





Article

Conceptual Analysis of Influential Factors in the Motivation and Involvement of the University Student towards the Assessment in Physical Education

Raúl A. Barba-Martín ¹, David Hortigüela-Alcalá ^{2,*}, Ángel Pérez-Pueyo ¹ and José Sánchez-Santamaría ³

¹ Department of Physical Education and Sports, University of León, 24007 León, Spain; raul.barba@unileon.es (R.A.B.-M.); angel.perez.pueyo@unileon.es (Á.P.-P.)

² Department of Specific Didactics, University of Burgos, 09001 Burgos, Spain

³ Department of Pedagogy, University of Castilla la Mancha, 16071 Cuenca, Spain; Jose.SSantamaria@uclm.es

* Correspondence: dhortiguela@ubu.es

Received: 28 September 2020; Accepted: 22 October 2020; Published: 24 October 2020



Abstract: The involvement of university students in their own assessment leads to motivation towards learning. The aim of this study is twofold. The first aim is to analyze the factors of evaluation in Physical Education that generate motivation and involvement. To do this, we have discussed five factors: (1) to generate awareness of what is being learned; (2) to delimit the deadlines in the development of tasks; (3) to associate it with the development of competencies; (4) to apply it in a variety of contexts and tasks; and (5) to allow reflection on the teaching and learning process. The second aim, based on the previous one, tries to delimit strategies to implement a quality evaluation in the university classrooms. Five strategies have been analyzed: (1) triadic assessment; (2) grade distribution; (3) collaborative creation of instruments; (4) elaboration of formative questions; and (5) use of apps. Finally, a series of reflections are proposed to put into practice the formative and shared assessment as opposed to the traditional evaluation. This manuscript is a substantial contribution to the existing literature, as it serves as a clear guide for university teachers to implement this type of assessment in the classroom, generating student motivation and transferability of their learning.

Keywords: motivation; formative assessment; self-regulation; competence learning; student involvement

1. Introduction

One of the most recurrent concerns of university teachers is to make learning interesting to their students without losing their potential. This fact has meant a constant rethinking in the teaching staff of all its processes in order to establish that relationship between interest and learning. Thus, in recent years, we have not only verified the evolution in the way of conceiving the methodological approaches [1–6] but we have also witnessed the (re)emergence and transformation of methodologies, pedagogical models or learning strategies [7–18] through which to obtain greater commitment of students in accomplishing their own academic achievements [19,20]. The teachers have thus tried to find the best methodological and pedagogical options for their students in order to achieve effective learning towards which they feel motivated. On some occasions, the new proposals have been effective and have led to good results in the students [21–24]; however, in other cases, the educational process has been distorted [25]. In the quest to capture the attention of students and their involvement in the teaching-learning process, it is very important not to focus on factors such as “fun” or “entertainment” and leave learning aside [25].

Teachers must be able to establish a coherent relationship between the cognitive components of learning and the personal components of the students, and this relationship must arise from making the students aware of their learning [26,27]. The student must be an active agent of the teaching-learning process, reflexive, critical and autonomous, being capable of establishing connections between his learning, his interests and his future development. The aim is to achieve a real and autonomous participation of the students in their learning as a means to achieve the extrapolation of such learning to other tasks, educational functions or their daily life.

In view of this current need of international importance, as shown by scientific literature, this article presents a new contribution to the achievement of motivation in Physical Education through assessment and self-regulation. Both aspects are inherent and fundamental in the development of a student and a future teacher. Learning to work through them in an autonomous, reflexive and collaborative way allows the student to develop self-driven learning, able to better connect with the values and social realities of a sustainable development [28].

The article exposes a theoretical delimitation of the most influential factors in relation to scientific literature. Further, as other predecessor researches of theoretical nature and great international depth on the topics [29–31], the present article intends to be a great contribution for university teachers in the achievement of motivation and involvement of their students.

1.1. Self-Regulation and Competent Learning in Physical Education

Self-regulation processes are fundamental to achieve the involvement of students in their learning. For years, studies have shown that self-regulation of students in the tasks is an essential factor to influence motivation [32,33] and improve academic results [34]. The teaching-learning processes must be planned and adapted cyclically, so that their development is adapted to the individuality of the students and to the achievement of personal goals [35–38]. In this sense, authors like Lee and collaborators [39] highlight the importance of the focus that the teacher provides to the learning tasks, to achieve the involvement of students and positively affect their motivation. In addition, it allows students to be aware of what is asked of them, in what time and how they will be evaluated throughout the process [33]. It is, therefore, essential to orient the tasks towards the deep construction of learning and its mastery, instead of simply executing them.

In this line, it is important to understand that learning must be connected to the professional competences of a teacher, and self-regulation must be the means to establish such learning in the future teacher [40–42]. Under these ideas, in the last years, we have tried to build new educational plans in Higher Education, with more or less efficiency [43]. The fact is that educational environments are spaces where students' needs for autonomy, relationship and competence can be supported or frustrated [44]. Thus, the union of a self-regulated and competent work should allow students to have autonomy and perform an open progressive learning, being able to link it with their professional skills and seeking the transferability of learning [45,46]. The possibility that the student navigates autonomously through the development of his learning, adapting it and connecting it to his needs, will help him maintain interest [47], while reducing the possibilities of experiencing incompetence, which would be counterproductive to his motivation [48]. Initial teacher training should support the understanding and use of self-regulatory practices in the future teacher [49], offering ideas, specific suggestions and encouraging them to think about how children's learning can be improved through self-regulatory practices [37,38,50].

In the specific case of the future Physical Education teacher, the work of self-regulation and competence seems to be an even more important need [30,51]. For many years, the use of analytical and execution tasks, such as the relentless repetition of the same technical gesture until it is mastered, has been the main form of teaching in Physical Education in primary and secondary education [52]. This fact implies that future teachers have had a continuous experience with these traditional teaching models, which will mean that they will reproduce them at the beginning of their career [53]. In the face of the use of traditional models based on ability, future Physical Education teachers have been

successful, generally autonomous, skilled and motivated, but it is necessary to understand that this experience is not the same for all students [54,55]. The traditional models of teaching in Physical Education imply an even greater gap in the skills and motivation of the students, where the less skilled are exposed to continuous penalties for their low performance [56–58]. The fact of performing generalized tasks, without the possibility of adaptation and development, often leads less skilled students to a low motor perception or the difficulty of developing individual skills [59]. This situation tends to generate a feeling of demotivation and failure towards motor practice in this student [60], and, with it, less interest towards physical activity in their daily life [61,62]. For these reasons, it is necessary to transform the beliefs of future Physical Education teachers, through experiencing reflective processes of self-regulation in their training, and, in this way, get them to learn how to use all the means, techniques or instruments at their disposal and then guide all their students to self-regulate their learning effectively [63].

