

# LEARNING ASSESSMENT IN THE EDUCATIONAL JUSTICE CONTEXT FOR THE POPULATION WITH DISABILITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION<sup>1</sup>

## *A AVALIAÇÃO DA APRENDIZAGEM NO CONTEXTO DA JUSTIÇA EDUCATIVA PARA POPULAÇÃO COM DEFICIÊNCIA NA EDUCAÇÃO SUPERIOR*

Jorge Iván Correa ALZATE<sup>2</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** The Tecnológico de Antioquia – University Institute, located in Colombia, has enabled access to its academic programmes without any restrictions to students with disabilities. A recurring issue in this process on the part of the professors has been the evaluation of the learning of these students. The dialogue with the professors has helped to understand that they did not know how to act with valorization learning due to the lack of knowledge in relation to the skills and abilities of students with disabilities, leading them to attribute a subjective assessment in the courses. In the same way, professors questioned their own performance in their field of work, once the students were graduated, because such situations demonstrated that the evaluation practices continue to be hegemonic. These facts gave motivation to undertake the research learning assessment analysis in students with disabilities who participate in different academic programmes. The hermeneutic phenomenological methodology was used with the aim of characterizing the learning assessment that professors carry out in different academic programs for students with disabilities. Five students participated in the study: one student with autism, one deaf, two with cognitive impairment and one with cerebral palsy, with impairment in mobility and verbal communication, and 78 professors from different academic programs. Results point out that the assessment is an educational opportunity for participation, which must be carried out in the context of educational justice, in order to transcend declarative knowledge, evoke student's reflection on the action and integrate the principles of the universal design of learning and the situated learning approach.

**KEYWORDS:** Special Education. Learning assessment. Inclusive Education.

**RESUMO:** a Instituição Universitária Tecnológico de Antioquia tem possibilitado o acesso a seus programas acadêmicos sem restrições aos estudantes com deficiência. Uma questão recorrente nesse processo por parte dos docentes tem sido a avaliação da aprendizagem desses estudantes. O diálogo com os professores possibilitou compreender que eles desconheciam como agir com a valorização da aprendizagem por não conhecerem as capacidades e as habilidades dos alunos com deficiência, levando-os a atribuir uma avaliação subjetiva nos cursos. De igual modo, os docentes questionavam o seu próprio desempenho no campo laboral, uma vez graduados, pois tais situações demonstraram que as práticas de avaliação seguem sendo hegemônicas. Esses fatos motivaram a realização da pesquisa *Análise da avaliação da aprendizagem em estudantes com deficiência participantes em diferentes programas acadêmicos*. A metodologia hermenêutica-fenomenológica foi usada com o propósito de caracterizar a avaliação da aprendizagem que os docentes realizam em diferentes programas acadêmicos para estudantes com deficiência. Participaram da pesquisa 5 estudantes, sendo: um estudante com autismo, um surdo, dois com deficiência cognitiva e um com paralisia cerebral, com comprometimento na mobilidade e na comunicação verbal, e 78 docentes de diferentes programas acadêmicos. Com a realização deste estudo, foi possível evidenciar que a avaliação é uma oportunidade educativa para a participação, a qual deve ser efetuada no contexto da justiça educativa, transcendendo conhecimentos declarativos, dando abertura à reflexão do estudante sobre a ação e integrando os princípios do desenho universal da aprendizagem e o enfoque da aprendizagem situada.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Educação Especial. Avaliação da Aprendizagem. Educação Inclusiva.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, Higher Education institutions face the challenge of 'educational attention to diversity', especially for historically excluded and discriminated groups. From the policy of Inclusive Higher Education in Colombia in the year 2013, it was possible to notice the

<sup>1</sup> <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1413-65382418000100008>

<sup>2</sup> Master in Educational Psychology and Bachelor in Didactics and Difficulties of School Learning. Tecnológico de Antioquia, Institución Universitaria, Medellín, Colombia. [jcorrea@tdea.edu.co](mailto:jcorrea@tdea.edu.co).

insertion of fundamental actions in educational opportunities, especially in relation to the access to education and how to define a percentage for the number of applications to the academic programs. Examples of this have been the enrollment subsidy, taking into account the native language of the indigenous students and Spanish as the second language of deaf people, as well as adjustments with ramps in the case of people with disabilities.

