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Abstract

The process to evaluate students is always a committed task. Evaluation can be a way of regulating the student lessons and also a tool to help them to improve. In order to achieve our goal, teaching, learning and evaluation should be aligned, which requires clear criteria and indicators. The use of rubrics as an evaluation tool allows the establishment of impartial and clear indicators. In addition, the rubrics promote formative evaluation, which is very interesting to treat evaluation as one more formative activity.

In the described framework of a learning-oriented evaluation, peer assessment, is to be evaluated by one's own peers. The process encourages active learning in the students and become the protagonists of their own learning process.

With the aim of achieving this formative evaluation, the authors have established peer-to-peer assessment in certain subjects of the different Degrees in Engineering, as well as in the Master’s Degree in Engineering, Processing and Characterization of Materials, both taught at the Universitat Politècnica de València (UPV). Specifically, rubrics have been developed to evaluate the oral presentations that students make of their projects, and the same rubric is used both by students for peer evaluation and by the lecturer.

The aim of this work is to show the results registered after several years of application of the described evaluative methodology and to compare them in order to obtain conclusions which validate their application in the different formative levels in the field of the universities.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Establishing an appropriate evaluation system, as well as the act of evaluating itself, is always a committed task for teachers. Evaluation can be a way of regulating what the student learns and also a tool to help them to improve. One way to proceed with the evaluation is to use the constructive alignment proposed by John Biggs. Teaching is reinforced by aligning his objectives, his methods and the assessment tasks (Biggs & Biggs, 2004). For this, clear criteria and indicators are needed.

And it is that even the evaluation protocols for the verification of official university degrees (Agencia Nacional de Evaluación de la Calidad y Acreditación - ANECA), and for the renewal of accreditation (Programa ACREDITA de la ANECA), in Spain, establish as a guideline that there is coherence or alignment between learning results and formation and evaluation activities (Fig. 1).

![Triangulation between Formation Activities, Learning Results and Evaluation Methods](image)

**Fig. 1. Triangulation between Formation Activities, Learning Results and Evaluation Methods**

The triangulation of these three concepts it is of vital importance to guarantee the quality of teaching and to reinforce the focus of the student-centered teaching and learning process. It should be remembered that there is a convergence of the educational systems of European countries towards a European Higher Education Area (EHEA), being the central axis of the change to make the student protagonist and responsible for their own learning, which must be meaningful and autonomous (Sánchez & Ruiz, 2011).

If the learning results are ambiguous, difficult to understand and/or complicated to achieve throughout the course, the evaluation will be complex. In this regard, the use of rubrics allows the establishment of clear and impartial indicators. As Stevens and Levis proposed, “a rubric is a scoring tool that lays out the specific expectations for an assignment. Rubrics divide an assignment into its component parts and provide a detailed description of what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable levels of performance for each of those parts” (Stevens & Levi, 2013). The rubrics used as an evaluation tool enhance the formative evaluation, being that it is very interesting to treat the evaluation as one more didactic activity.

In the described framework of a learning-oriented evaluation, peer assessment, is to be evaluated by one's own peers, encourages active learning in which the students also become the protagonists of their own learning process (Sluijsmans, Brand-Gruwel, & van Merriënboer, 2002). Through this system, students compare their work, their efforts, their results, with those of their peers in the act of evaluation, and this comparison produces a feedback that drives students towards improvement.

With the aim of achieving this formative evaluation, the authors have begun to implement in certain subjects an evaluation methodology in which the evaluation of the teacher is combined with the peer assessment, using the same rubric. For this moment, the evaluative methodology described is being applied only to evaluate the oral presentations that the students make of their projects, but the objective is to apply it progressively in other acts of evaluation of the subjects.

The aim of this work is to show the results registered after several years of application of the described evaluative methodology and to compare them in order to obtain conclusions which validate their application in the different formative levels in the field of the universities.
2 METHODOLOGY

In certain subjects of the different Degrees in Engineering, as well as in the Master's Degree in Engineering, Processing and Characterization of Materials, both taught at the Universitat Politècnica de València (UPV), a project-based learning is carried out. The results of their project must be defended by the students at the end of the subject through an oral presentation.