1.2. The Role of Assessment in Promoting the Motivation and Involvement of University Students

Assessment plays a very important role in involving and motivating students in their learning, through self-regulation and competitive work [33]. Assessment is an integral part of teaching and learning and, as such, can be a fundamental factor in hindering or improving such processes [64]. An assessment intended to enrich should be constructed as a means to support learning [65,66]. It is about understanding assessment as a continuous system and not just as an end: an authentic assessment [67,68]. If the teaching-learning processes have a competence base and are destined to staggered self-construction, assessment can be a means to help students guide themselves and advance during their development; thanks to its role in assessing learning at a given time. To achieve this, an assessment must be built that is capable of motivating students towards their learning and that, in turn, motivates them to evaluate themselves. This could be reduced to the motto “evaluate to motivate and motivate to evaluate”, something that is only possible if the students participate in the assessment and this helps them to improve.

Formative and shared assessment should be the model to follow. The formative and shared assessment processes seek to make the students aware and responsible for their achievements, relate them to the competences to be developed and enable them to make autonomous and contextualized progress in their learning [65,69–74]. This leads us to obtain results as positive as those indicated by Leenknecht, Wijnia, Köhler, Fryer, Rikers and Loyens [75], who have demonstrated that the practice of a formative assessment with students generates in them a feeling of competence and autonomous motivation, or other studies [76–78], which corroborated the importance of formative assessment for increasing student involvement and responsibility. In this sense, we can find transferable practical experiences of formative and shared assessment, capable of generating motivation and responsibility in students through the development of their autonomy, such as the one presented by Pérez-Pueyo, Hortigüela-Alcalá and Hernando-Garijo [79]. These authors carried out a practice based on the participation of the students in their assessment and qualification process, reporting very good results. With much defined evaluation criteria and instruments from the beginning, based on the possibility of obtaining feedback from different approaches, the authors present an experience that strengthens the involvement and motivation of students in the assessment of all their learning results and those of their peers. The generation of responsibility and the constant knowledge of their situation allows the authors to finish the process with the participation of the students in their qualification process. In this way, there are continuous reflections and dialogues, applicable to any learning and a knowledge that ends up being reflected in a fair distribution of grades among peers. However, in spite of these virtues and experiences, other studies point out that there is still a lack of tradition in university centers to apply these assessment models, which leads to a lack of training for newly qualified teachers [80–84].

For these reasons, in this paper we will try to support the development of formative and shared assessment in Physical Education in Higher Education to encourage student self-regulation. For this purpose, we have set a double objective in this manuscript. First, to analyze the factors of assessment

in Physical Education that generate motivation and involvement. For this purpose, five key factors of assessment in Physical Education have been selected and their theoretical bases and relations with self-regulation, competencies, transferability or reflection have been deepened as fundamental aspects in the development of motivation and participation. The second objective is to delimit strategies to implement a quality assessment in university classrooms, through the selection of five strategies that combine the implementation of assessment in Physical Education based on theoretical developments and key aspects previously analyzed. Finally, we present some reflections about the applicability of assessment as a methodological tool to promote self-regulation against traditional models.

2. Methodological Justification for the Selection of Factors and Strategies

A theoretical study based on the scientific bibliography has been carried out on the themes worked on. Theoretical or conceptual research based on traditional reviews, systematic reviews or meta-analysis is fundamental to understanding the situation of a topic, its connections and its limitations [85]. These studies represent an important step in the development of proposals in practice. This has already been demonstrated by research of a theoretical and review nature, whose high impact has allowed teachers to lay the foundations on which to begin to establish new practices [30,86]. Therefore, it is necessary that theoretical research, such as the one presented in this study, capable of gathering the new proposals that have emerged in recent years and their connections with current educational and social situations, be published and updated [87].

In the present work, a review of the main scientific studies in higher education on self-regulation for example, [88,89] and formative and shared assessment for example, [90,91] has been carried out. In this way, the authors extracted the main contributions of these studies, their connections and the gaps, in order to establish the guide of our theoretical work. Aspects such as critical reflection, the active participation of the students, the importance of assessment in the educational system, the applicability of the contents in the assessment or the transferability of knowledge have been the aspects on which we have based the concretion and development of the five factors and the five strategies presented below.

3. What Factors Should Assessment in Physical Education Consider in Order to Generate Motivation and Involvement in the Student?

As we have been introducing, there are a series of essential aspects in the assessment to promote the motivation and the involvement of the students. In this section, we analyze the main keys of the assessment that the scientific literature has identified as positive to generate such feelings in the student. Next, we present five fundamental factors, which extend the phases of predecessor studies [92]:

- *Generate awareness of what is being learned:* For many years, assessment has had an instrumental, final and grading use. In the case of Physical Education, traditional assessment systems have been used to measure physical aptitudes, subjective or non-educational criteria, such as clothing [93]. These assessment models make it very difficult to connect the different learnings of the students, by giving importance to decontextualized aspects and the final result. If we want to motivate and involve the students in their learning, it is necessary that the assessment is a support that gives sense to the learning as it is acquired [94]. The way to achieve it has to be based on the fact that the assessment promotes spaces and moments of individual and shared reflection during the whole process [95]. In this way, the students become aware of their learning in each moment, they are able to connect them with other previous ones and give them meaning for themselves in a diversity of contexts.
- *Delimiting deadlines in the development of tasks:* One of the most important factors in assessment to favor self-regulation is the student's commitment [96]. The proposed tasks must have a set deadline. The definition of deadlines should not be understood as a requirement of the teacher towards the students, but as a measure of responsibility of the students with their learning. In addition, if the tasks are in a group or are intended for group productions, such as choreography, students must also understand the shared responsibility that is acquired with other colleagues.

This fact does not mean that the teachers do not understand until the final moment, since they must introduce and give a follow-up and support to the students towards self-regulated learning [97]. This is where assessment plays a vital role in achieving this. If self-regulation tasks are linked to assessment from the beginning, students will be able to navigate through their learning while receiving constant feedback from teachers, peers, or the proposed instruments [30,98]. Feedback moments during the process can be set from the beginning, but it is important that students are also able to obtain them at any time. This will allow students to move forward at their individual pace and to stop and seek support at the most difficult times. Always without losing sight of the responsibility acquired.