When relating these actions to educational policies worldwide, the Mato (2009) recommends that universities promote the dissemination of research and community, technological, scientific and humanistic development in order to boost, diversify and balance the regional development, as well as respect and promote interculturality among the organized communities of the state. The aim is to assist the students and seek to reduce the inequalities in congruence with four axes: health, legal framework, regional economic development and intercultural education, taking into account the structuring of the educational offer.

It is important that from the international context affirmative actions are promoted by institutions with a differential focus in coherence with the educational needs of recognized groups, whose right to education is violated to a greater degree, aiming at the equalization of opportunities. This opening implies the structuring of policies of attention to diversity, linked to the admission processes of universities (teaching, research and social projection), leading to the institutionalization of education with an inclusive approach and seeking the empowerment of administrators and academics to make decisions that take action related to accessibility, flexibility, relevance, equity and also make participation of academic programs feasible.

Thus, in the Tecnológico de Antioquia – University Institute there is an increase in the enrollment of deaf students, with autism and cognitive *impairment*, due to the implementation of some strategies in its policy of attention to diversity for students who recognize themselves as coming from minority groups, such as:

- For accessing academic programs, the interview is adapted to give conditions to people with disabilities, especially the deaf, with intellectual disability and autism; for students belonging to other minorities, the group interview is conducted without restriction in the enrollment.
- In the educational permanence, there is psychological support in processes of adaptation to the educational context, if necessary; flexibility in relation to the second language of indigenous and deaf students, and adaptation of assessments consistent with students' communicative systems.
- Prevention of situations of discrimination, implementing a campaign with the purpose of promoting respect for difference and harmonious coexistence among the educational community.

In addition, the educational community is invited to review and modify hegemonic approaches and evaluative practices in search of other humanistic ones that respond to the needs, interests and potentials of the students' diversities, taking on the challenge of not minimizing the curricula of the academic programs. This has been implied in the analysis of alternatives;

in this case, the revision of the professional profiles to be coherent with the dialogicity between the teaching of specific knowledge and the students' assessment.

The educational function of the institution goes beyond policies of access to student diversity or implementation of the inclusion approach. It is necessary to approach aspects that perpetuate exclusion and discrimination in the social sphere, how the imaginary and the expectations regarding learning work, and also to avoid problems taking on different shades inside the institution whereby a subject is discriminated and stigmatized. The proposal is to generate formative spaces to learn how to coexist with difference based on the potentialities of each one.

For an education to value and recognize the diversity of the students, it is necessary to assume teaching and assessment practices that respond to the learning possibilities of these students. Thus, the assessment is articulated to the teaching practice and evidences that the students are learning in a coherent and differentiated way from the teaching forms of the professor. This idea is related to Litwin's (1998, p. 2) argument: '[...] the place of assessment as the place that generates information of its own teaching proposal'. The pedagogical activity of the professor, therefore, concerns a curriculum that is usually imbricated to the area of knowledge proper to academic programs and to the organizational policies of educational institutions. According to Palou de Maté (2008, p. 98), '[...] to evaluate is to value what leads to a judgment of value according to axiological frameworks, aimed at performance. This implies approaching the object of knowledge, taking as its starting point its description, its understanding and its explanation'. The authors point out the importance of the pedagogical activity focused on an epistemic framework found in the curriculum and didactics to give meaning to the assessment as a responsible practice from what was taught by the professor and what was learned by the students.

Assessment should also be carried out in a fair way in relation to what was taught to students and what is expected from them. It is necessary to experience the harmony between teaching and learning, without trying to equate them, but, rather, put them into dialogicity between those who teach and those who learn. Palou de Maté (2008, p. 108) suggests that the assessment should be structured in a project with the following elements: '[...] the object to be assessed, the scientific field of reference of the object to be evaluated and the structure to have a framework of fixed references'.

These positions allow the search for relevant references to explain and justify the evaluation and design of an educational device, which, within the framework of educational justice, implies that the education system educate the students considering their specificities to act in freedom and in several areas of social life. This view contrasts '[...] with the approaches of equal opportunities and educational quality' (Veleda, Rivas, & Mezzadra, 2011, p. 64-65).

These conceptual visions collaborate so that the Tecnológico de Antioquia – University Institute considers the assessment as an ongoing process of guaranteeing the quality of teaching and learning in its academic programs, consistent with the formative model of sociocritical type. In addition, it gives meaning to disciplinary knowledge and to the appropriation of the postulates of assessment of procedural, formative and contextualized character; facilitates the valorization of learning processes and results, carried out in a permanent, dynamic, continuous,

holistic, flexible, cooperative, dialogical, personalizing, qualitative, systematic, objective and procedural way, with a respectful attitude toward the other, in which the feedback in relation to what, why, what for, when and how to assess as systematic action prevails.

