittadinanza democratica. Ricerca e autovalutazione nelle scuole, Progetto di Ricerca di rilevanza nazionale 2006-08*. Sassari: EDES.
- Cambi, F. (2005a). *La ricerca-azione*. Bellaria. IRRE Emilia-Romagna.
- Cambi, F. (2005b). *Le pedagogie del Novecento*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- Cambi, F. (2004). L'ultimo Dewey e la filosofia della mente. In N. Filograsso, & R. Travaglini (Eds.), *Dewey e l'educazione della mente*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Castoldi, M. (2006/2007). *L'educatore, Lo sguardo trifocale*, 4. Milano: Fabbri Editori.
- Comoglio, M. (2002). *La valutazione autentica. Orientamenti Pedagogici*. Torino: Centro studi Erickson.
- Conseil de l'Europe (2015). *Éducation à la citoyenneté démocratique 2001–2004*. Starsburgo.
- Cornacchioli, T. (2002). *Lineamenti di didattica della storia: dal sapere storico alla storia insegnata: la mediazione didattica*. Cosenza: Pellegrini editore.
- De Luca, C. (2008). *Una teoria pedagogica della solidarietà*. Roma: Anicia.
- Dewey, J. (1992). *Democrazia ed educazione*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Dewey, J. (1974). My Pedagogic Creed. In R.D. Archambault (Ed.), *John Dewey on education. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press*.
- Dewey, J. (1979). Philosophy of education. In J.A. Boydston (Ed.), *Middle works of John Dewey*, Vol. 7: 1912–1914. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Doran, H.C., & Lockwood, J.R. (2006). Fitting value-added models. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 31(2).
- Durand, M. (2013). Human activity, social practices and lifelong education: an introduction. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 32(1).
- Frabboni, F. (2004). *Il laboratorio*. Laterza: Roma-Bari.
- Frauenfelder, E., & Santoianni, F. (2002). *Percorsi dell'apprendimento percorsi per l'insegnamento*. Armando: Roma.
- Gardner, H. (1991). *Aprire le menti. La creatività e i dilemmi dell'educazione*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Hergenhahn, B.R., & Olson M.H. (1997). *An Introduction to Theories of Learning 5e*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Joas, H. (1993). *Pragmatism and social theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marzano, A., & Vegliante, R. (2017). I laboratori pedagogico-didattici per la formazione iniziale degli insegnanti: l'esperienza di Salerno. In S. Kanizsa (Ed.), *Oltre il fare. I laboratori nella formazione degli insegnanti*. Reggio Emilia: Edizioni Junior-Bambini Srl.
- Mayhew, K., Camp, E., & Camp, A. (1966). *The Dewey school*. New York, NY: Atherton.
- Ministry of Education of the University and Research (2015). *Guidelines for the certification of skills in the first cycle of education*. Rome.
- MIUR (2018). *Indicazioni Nazionali e nuovi scenari*. Roma.
- Notti, A.M. (2014). *A scuola di valutazione*. Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.
- OECD (2008). *Measuring improvements in learning outcomes. Best practices to asses the value-added of school*. Paris.
- Paparell, N. (2011). Insegnare per competenze in università. Modelli, procedure, metodi. In L. Galliani, C. Zaggia, & A. Serbati (Eds.), *Apprendere e valutare competenze. Progettazione e sperimentazione di strumenti nelle lauree magistrali*. Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.
- Pastore, S. (2015). *La valutazione del sistema scuola. Contesti, logiche, modelli e principi operativi* (Ed. by G. Moro & F. Scardigno). Milano: MondadoriEducation.
- Perrenoud, P. (1993). Curriculum: le formel, le réel, le caché. In J. Houssaye (Ed.), *La pédagogie: une encyclopédie pour aujourd' hui* (pp. 61–63). Paris: ESF.
- Plessi, P. (2004). *Teorie della valutazione e modelli operativi*. Brescia: La Scuola.
- Pollard, A. (2014). *Reflective teaching in school*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on key competences for lifelong learning. Conseil de l'Europe (2005). *Éducation à la citoyenneté démocratique 2001–2004. Outil de formation des enseignants pour l'éducation à la citoyenneté démocratique et aux droits de l'Homme*. Strasbourg.
- Scalcione, V.N. (2019). Valutazione degli apprendimenti– progettazione didattica – miglioramento scolastico. In M. Castoldi, & V.N. Scalcione (Eds.), *Competenze di cittadinanza e valutazione del contesto educativo – Metodologie e tecniche didattiche generali*. Roma: Anicia.
- Shagen, I., & Hutchison, D. (2003). Adding value in educational research: the marriage of data and analytical power. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(5).

- Sibilio, M. (2007). *Il laboratorio ludico-sportivo e motorio tra corpo, movimento, emozione e cognizione*. Roma: Aracne.
- Sofo, A., & Venezia, M. (2013). *L'educazione ambientale. Laboratori nella scuola primaria*. lulu.com.
- Spadafora, G. (2015). *La teoria dell'esperienza in John Dewey e le sue implicazioni nella pedagogia contemporanea*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Tammaro, R., Marzano, & A., Notti, A. (2005). *Apprendere e progettare. Strumenti e modelli di programmazione scolastica*. Roma: Anicia.
- Türer, C. (2008). William James's Theory of Education. In M. Taylor, H. Schreier & P. Ghirdelli, Jr. (Eds.), *Pragmatism, Education, and Children: International Philosophical Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi.
- Weeden, P., Winter, J., & Broadfoot, P. (2009). *Valutazione per l'apprendimento*. Trento: Erickson.
- Wenger, E. (2006). *Comunità di pratica. Apprendimento, significato e identità*. Milano: Cortina.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2004). *Fare progettazione. La teoria di un percorso didattico per la comprensione significativa*. Roma: LAS.

Sitography

http://ec.europa.eu/education/pdf/doc248_en.pdf