- *Partnering with competent student learning:* Learning must go beyond the walls of the classroom and assessment must help achieve it. Through assessment, teachers should try to guide the processes of self-regulation of students towards learning that can be extrapolated outside the classroom. The learning acquired by the students should be directed towards the acquisition of skills that allow a correct development of this knowledge in other situations and contexts [99]. To this end, planning and methodologies must provide students with open and attractive experiences, which, through assessment, they can understand in all its breadth and learn to focus on a specific context. The idea is that the assessment is open enough to allow students to learn to settle the learning and, in turn, prepare them to face the future in different contexts [100]. For these reasons, it is fundamental that the tasks, the achievement goals, the assessment instruments and the feedback moments are dialogued from the beginning and go in the same line.
- *Applicable in a variety of contexts and tasks:* Feedback is one of the most influential assessment factors in learning [101]. However, students tend to have problems understanding the feedback they receive, in terms of its usefulness, consistency, specificity or clarity [102]. Therefore, the first step should be to get students to understand the feedback they receive, for their use in further learning [31], and, to do so, it is essential that they are based on a dialogical process [103]. Feedback moments should be directed towards deep understanding of learning objectives, achievement goals and how to achieve them, thus allowing students to become reflective and self-regulated learners [104]. The excessive focus of the feedback on the work to be developed gives importance to the task and not to the learning, which transforms a formative assessment process into a continuous qualification process.
- *Reflection on the teaching and learning process:* Moments of reflection should be part of the formative assessment processes [105]. Not all reflection is valid for the improvement of learning and self-regulation. Reflection should lead the student to continuously reconsider the formative processes he or she is carrying out [106]. If we want to achieve that the students advance autonomously in learning and in an effective way, it is necessary that they learn to evaluate the decisions that they are making and how these are affecting them [104]. In this way, they will be aware of their learning process and will be able to regulate it. In addition, they will be able to know what would change if they were to face a similar process again or where they should go in the future to further strengthen their learning. In this line, the reflection will help to work another fundamental aspect of the future teachers, as is the construction of their professional identity. Various studies indicate that this begins to be built during the pre-service stage and plays a fundamental role in the first years of teaching [107]. Being able to start creating a pedagogical base with knowledge, as well as understanding how to advance and connect learning, will be of great help to a Physical Education teacher.

4. Some Strategies to Implement a Quality Assessment in the Classrooms

Based on the scientific evidence presented above, five strategies for application to the classroom are presented below. Before starting, it is necessary to understand that the strategies, techniques, means and instruments with which to carry out a formative and shared assessment are very varied, and adaptable to the concrete situations of each teacher. For this reason, this section does not intend to

be a manual for teachers to follow strictly, but it tries to delimit and show five strategies that have given good results in the application of formative and shared assessment systems. These strategies are:

- *Triadic assessment*: This process consists in the comparison of the assessment through the joint use of self-assessment (assessment of oneself), peer assessment or co-assessment (assessment among the students themselves) and hetero assessment (teacher-student assessment) [108]. The use of these three types of assessment together allows the student to obtain a triple feedback on the same task from different points of view, which allows him to generate a greater settlement of the learning [46]. The teachers, together with the students, have the option of building instruments that address the same or different aspects from each of the types of assessment. In this way, a more detailed feedback of the process can be obtained and, with it, the possibility of achieving better learning. In this sense, it is important that the students always know the instruments before starting the task; since in this way they will be able to use them autonomously at the moment they need them.
- *Grade distribution*: When group work is carried out, it is necessary that all students acquire individual responsibility for the task [109]. Thus, assessment processes can help guide and corroborate this responsibility in each student and try to act in a fair and proportional way to the work done [110]. As in individual work, group tasks require continuous assessment processes. Intergroup co-assessment is necessary at least twice during the development of the task, since peer assessment and self-assessment have a significant impact on the co-regulation of a group [111]. This allows each student to be aware of what they are contributing and learning, which will lead to a certain grade at the end. This grade may be different among the members of the group, since it must reflect fairly and proportionally the contribution of each member during the process [112]. One strategy for this is the distribution of grades among group members, where they must justify their qualification through the contribution they have made to the task, based on the different inter-group co-assessment processes carried out during its development [113].
- *Collaborative creation of instruments*: The active participation of students in the teaching-learning process is an important factor in improving it [114,115]. It is therefore essential that the promotion of this participation is real and occurs in all aspects associated with their learning, such as assessment. Before starting, the aspects to be evaluated in each task should be delimited jointly between teacher and students, and the instruments to carry out a formative assessment of learning can be agreed between teachers and students, reaching agreements that meet the learning objectives of both [116]. In addition, an agreement should be reached from the beginning on the weight of each work or parts of the work in the final grade. In this way, assessment becomes a truly shared and more democratic process, in which the student is involved and acquires a shared responsibility in its creation and use.
- *Elaboration of formative questions*: The word “exam” seems to be a backward step for the university teachers of Physical Education who want to implement formative assessment processes. However, the exams can become part of it, if they do not break the linearity of the formative processes [117]. The idea of the exams in this type of assessment is that the students are able to understand what they have learned, select what is important and learn to develop it. To achieve this, the use of final assessment tests must be a process shared between teachers and students, from their creation to their correction. The selection of questions or motor tasks is done by the students and are reviewed together. Teachers must ensure that students are able to generate quality motor questions or practices, through reflection and evaluated aspects throughout the teaching-learning process. In this way, a final test will be transformed into a formative process of reflection and synthesis of the learning achieved [118]. In addition, as we have been defending, assessment processes based on self-regulation and student involvement go far beyond final tests; therefore, exams cannot have all the weight of the final grade in a formative assessment system, but only a small part of it [119].

- *Use of apps*: The use of web applications to make or use as assessment instruments was common in recent years [120]; however, the current situation of pandemic caused by COVID-19, and, with it, the impossibility of sharing material in Physical Education, make it even more relevant at this time. The use of web applications must have a pedagogical logic. It is not a question of using applications to facilitate the mechanization of the instruments, but it must be clear how a good instrument is made and what the user wants it for. Before using web applications or any other instrument, it is necessary to know what you want to evaluate, how and who is going to use it [98]. Teachers can find on the Internet specific tools to evaluate, such as “rubistar” to create rubrics, “corubric” to create rubrics in a collaborative way or “evalcomix,” a tool able to be integrated in already designed learning management systems. These tools are useful to help teachers in the construction and integration of instruments in the teaching-learning processes. In addition, you can find other tools and web applications on the Internet whose use associated with the assessment can be very useful, such as “plickers”, “kahoot” or “socrative”, which are tools for making tests and questions to students through the mobile and check all together the results in the moment. These applications can facilitate and reduce the time of making assessments in the middle of the learning process by means of which they make the students aware of where they are, as well as having a global vision of the learning of the class.