## 2 METHODOLOGY

This research was carried out for two years. The hermeneutic phenomenological approach was used to analyze the learning assessment of students with disabilities who participate in different academic programs. The learning assessment as the object of study is assumed and the facts of the evaluative practice constitute elements of interpretation, aimed at both the professor and the student. The unit of analysis is of situational character that discusses the learning assessment implemented by professors for students with disabilities in academic programs in a Higher Education institution.

In order to reach the results, the group discussion technique was implemented, carried out separately between professors, students and families, fulfilling the criterion of the members not knowing each other to enable greater transparency in the information that was intended to be analyzed. There were 9 discussion spaces with professors, organized into six different groups; five with students; and two with families. The meetings were held every two months with the professors to take time to implement actions and reflect on its execution, one at the beginning of the term and another at the end. Meetings were also held with the students and their families at the beginning and end of the research. In all cases, the acceptance was obtained, and the free consent term was signed in agreement with the Institution's Ethics Committee.

The research approach was guided by two characteristics: open spaces to speeches, in order to allow the participants to tell their experiences; and the need to reach a consensus - both mediated by dialogue for the construction of meanings. In these groups, it was proposed to the professors to discuss the evaluative experiences of the learning of students with disabilities; it was proposed to the students to discuss how they were taught and evaluated by their professors; and to the families about the outcome of their children's learning. Between one discussion group and another, three professionals with training in educational processes for people with disabilities who knew how to handle the proposal of the universal design for learning gave support according to the demands of the professors and the students' needs.

During the two years of the research, 78 professors (69 MSc and 9 PhD) participated: 11 from the Education area, 6 from the Social area, 20 from Engineering, 5 from Law, 33 from Administration and 3 from Medical school. Of the total, 15 were taking a Bachelor's degree (thus, not in the teaching area). In this course, there is an inclusive education module; however, in the other courses of the other 63 participants (Administration, Mathematics and Engineering) - there are no elements of Pedagogy, nor attention to diversity.

The students with disabilities who participated in this research were enrolled in different academic programs, namely:

- Two students in Information and Communication Technologies, one with autism and the other with cognitive impairment.

- One deaf student who used Colombian sign language in a teaching degree in Basic Education, with an emphasis on Humanities and Spanish language.
- Two students in Systems Engineering, one with cerebral palsy and another with cognitive impairment.

Among the 5 families of students with disabilities, three of them have Higher Education and two completed High School. Despite the reliability of the information (ensuring the confidentiality of the research participants), it is important to note that the situations in the discussion groups were pertinent to the study object, validated through a consensus between the results of the situations in relation to the learning assessment.

### 3 RESULTS

In the development of the discussion groups, it was possible to notice the consensus between the statements of the participants of the first two groups. In the first and second groups, the discussions with the professors made it possible to recognize that they attribute subjective valorization to the results of students with disabilities, without being clear about the learning achievement. They thought about the learning performance of these students and how they could be professionals after graduating from university.

In the third discussion group, the contributions of the members allowed to identify that the assessment practice is hegemonic. They use the same strategies for all students. The only difference was for deaf students who were evaluated with the help of a sign-language interpreter during class. In the fourth and fifth groups, they discussed how to assess these students; and from the sixth onwards, they reflected on their experiences, which initially focused on conceptual learning and culminated in a reflection on the professional practices of the graduates.

The discussion group with the students showed that they do not understand what to do in relation to written works such as reviews, essays and papers. Nowadays, this difficulty has been overcome due to access to instruction classes and academic norms that help to overcome difficulties regarding scientific writing. In addition, regarding the scientific presentations, they pointed out that sometimes they do well and sometimes they do not. The consensus with the group allowed to identify that there is no knowledge of the strategies to be used in the productions, being the verbal type, the one that presents greater difficulties.

The family group has the expectation centered on their children having a university degree. Family members fear that their children will drop out of the program if they do not succeed in program proposals. One of the families (F2) said:

To go to school, they told me that he needed someone to monitor him, to be his mentor/his support, and, to help him, and I went to school with him every day; [...] at university, I thought it would be the same. It took me long to understand that my son could develop on his own and that I should give him the opportunity to learn quickly to do things.