At the beginning, these final presentations of the projects were evaluated only by the lecturer. However, in order to achieve a significant improvement in their teaching, the authors have started to apply other techniques in which the evaluation system itself promotes learning, including peer assessment.

The score obtained in the final presentation - defense of a project, of a student, is the average of the score given by the classmates and the score given by the teacher. In order to have students and teacher a common criterion in the evaluation, clear and precise indicators are established, describing in them the different levels of development reached and their corresponding weighting. That is, a rubric has been used as an evaluation tool.

It is worth mentioning that the UPV has an on-line platform to support on-site teaching called “PoliformaT”. Among other utilities, in this platform is the tool “irubrics” in which, among other things, it is possible to consult UPV institutional rubrics created for different purposes. From this repository of rubrics, the lecturers involved in this work chose one to evaluate the oral expositions of the engineering students, which is shown in the Fig. 2 and which can be accessed at the address:

https://irubric.upv.es/rubricshowc.cfm?code=Q6B68&sp=yes

![Fig. 2. Rubric to evaluate oral expositions of university engineering students](image-url)

The indicators to be evaluated considered in the rubric are the following:

- Preparation of the speech (10%).
- Originality of the contents (10%).
- Domain of content (15%).
- Structure of the presentation (10%).
- Use of language (10%).
- Speech speed (10%).
- Non-verbal communication (10%)
Support means (15%).
Need for clarification (10%).

Finally, Table 1 shows relevant information in relation to the subjects in which the evaluation methodology described has been applied.

**Table 1. Set of subjects in which peer assessment / teacher evaluation has been applied through rubrics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Degree/Master</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nº Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation in chemical engineering I</td>
<td>Degree in Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical engineering Bases</td>
<td>Degree in Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>Degree in Industrial Design Engineering and Product Development</td>
<td>3º</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>Degree in Industrial Design Engineering and Product Development</td>
<td>3º</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation in chemical engineering II</td>
<td>Degree in Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>3º</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, design and restyling</td>
<td>Degree in Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>4º</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and behavior in service</td>
<td>Master's Degree in Engineering, Processing and Characterization of Materials</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and behavior in service</td>
<td>Master's Degree in Engineering, Processing and Characterization of Materials</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and behavior in service</td>
<td>Master's Degree in Engineering, Processing and Characterization of Materials</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 RESULTS

For the set of subjects described in the previous section, Table 2 shows the average results of the peer assessment and the average results of the evaluation of the teacher responsible for the subject, as well as the difference registered between both evaluations. It should be noted that in these subjects the final presentation’s score obtained by the students, as stated above, is the average of the score given by the classmates and the score given by the teacher.
Table 2. Results of peer assessment / teacher evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average result peer assessment</th>
<th>Average result teacher evaluation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation in chemical engineering I</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bases in chemical engineering</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>3º</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>3º</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation in chemical engineering II</td>
<td>3º</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials, design and restyling</td>
<td>4º</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and behavior in service</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and behavior in service</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and behavior in service</td>
<td>2º</td>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the analysis of the results obtained, the following partial conclusions can be drawn:

- The undergraduate students of the lowest courses (2nd and 3rd) normally give their classmates a score slightly higher than the teacher in average value.
- As they near the end of their undergraduate studies (4th year), the teacher's score is somewhat higher than those they give themselves in peer assessment.
- This trend is more accentuated in master's student. The teacher gives higher scores than those given among the students, probably due to the incipient competitiveness created.
- This is probably due to the fact that the students of the last courses are more aware of the effort that the work has cost them and are less lax when it comes to evaluating the result of the work of others compared to their own.
- In any case, the difference between peer assessment and teacher evaluation is below 1 point out of 10, except for some exceptions, which indicate the correct evaluations process used.

4 CONCLUSIONS

In view of the results obtained and the partial conclusions presented in the previous section, the evaluation methodology described seems to provide good results, since the differences between the peer assessment and the teacher evaluation are not great and instead with the evaluation between peers a learning-oriented assessment is achieved, which is highly beneficial for students.

Although one should expect to have more data to draw more firm conclusions, it seems that the methodology described is apt to be applied in more evaluation acts within the subjects presented (or in others), as well as at different formative levels in the field of the universities.
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