5. Reflections on the Application of Formative Assessment as a Methodological Tool Compared to Traditional Models

One of the main reflections that we can extract from the analysis is that the assessment is essential to promote self-regulation of students and their involvement, provided that it is proposed as a training tool and shared. The first step to implement it is that teachers reflect on the contribution that assessment has in its methodology and have clear what, why and how they want to evaluate, thus being able to break with all the negative aspects of traditional models and unidirectional [84]. In this section we try to help teachers through the reflective analysis of some results of traditional assessments and how to break them with the application of formative and shared assessment as a methodological tool.

- The assessment should no longer be an obscure and unfamiliar part of the student body [121]. It cannot feel like a piece of the learning process destined to sentence it, classifying it according to final tests, as has happened for years in Physical Education with the use of physical aptitude tests [93]. Assessment should be integrated into the entire teaching-learning process and should be clear, open and flexible. The idea is that the assessment should help to provide adequate scaffolding [122]. If the student understands and shares from the beginning what is expected of him, he will be able to use the assessment as a tool for growth.
- The assessment cannot be understood as the yes or no, apt or not apt, which is obtained at the end of the course or of an assignment, because that is not evaluating. The reduction of the assessment to the simple grade makes it lose its formative potential and gives a wrong vision to the students, making them understand the final grade as the important part of the process. It is necessary to raise an assessment that accompanies the student from the beginning during the tasks and to which he can resort to know his level of learning, not his grade. It is fundamental that the grades do not appear until the end and that they are considered as the logical jump from the assessment [123]. Numerical grades should never be the center of the learning process, nor the purpose.
- Assessment should not be equated with judging. Assessment cannot be about the teacher, as the highest authority, giving his or her final verdict on a student’s learning. This process is not going to mean an improvement in the student, but a judgment of which many times the reasons are not even known. Formative assessment should be based on reflection and dialogue [103]. It must be a process of constant feedback, based on pre-established criteria and understandable by the student. The reflective processes, individual and shared, must be constant and planned so that the students are able to discover how to continue advancing in their learning [106].

- Assessment cannot be a means for teachers to show their authority. Assessment as a tool to punish or threaten the student for misbehavior or development should not be conceivable. Formative, shared assessment should activate students as instructional resources for others and as masters of their own learning [124]. Students must participate in order to enhance their learning and that of their peers. In this process, the teachers are one more member that evaluates and can be evaluated, in order to achieve the desired learning. Ethics and democracy are fundamental aspects in this type of assessment [125].
- Assessment cannot be an isolated part of the teaching-learning process. The planning of learning must not be based only on the organization of tasks and the use of methodologies. When teachers plan the learning, they want to achieve in their students and how to do it, they must take into account assessment. In fact, assessment should be the initial part of the learning design process. Nothing can be designed that is intended to work if the process of assessment and student involvement in the process is not considered simultaneously. The adequate choice of assessment and qualification activities and the most appropriate instruments in relation to the procedures/techniques for obtaining information are keys to adequate learning. Therefore, the assessment must be directly associated with the teaching methodology and the proposed tasks.
- The assessment should not be decontextualized from social aspects. Assessment systems should not focus on a specific concept or knowledge, such as the simple execution of a jump, a sprint or a throw. The use of a formative assessment must be structured so that the students are able to reflect on the learning and not only on the tasks performed. The aim is to build a deep learning in the students, as a fundamental factor for the development of sustainability in education and society [126]. In this way, it will be easier for the student to generate transversal skills applicable outside the classroom: in the field of sports, values, healthy habits or socialization [127]. Without these processes of awareness and reflection through assessment, learning may have difficulties in leaving the school.