In this sense, participating in this experience was useful for family members to realize that some strategies were equally valid.

In this group discussion formed of the families, several moments of experiences were recognized, which were given in a chronological sequence, especially in the case of students with cognitive impairment: denial of the diagnosis, since it is considered that it is only a matter of slowness in learning; followed by the fear that the children will be suspended from the institution because they do not reach the expected results in the program; the tendency to control learning, focused on results. At the same time, overprotection is manifested, consistent with the practices of creation; and also modification in monitoring, allowing more autonomy to the children and to trust in what they can carry out independently. To illustrate, one of the young people with autism stated: 'I didn't use to go to the library (the public library involved taking a bus of a different route from the one to return home), my mother would say: "You might get lost and how will I find you?"; I don't know". The student was guided by a map and a graphic plan on how to get to the library and how to get home without having to return to university, and also how to use the cell phone in case of getting lost. Now, the student enjoys the public library several afternoons a week.

In the assessment practices of the professors, the use of vocational languages in the fields of education of each academic program predominates, which implies an approach for the students to access a particular language in spaces outside the classrooms, to facilitate the access to information and knowledge. In this case, a dictionary with the technical names of the program was carried out, based on the use of pictograms for the processing of information and mental maps to favor the synthesis process. All situations are accompanied by the student's reflection on the action taken.

At the beginning of the process, pedagogical communication was characterized as limited. The majority of teachers (51) believed that they were certain of what was happening to the process of information appropriation of their students; they considered that the learning outcomes were determined according to the strategy used in the assessment, whether oral or written. In the discussion groups, they agreed to understand the student's thinking through hypotheses, questions, reflections and assumptions. The implementation of this action allowed complementing the evaluative strategy with the recognition of reflexive thinking and evidencing processes of understanding conceptual knowledge with students own words; besides, it has favored communication between peers.

In the third discussion group with professors, it was observed that the evaluation of situations proposed by the learning valorization considered the performances in the different tests as the only criterion and that the results were a problem of student learning rather than teaching. The transformation of this conception occurred in the process of including four strategies: environment centered on trust, giving time for information processing; and space to listen to the student with disabilities, without judging him/her, in order to reflect on the action from what he/she performs; observation by the systematic register that allowed to account for particular conditions of the student; and periodic analysis and feedback after teaching each subject rather than at the end of the course.

Professors began to see student learning focusing on the limitations of disability. Then, they associated these difficulties with the visual or auditory learning channels, and, later, the potential of learning without being associated to the disability. This change of conception was due to the systematicity of the follow-up until it came at a time when they rejected their proposals and started to organize new proposals and strategies.

Students have become familiar with learning strategies to minimize trial-error practices and ensure speed in information processing. This means that strategies are a teaching object. In relation to that, one professor (D13) expressed:

He has shown me that he is no less capable than others, that he is capable and that, although it is known that he is a person with disability, he cannot be treated as such, but as a person like any other so that he strives and he is not prevented by his disability. That was my learning.

This experience shows that changes occurred in the conceptions.

The professional practices of the students is one of the education processes that worries the professors. A structure was defined in order to articulate the requirements to the learning possibilities: in the first cycle, the guided practice is established, with guides for its application, centered on the potentialities of the student. The result of this action is learned in the process inherent in practice; there is continuity with the generalization of this learning to other contexts, companies, institutions or communities, with tutor monitoring; self-control and self-assessment of students' performance that culminate in autonomous practices in which he/she plans, executes and evaluates the process and outcome, as well as the co-evaluation of a peer and the hetero-evaluation of his/her course professor.

#### 4 DISCUSSION

The evaluation practice has a theoretical construct that guides it, being evident in the curriculum and related to an institutional policy to support the academic programs. In addition, it implies mastery of the subject to be taught, commitment to students' learning, open mentality to the possibilities of the other, in order to recognize their individual processes, their expectations and achievements. For this, criteria that focus on teaching and learning are needed, free of prejudice due to the personal, social and cultural conditions of the students. It is assumed that, in teacher education, assessment is, in itself, a learning process for the professor, since he/she has the possibility to reflect on his/her pedagogical activity, to give meaning, to research and to carry out new constructions. This is consistent with the responsibility that the institution assumes in relation to the knowledge and practices of the population that comes from contexts of greater social vulnerability to construct educational opportunities.