6. Conclusions

Through this work, we have tried to analyze and reflect on the use of formative and shared assessment in Physical Education to achieve the promotion of self-regulation and involvement of university students. Although formative and shared assessment systems are being implemented in more and more university classrooms, there is still a great deal of work to be done to achieve this throughout the university system. For this reason, in our study we have analyzed five factors that support the use of formative and shared assessment in Physical Education to generate motivation, autonomy and involvement in university students, and five implementation strategies with which to carry it out. We consider that this is a need for teachers to understand in more detail the benefit of these assessment systems in the learning of their students and how to develop them. In this sense, the fact of closing the manuscript with a section dedicated to the reflection of the applicability of these assessment training systems and their break with traditional assessment systems, can be a turning point for teachers who do not yet apply them and help them to achieve it. It is undeniable that if we want to get the students involved in the classes, acquire an autonomous learning and be able to implement it outside the classroom, thus achieving a more effective motor and social development, it is necessary to establish a formative and shared assessment in the classroom.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, R.A.B.-M. and D.H.-A.; methodology, Á.P.-P.; formal analysis, D.H.-A., J.S.S. and Á.P.-P.; resources, R.A.B.-M.; writing—original draft preparation, D.H.-A. and J.S.-S.; writing—review and editing, Á.P.-P.; visualization, all the authors; supervision, R.A.B.-M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Joyce, B.; Weil, M. *Models of Teaching*; Prentice-Hall International: London, UK, 1972.
- Jewett, A.E.; Bain, L.L. *The Curriculum Process in Physical Education*; Brown & Benchmark: Dubuque, IA, USA, 1985.
- Metzler, M.W. *Instructional Models for Physical Education*; Allyn & Bacon: Needham Heights, MA, USA, 2000.
- Siedentop, D.; Tannehill, D. *Developing Teaching Skills in Physical Education*, 4th ed.; Mayfield: Mountain View, CA, USA, 2000.
- Haerens, L.; Kirk, D.; Cardon, G.; De Bourdeaudhuij, I. Toward the development of a pedagogical model for health-based physical education. *Quest* **2011**, *63*, 321–338. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Fernández-Río, J.; Calderón, A.; Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Pérez-Pueyo, A.; Aznar, M. Modelos pedagógicos en educación física: Consideraciones teórico-prácticas para docentes. *Rev. Española Educ. Física Deportes* **2016**, *413*, 55–75.
- Bunker, D.J.; Thorpe, R.D. A model for the teaching of games in Secondary Schools. *Bull. Phys. Educ.* **1982**, *18*, 5–8.
- Thorpe, R.; Bunker, D.; Almond, L. *Rethinking Games Teaching*; University of Technology of Loughborough: Loughborough, UK, 1986.
- Grineski, S. *Cooperative Learning in Physical Education*; Human Kinetics: Champaign, IL, USA, 1996.
- Johnson, D.W.; Johnson, R.T. *Meaningful and Manageable Assessment through Cooperative Learning*; Interaction Book Co.: Edina, MN, USA, 1996.
- Siedentop, D.; Hastie, P.A.; Van der Mars, H. *Complete Guide to Sport Education*; Human Kinetics: Champaign, IL, USA, 2004.
- Metzler, M.W. *Instructional Models for Physical Education*, 3rd ed.; Allyn & Bacon: Needham Heights, MA, USA, 2005.
- Hellison, D.; Martinek, T.; Walsh, D. Sport and responsible leadership among youth. In *Positive Youth Development through Sport*; Holt, N.L., Ed.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2008; pp. 49–60.
- Liu, M.; Karp, G.G.; Davis, D. Teaching learning-related social skills in kindergarten physical education. *J. Phys. Educ. Recreat. Danc.* **2010**, *81*, 38–44. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Velázquez, C. *Aprendizaje Cooperativo en Educación Física. Fundamentos y Aplicaciones Prácticas*; INDE: Barcelona, Spain, 2010.
- Siedentop, D.; Hastie, P.A.; Van der Mars, H. *Complete guide to Sport Education*, 2nd ed.; Human Kinetics: Champaign, IL, USA, 2011.
- Johnson, D.W.; Johnson, R.T.; Holubec, E.J. *Cooperation in the Classroom*, 9th ed.; Interaction Book Company: Edina, MN, USA, 2013.
- Slavin, R.E. Cooperative Learning and Academic Achievement: Why Does Groupwork Work? *An. Psicol.* **2014**, *30*, 785–791.
- Barba-Martín, R.A.; Bores-García, D.; Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; González-Calvo, G. The Application of the Teaching Games for Understanding in Physical Education. Systematic Review of the Last Six Years. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17*, 3330.
- Bores-García, D.; Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Fernández-Río, J.; González-Calvo, G.; Barba-Martín, R.A. Research on Cooperative Learning in Physical Education. Systematic Review of the Last Five Years. *Res. Q. Exerc. Sport* **2020**, in press.
- Mesquita, I.; Farias, C.; Hastie, P. The impact of a hybrid sport-education-invasion games competence model soccer unit on students decision making skill execution and overall game performance. *Eur. Phys. Educ. Rev.* **2012**, *18*, 205–219. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Fernández-Río, J.; Sanz, N.; Fernandez-Cando, J.; Santos, L. Impact of a sustained cooperative learning intervention on student motivation. *Phys. Educ. Sport Pedagog.* **2017**, *22*, 89–105. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Wallhead, T.; Dyson, B. A didactic analysis of content development during cooperative learning in primary physical education. *Eur. Phys. Educ. Rev.* **2017**, *23*, 311–326. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Bracco, E.; Lodewyk, K.; Morrison, H.A. Case study of disengaged adolescent girls' experiences with teaching games for understanding in physical education. *Curr. Stud. Health Phys. Educ.* **2019**, *10*, 207–225. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Pérez-Pueyo, A.; Hortigüela-Alcalá, D. ¿Y si toda la innovación no es positiva en Educación Física? Reflexiones y consideraciones prácticas. *Retos* **2020**, *37*, 579–587.

26. Beane, J.A.; Apple, M. The Case for Democratic Schools. In *Democratic Schools: Lessons in Powerful Education*; Apple, M., Beane, J.A., Eds.; Heinemann: Portsmouth, NH, USA, 2007; pp. 14–19.
27. Imbernon, F.; Medina, J.L. *Metodología Participativa en el Aula Universitaria. La Participación del Alumnado*; Octaedro: Barcelona, Spain, 2008.
28. Herranen, J.; Vesterinen, V.-M.; Aksela, M. From Learner-Centered to Learner-Driven Sustainability Education. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 2190. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. McKeachie, W.J.; Svinicki, M. *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*, 12th ed.; Houghton-Mifflin: Boston, MA, USA, 2006.
30. Nicol, D.J.; Macfarlane-Dick, D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Stud. High. Educ.* **2006**, *31*, 199–218. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. Sadler, D.R. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* **2010**, *35*, 535–550. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Panadero, E.; Alonso-Tapia, J. Teorías de autorregulación educativa: Una comparación y reflexión teórica. *Psicol. Educ.* **2014**, *20*, 11–22. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Ozan, C.; Kincal, R.Y. The Effects of Formative Assessment on Academic Achievement, Attitudes toward the Lesson, and Self-Regulation Skills. *Educ. Sci. Theory Pract.* **2018**, *18*, 85–118.
34. Dignath, C.; Büttner, G. Components of fostering self-regulated learning among students. A meta-analysis on intervention studies at primary and secondary school level. *Metacognition Learn.* **2008**, *3*, 231–264. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Zimmerman, B.J. Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation*; Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P.R., Zeidner, M., Eds.; Academic Press: San Diego, CA, USA, 2000; pp. 13–40.
36. Zimmerman, B.J.; Shunk, D.H. *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance (Educational Psychology Handbook)*; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2011.
37. Casado, O. La Autorregulación en el aula de Educación Primaria. Estudio y Aplicación de un Modelo Integral de Transición Activa Hacia la Autonomía. Ph.D. Thesis, Universidad de Valladolid, Valladolid, Spain, 2018.
38. Casado, O.; Pérez-Pueyo, A.; Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Fernández-Río, J. MITAA: Modelo Integral de Transición Activa Hacia la Autonomía. *Hacia un Proceso de Autorregulación del Aprendizaje en el Aula de Educación Primaria*; Servicio de de Publicaciones de la Universidad de León: León, Spain, 2019.
39. Lee, C.S.; Hayes, K.N.; Seitz, J.; DiStefano, R.; O'Connor, D. Understanding motivational structures that differentially predict engagement and achievement in middle school science. *Int. J. Sci. Educ.* **2016**, *38*, 192–215. [[CrossRef](#)]
40. Flavell, J.H. Speculations about the nature and development of metacognition. In *Metacognition, Motivation and Understanding*; Weinert, F.E., Kluwe, R.H., Eds.; Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ, USA, 1987.
41. Boekaerts, M.; Cascallar, E. How Far Have We Moved Toward the integration of Theory and Practice in Self-Regulation? *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* **2006**, *18*, 199–210. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. García-Martín, M. La autorregulación académica como variable explicativa de los procesos de aprendizaje universitario. *Profr. Rev. Currículum Form. Profr.* **2012**, *16*, 203–221.
43. Barba-Martín, R.A.; Hernando-Garijo, A.; Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; González-Calvo, G. Tras casi una década de Bolonia, ¿realmente hemos mejorado la calidad de la enseñanza? *Espiral Cuad. Profr.* **2020**, *13*, 97–108.
44. Ryan, R.M.; Deci, E.L. Toward a social psychology of assimilation: Self-determination theory in cognitive development and education. In *Self-Regulation and Autonomy: Social and Developmental Dimensions of Human Conduct*; Sokol, B.W., Grouzet, F.M.E., Muller, U., Eds.; Cambridge University: Cambridge, UK, 2013; pp. 191–207.
45. Zimmerman, B.J. Investigating Self-Regulation and Motivation: Historical Background, Methodological Developments, and Future Prospects. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* **2008**, *45*, 166–183. [[CrossRef](#)]
46. Pérez-Pueyo, A.; Casado, O.; Hortigüela-Alcalá, D. La evaluación formativa, la autorregulación y la secuenciación de competencias. In *Profesión y Profesionalidad Docente. Una Acción Educativa Comprometida con el Desarrollo Humano*; Manso, J., Moya, J., Eds.; ANELE: Andalucía, Spain, 2019; pp. 103–120.
47. Minnaert, A. Autonomy, competence, and social relatedness in task interest within project-based education. *Psychol. Reports* **2007**, *101*, 574–586. [[CrossRef](#)]
48. Elliot, A.J.; Dweck, C. *Handbook of Competence and Motivation*; Guilford Publications: New York, NY, USA, 2005.
49. Oates, S. The Importance of Autonomous, Self-Regulated Learning in Primary Initial Teacher Training. *Front. Educ.* **2019**, *4*, 102. [[CrossRef](#)]

50. Perry, N.E.; Hutchinson, L.; Thauberger, C. Talking about teaching self-regulated learning: Scaffolding student teachers' development and use of practices that promote self-regulated learning. *Int. J. Educ. Res.* **2008**, *47*, 97–108. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Lorente-Catalán, E. Evaluación auténtica y autorregulación del aprendizaje. Un binomio interesante en la formación del profesorado de Educación física. *Rev. Infanc. Educ. Aprendiz.* **2017**, *3*, 25–30. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Raiola, G.; Tafuri, D. Teaching method of physical education and sports by prescriptive or heuristic learning. *J. Hum. Sport Exerc.* **2015**, *10*, S377–S384. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Maggioni, L.; Parkinson, M. The role of teacher epistemic cognition, epistemic beliefs, and calibration in instruction. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* **2008**, *20*, 445–461. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Nabaskues, I.; Usabiaga, O.; Martos-García, D.; Standal, Ø. Comprensión de la habilidad desde la perspectiva del futuro profesorado de Educación Física. *Retos* **2019**, *36*, 121–128. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Nabaskues, I.; Usabiaga, O.; Martos-García, D. ¿Dónde está mi Capital? Una Reflexión Personal sobre la Habilidad y el Acceso al Reconocimiento para la Inclusión en Educación Física. *Qual. Res. Educ.* **2019**, *8*, 126–147. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Pérez-Pueyo, A.; Moncada, J. An analysis of the responsibility of physical education students depending on the teaching methodology received. *J. Phys. Educ. Sport* **2015**, *15*, 202–207.
57. Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Fernández-Río, J.; Pérez-Pueyo, A. Long-term effects of the pedagogical approach on the perceptions of physical education by students and teachers. *J. Phys. Educ. Sport* **2016**, *16*, 1326–1333.
58. Beltrán-Carrillo, V.; Devís-Devís, J. El pensamiento del alumnado inactivo sobre sus experiencias negativas en educación física: Los discursos del rendimiento, salutismo y masculinidad hegemónica. *RICYDE Rev. Int. Cienc. Deporte* **2019**, *15*, 20–34. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Hay, P.J.; Macdonald, D. Evidence for the social construction of ability in physical education. *Sport Educ. Soc.* **2010**, *15*, 1–18. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Hellin, P.; Moreno Murcia, J.A.; Rodríguez, P. Relación de la competencia motriz percibida con la práctica físico-deportiva. *Rev. Psicol. Deporte* **2006**, *15*, 219–231.
61. Evans, J. Making a difference? Education and “ability” in physical education. *Eur. Phys. Educ. Rev.* **2004**, *10*, 95–108. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Fort-Vanmeerhaeghe, A.; Román-Viñasa, B.; Font-Lladó, R. ¿Por qué es importante desarrollar la competencia motriz en la infancia y la adolescencia? Base para un estilo de vida saludable. *Apunts* **2017**, *5*, 103–112. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Dignath-van Ewijk, C.; Van der Werf, G. What Teachers Think about Self-Regulated Learning: Investigating Teacher Beliefs and Teacher Behavior of Enhancing Students' Self-Regulation. *Educ. Res. Int.* **2012**, *2012*, 1–10. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Wilson, M.; Scalise, K. Assessment to improve learning in higher education: The BEAR Assessment System. *High. Educ.* **2006**, *52*, 633–635. [[CrossRef](#)]
65. Black, P.; Wiliam, D. Assessment and Classroom Learning. *Assess. Educ. Princ. Policy Pract.* **1998**, *5*, 7–74. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Gardner, J. *Assessment and Learning*; SAGE: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2012.
67. Darling-Hammond, L.; Snyder, J. Authentic assessment of teaching in context. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* **2000**, *16*, 523–545. [[CrossRef](#)]
68. Gulikers, J.T.; Bastiaens, T.J.; Kirschner, P.A. A Five-Dimensional Framework for Authentic Assessment. *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.* **2004**, *52*, 67–86. [[CrossRef](#)]
69. Dochy, F.; Segers, M.; Dierick, S. Nuevas vías de aprendizaje y enseñanza y sus consecuencias: Una era de evaluación. *Rev. Docencia Univ.* **2002**, *2*, 13–30.
70. Biggs, J. *Calidad del Aprendizaje Universitario*; Narcea: Madrid, Spain, 2005.
71. Boud, D.; Falchikov, N. *Rethinking Assessment in Higher Education. Learning for the Long Term*; Routledge: Oxon, UK, 2007.
72. López-Pastor, V.M. *Evaluación Formativa y Compartida en Educación Superior: Propuestas, Técnicas, Instrumentos y Experiencias*; Narcea: Madrid, Spain, 2009.
73. Brown, S.; Pickford, R. *Assessing Skill and Practice*; Routledge: London, UK, 2013.
74. Hamodi, C.; Moreno-Murcia, J.A.; Barba-Martín, R.A. Medios de Evaluación y Desarrollo de Competencias en Educación Superior en Estudiantes de Educación Física. *Estud. Pedagógicos* **2018**, *44*, 241–257. [[CrossRef](#)]