Evaluation as a practice should transcend the valorization of the results of the courses in academic programs, not only for people with disabilities, but for all students. Few professors evaluate the process, as they do not know that it is possible to perceive the progress of students valuing their own pace in relation to learning. In addition, the application of tools for learning is repetitive. In this regard, Morales and Zambrano (2016, p. 17), when consulting the evaluation instruments of the process, point out that '[...] the professors' answers focus on those instruments destined to a final or summative evaluation, with grades developed as a way

of evaluating to what extent learning was achieved'. The authors point out that in the selection of procedures and their application, the attitude that is assumed towards knowledge plays an important role, because in some cases, it is necessary to verify what the professor has taught and not what the student has learned. Therefore, it is necessary to include strategies of teaching and evaluation pertinent to the forms of conceptual and communicative representation. Alfageme-Gonzalez, Miralles Martínez, & Monteagudo Fernández (2015, p 577) explain that '[...] professors need to apply a wide variety of instruments to evaluate correctly. For this, they use qualitative evaluation procedures, although they are subjective and consider that the examination is the most objective instrument'. In this way, the key is in the selection of instruments that respond to the real possibilities of the students.

The evaluation practices acquire meaning when the professor reflects on them for the self-regulation of their own teaching, in order to project it in the valorization of the significant learning of their students. Suárez Vallejo (2014, p. 54) expresses that '[...] from the teaching experiences, it is the opportunity to show to the teacher that he/she must be protagonist, propositive, in search of alternatives for the challenges that are imposed on the school'. These intentions should have institutional support. In this sense, Correa, Bedoya, and Agudelo (2015, p. 58) state that '[...] the confidence given to the teacher in the monitoring is an element to be claimed and gives him/her security to act with greater assertiveness'. Therefore, the institutional proposal and the learning assessment guidelines take into account conceptual and practical elements that give them an identity in their implementation, namely:

- Curriculum: defines, in the teaching cycle, processes of contextualization, internalization, application, transference and socialization of knowledge, allowing the professor not to focus on the orientation of one of them, but he/she favors the learning process of any student.
- Teaching: assumes as a starting point the consensus between the goals to guide relevant concepts and apply strategies that allow the student to re-signify knowledge; the evaluation focused on real situations allows the subject to acquire knowledge, relying on the use of pictograms and graphic organizers. Mind maps have been most significant in applying to students with disabilities and favoring other students in classrooms. Rojo and Chaverra's (2017, p. 188) results contribute to this reflection:

The effectiveness is highlighted in the use of the strategies of both the mental map and the pictogram, since they allow the graphical representation of the learned and facilitate the contextualization when necessary. In addition, it favors the ability of reflection, synthesis and understanding, allowing them to advance in the more complex cognitive processes.

In this process, the observation establishes itself as an evaluation technique to recognize learning in students who do not do it explicitly, through verbal descriptions - this is the case of deaf students and students with autism.

- Learning: teaching and assessment strategies are object of learning and, when they are familiarized by the subjects, they go to higher levels of knowledge. The rhythm of the student and the concentration in the action is also taken into account. In the implementation of the formative assessment model, the narrative strategy is important



in recognizing the reflection of the action and identify learning, what is being successful or needs to be more qualified.

- Curriculum flexibility: maintaining the assessment criteria proposed by the general group with numerous strategies that favor learning that is consistent with the abilities of students with disabilities.
- Dialogic learning: it is a way of favoring learning in contexts and disadvantaged sectors, it helps to overcome linguistic limitations that are recognized by the limitations of the context. Learning is built on the communicative interaction among peers (student\ student, student\professor).

Correa and Restrepo (2017, p. 65) state that,

[...] through the use of language, dialogues among all people are allowed, leading to elaborate changes in education, in the way knowledge is taught and made known, in these societies consisting of understanding and accepting the difference of the other, this is a transformative element of education in favor of equality because it aims for solidarity among all people.

In this proposal, the equalization of educational opportunities offered to people with disabilities is an issue that requires evaluations. In this case, the institution, from the research presented here, is based on five approaches:

- Rights: the need to make reasonable adjustments to guarantee the right to education without exclusion or discrimination.
- Situated learning: knowledge linked to the real world and everyday life of students.
- Learning potential: recognize the real possibilities of solving context problems and guide the strategies that lead students to be protagonists in solving the proposed activities.
- Assessment dynamics: review the teaching and learning process to identify what and how to learn.
- Autonomous learning: assessment is itself a learning experience for professors and students. For the former, it becomes clear how he/she is teaching, and for the latter, what he/she is meaningfully learning, generating processes of self-regulation in both.