75. Leenknecht, M.; Wijnia, L.; Köhler, M.; Fryer, L.; Rikers, R.; Loyens, S. Formative assessment as practice: The role of students' motivation. *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* **2020**. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Pérez-Pueyo, Á.; Abella, V. ¿De qué manera se implica el alumnado en el aprendizaje? Análisis de su percepción en procesos de evaluación formativa. *Rev. Investig. Educ.* **2015**, *13*, 88–104.
77. Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Pérez-Pueyo, Á.; López-Pastor, V. Implicación y regulación del trabajo del alumnado en los sistemas de evaluación formativa en educación superior. *RELIEVE* **2015**, *21*, 1–15. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Weldmeskel, F.M.; Michael, D.J. The impact of formative assessment on self-regulating learning in university classrooms. *Tuning J. High. Educ.* **2016**, *4*, 99–118. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Pérez-Pueyo, A.; Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Hernando-Garijo, A. La coevaluación intragrupal y el reparto de notas bajo un proceso de evaluación formativa. In *Experiencias e Innovación Docente en el Contexto Actual de la Docencia Universitaria*; Membiela, P., Casado, N., Cebreiros, I., Eds.; Educación Editora: Ourense, Spain, 2014; pp. 285–289.
80. Ibarra, M.S.; Rodríguez, G. Aproximación al discurso dominante sobre la evaluación del aprendizaje en la universidad. *Rev. Educ.* **2010**, *351*, 385–407.
81. Hamodi, C.; López-Pastor, V.M.; López, A.T. If I experience formative assessment whilst at University will I put it into practice later as a teacher? Formative and shared assessment in Initial Teacher Education (ITE). *Eur. J. Teach. Educ.* **2017**, *40*, 171–190. [[CrossRef](#)]
82. Shieh, J.J.; Cefai, C. Assessment of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: A Case Analysis of a University in the South of Europe. *Malta Rev. Educ. Res.* **2017**, *11*, 27–49.
83. Panadero, E.; Fraile, J.; Fernández-Ruiz, J.; Castilla-Estevéz, D.; Ruiz-Díaz, M. Spanish university assessment practices. *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* **2019**, *44*, 379–397. [[CrossRef](#)]
84. Barba-Martín, R.A. Desarrollo de un enfoque pedagógico crítico en la formación inicial del profesorado para romper con la evaluación tradicional en Educación Infantil. *Publicaciones* **2020**, *50*, 207–227. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Jesson, J.; Matheson, L.; Lacey, F. *Doing Your Literature Review. Traditional and Systematic Techniques*; SAGE: London, UK, 2011.
86. Gikandiab, W.; Morrow, D.; Davisa, N.E. Online formative assessment in higher education: A review of the literature. *Comput. Educ.* **2011**, *57*, 2333–2351. [[CrossRef](#)]
87. Guirao Goris, G.A. Utilidad y tipos de revisión de literatura. *Ene* **2015**, *9*. [[CrossRef](#)]
88. Duchatelet, D.; Donche, V. Fostering self-efficacy and self-regulation in higher education: A matter of autonomy support or academic motivation? *High. Educ. Res. Dev.* **2019**, *38*, 733–747. [[CrossRef](#)]
89. García-Pérez, D.; Fraile, J.; Panadero, E. Learning strategies and self-regulation in context: How higher education students approach different courses, assessments, and challenges. *Eur. J. Psychol. Educ.* **2020**, 1–18. [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Wanner, T.; Palmer, E. Formative self-and peer assessment for improved student learning: The crucial factors of design, teacher participation and feedback. *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* **2018**, *43*, 1032–1047. [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Wu, Q.; Jessop, T. Formative assessment: Missing in action in both research-intensive and teaching focused universities? *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* **2018**, *43*, 1019–1031. [[CrossRef](#)]
92. Pintrich, P.R. A Conceptual Framework for Assessing Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning in College Students. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* **2004**, *16*, 385–407. [[CrossRef](#)]
93. López-Pastor, V.; Kirk, D.; Lorente-Catalá, E.; MacPhail, A.; Macdonald, D. Alternative assessment in physical education: A review of international literature. *Sport Educ. Soc.* **2013**, *18*, 57–76. [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Carless, D. Learning-oriented assessment: Conceptual bases and practical implications. *Innov. Educ. Teach. Int.* **2007**, *44*, 57–66. [[CrossRef](#)]
95. Hernández, R. Does continuous assessment in higher education support student learning? *High. Educ.* **2012**, *64*, 489–502. [[CrossRef](#)]
96. Casado, O.; Pérez-Pueyo, A.; Casado, P. La autorregulación en educación primaria. una propuesta para favorecer la autonomía del alumnado. In *Evaluación Formativa y Compartida en Educación: Experiencias de Éxito en Todas las Etapas Educativas*; López-Pastor, V.M., Pérez-Pueyo, A., Eds.; Universidad de León: León, Spain, 2017; pp. 208–237.
97. Kramarski, B. Teachers as agents in promoting students' SRL and performance: Applications for teachers' dual-role training program. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance*; Schunk, D.H., Greene, J.A., Eds.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2018; pp. 223–239.

98. López-Pastor, V.M.; Pérez-Pueyo, A. *Evaluación Formativa y Compartida en Educación: Experiencias de éxito en Todas las Etapas Educativas*; Universidad de León: León, Spain, 2017.
99. Yániz, C.; Villardón, L. *Planificar Desde Competencias Para Promover el Aprendizaje*; Universidad de Deusto: Bilbao, Spain, 2006.
100. Cano, M.E. La evaluación por competencias en la educación superior Profesorado. *Rev. Currículum Form. Profr.* **2008**, *12*, 1–16.
101. Hattie, J.; Timperley, H. The Power of Feedback. *Rev. Educ. Res.* **2007**, *77*, 81–112. [[CrossRef](#)]
102. Bailey, R.; Garner, M. Is the feedback in higher education assessment worth the paper it is written on? Teachers' reflections on their practices. *Teach. High. Educ.* **2010**, *15*, 187–198. [[CrossRef](#)]
103. Nicol, D. From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback in mass higher education. *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* **2010**, *35*, 501–517. [[CrossRef](#)]
104. Carless, D. Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Stud. High. Educ.* **2006**, *31*, 219–233. [[CrossRef](#)]
105. Hortigüela-Alcalá, D.; Pérez-Pueyo, Á.; González-Calvo, G. Pero ... ¿A qué nos referimos realmente con la evaluación formativa y compartida?: Confusiones habituales y reflexiones prácticas. *Rev. Iberoam. Evaluación Educ.* **2019**, *12*, 13–27.
106. Congdon, G.J.; Congdon, S. Engaging Students in a Simulated Collaborative Action Research Project: An Evaluation of a Participatory Approach to Learning. *J. Furth. High. Educ.* **2011**, *35*, 222–231. [[CrossRef](#)]
107. Flores, M.A.; Day, C. Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teach. Teach. Educ.* **2006**, *22*, 219–232. [[CrossRef](#)]
108. Pérez-Pueyo, A. El estilo actitudinal como propuesta metodológica vinculada a la evaluación formativa. In *Evaluación Formativa y Compartida en Educación: Experiencias de Éxito en Todas las Etapas Educativas*; López-Pastor, V.M., Pérez-Pueyo, A., Eds.; Universidad de León: León, Spain, 2017; pp. 240–259.
109. Barba, J.J.; Martínez-Scott, S.; Torrego, L. El Proyecto de Aprendizaje Tutorado Cooperativo. Una experiencia en el grado de maestra de Educación Infantil. *REDU* **2012**, *10*, 123–144. [[CrossRef](#)]
110. Asún, S.; Rapún, M.; Romero, M.R. Percepciones de Estudiantes Universitarios sobre una Evaluación Formativa en el Trabajo en Equipo. *Rev. Iberoam. Evaluación Educ.* **2019**, *12*, 175–192.
111. Meusen-Beekman, K.D.; Joosten-ten Brinke, D.; Boshuizen, H.P.A. Effects of formative assessments to develop self-regulation among sixth grade students: Results from a randomized controlled intervention. *Stud. Educ. Eval.* **2016**, *51*, 126–136. [[CrossRef](#)]
112. Morales, P. Estrategias para evaluar y calificar el producto del equipo: Cómo diferenciar las calificaciones individuales. In *La enseñanza Centrada en el Aprendizaje: Estrategias útiles Para el Profesorado*; Prieto, L., Ed.; Octaedro: Barcelona, Spain, 2008; pp. 151–169.
113. Hortigüela, D.; Pérez-Pueyo, Á.; Salicetti, A. ¿Cómo percibe el alumnado universitario de educación física la evaluación recibida? Contraste de dos metodologías diferentes. *Retos. Nuevas Tend. Educ. Física Deporte Recreación* **2015**, *28*, 66–70.
114. Biggs, J. What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *High. Educ. Res. Dev.* **1999**, *18*, 57–75. [[CrossRef](#)]
115. McGowan, W.; Graham, C. Factors contributing to improved teaching performance. *Innov. High. Educ.* **2009**, *34*, 161–171. [[CrossRef](#)]
116. Gámiz-Sánchez, V.; Torres-Hernández, N.; Gallego-Arrufat, M.J. Construcción colaborativa de una e-rúbrica para la autoevaluación formativa en estudios universitarios de pedagogía. *REDU Rev. Docencia Univ.* **2015**, *13*, 319–338. [[CrossRef](#)]
117. Grosas, A.; Raju, S.; Schuett, B.; Chuck, J.; Millar, T. Determining if active learning through a formative assessment process translates to better performance in summative assessment. *Stud. High. Educ.* **2016**, *41*, 1595–1611. [[CrossRef](#)]
118. López-Pastor, V.M.; Castejón, J.; Pérez-Pueyo, Á. Implicar al alumnado en la evaluación en la formación inicial del profesorado? Un estudio de caso de evaluación entre iguales de un examen. *Multidiscip. J. Educ. Res.* **2012**, *2*, 177–201.
119. Fraile, A.; López-Pastor, V.; Castejón, J.; Romero, M.R. La evaluación formativa en docencia universitaria y el rendimiento académico del alumnado. *Aula Abierta* **2013**, *41*, 23–34.
120. Sangle, S.B.; Nandurkar, K.N.; Pawar, P.J. Incorporating E-Assessment Tools in Teaching for Effective and Authentic Assessment. *J. Eng. Educ. Transform.* **2020**, *33*, 130–136.

121. Lam, B.H.; Tsui, K.T. Examining the Alignment of Subject Learning Outcomes and Course Curricula through Curriculum Mapping. *Aust. J. Teach. Educ.* **2013**, *38*, 1–9. [[CrossRef](#)]
122. Pérez-Pueyo, Á.; Hortigüela, D.; Gutiérrez-García, C.; Hernando, A. Andamiaje y evaluación formativa: Dos caras de la misma moneda. *Rev. Infanc. Educ. Aprendiz.* **2019**, *5*, 559–565. [[CrossRef](#)]
123. López-Pastor, V.M. Evaluación formativa y compartida: Evaluar para aprender y la implicación del alumnado en los procesos de evaluación y aprendizaje. In *Evaluación Formativa y Compartida en Educación: Experiencias de Éxito en Todas las Etapas Educativas*; López-Pastor, V.M., Pérez-Pueyo, A., Eds.; Universidad de León: León, Spain, 2017; pp. 34–68.
124. Black, P.; Wiliam, D. Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educ. Assess. Eval. Account.* **2009**, *21*, 5. [[CrossRef](#)]
125. Fernández-Balboa, J.M. Dignity and democracy in the college classroom: The practice of self-evaluation. In *Useful Theory: Making Critical Education Practical*; Goldstein, R.A., Ed.; Peter Lang Publishing: New York, NY, USA, 2007; pp. 105–128.
126. Warburton, K. Deep learning and education for sustainability. *Int. J. Sustain. High. Educ.* **2003**, *4*, 44–56. [[CrossRef](#)]
127. López-Pastor, V. Nuevas perspectivas sobre evaluación en Educación Física. *Rev. Educ. Física* **2013**, *29*, 1–10.

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).