The practice of evaluation as a proposal to advance the construction of a fairer education system should recognize the performance expectations of students with disabilities related to academic performance, articulated to the professional profile, free of prejudice due to personal, social and cultural conditions, prevailing the capacity over limitation. In addition, the articulated evaluation to teaching allows guiding and valuing processes such as internalization, application, transfer and socialization of knowledge.

Resignifying evaluation, taking into consideration the diversity of the students, implies the look at two directions: who is excluded from learning and the effective teaching conditions. Both have implications for the curriculum, so that they promote skills-oriented

practices, guiding strategies through empowerment that enable people to recover, overlap, and successfully adapt to the adversity generated by situations of exclusion or discrimination.

In this sense, emancipatory education is ratified by the recognition of groups in society that have been marginalized and have experienced inequalities in relation to the right to education. It is necessary, therefore, to overcome the professionalizing view of evaluation, in a way that relates the learning situations and the demands of the work context to the expectations and learning possibilities of each student. In addition, what is taught and assessed has applicability in working life. Regarding that, Valassina et al (2014, p. 152) established that:

The relevance or social relevance of education requires that it is designed and implemented according to a logical sequence of components that incorporate both the social demands and the institutional mission in a harmonic and feasible form of putting into practice in certain curricular structures.

Assessment will have to focus more on the pedagogical processes that guide the professors and the dynamics of the class, in order to analyze the effectiveness of teaching in relation to student's learning. It implies '[...] reflecting on what enables the success of the student, what difficulties are observed, how they are faced and how to improve teaching practice' (Correa, 2010, p. 71).

Assessment, from this perspective of equity and justice, enables the ontological understanding, in order to interpret, reconstruct and self-evaluate the practice of assessment directed at the students that have traditionally been excluded from the educational system or that, by personal, cultural or social conditions are object of discrimination and underestimating skills. Assessment will have to respond to the possibilities of all students and value knowledge, skills and knowledge practices.

By transcending educational justice, it is possible to construct it. This is evidenced in research on three fronts: attention to the needs in the inclusion of some knowledge of minority groups such as written Spanish as a second language for deaf students. In this case, this reflects on the participation of students with disabilities in relation to their autonomy, without depending on their families. The consensus of strategies for intercultural dialogue in order to harmonize curriculum and education entails recognizing the ways in which each one communicates with the curriculum. And, also, the pedagogical accompaniment of professors, the implementation and sustainability of counter-hegemonic curricula, aspects that are still under discussion in the work with the professors' collective. In this sense, Suárez Vallejo (2017, p. 125) states:

[...] the problem of social justice in the educational field continues to be the object of research, since it is necessary to find alternatives to obtain the guarantee of educational practices that allow the access, permanence, graduation and projection for the labor inclusion of the students who are in situation of vulnerability.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions are presented in line with the purpose of the investigation, which was to analyze the learning assessment of students with disabilities who participate in different academic programs. Through the hermeneutic phenomenological approach, it was found that assessment is a consequence of the posture of fair teaching, articulating teaching and learning,

without intending to equate them, but putting them in dialogue with the one who teaches and how he/she teaches and with the one who learns and how he/she learns.

Assessment is assumed as a sociocultural practice, which is not exclusive to Higher Education. The teaching role has its own connotations such as valued learning, with the application of models, definition of criteria, use of results and self-assessment about the teaching of contents established in the curriculum, without ignoring the validity of the evaluation.

The assessment, focused on tangible and observable productions in the student is, according to the majority of the professors in this research, the one that takes into account more flexible strategies according to the capacities of all in order to establish the relation between the professional profile and the individual performance to guarantee access to work.

The professional profile is no longer a concern when the teaching process is guided by strategies that allow the student to understand the object of knowledge of the academic program and recognize the possibilities of transference to professional performance, centered on the abilities and opportunities given by the context; without ignoring that it must be mediated in learning situations that facilitate participation in academic programs for future work performance.

The proposal is to guarantee the participation and the learning of all the students, respecting the rhythms of knowledge appropriation of each one. This practice requires constant monitoring in the learning process and the implementation of pedagogical support when necessary, in order to prevent students from failing.

Also, it is necessary to promote a mentorship of opinion, a fact that gives greater security to the student with disability when the student can move from one level to another with his/her classmates - when the student with disability is permanently connected to a stable group of classmates, attending the academic program, the possibility of adaptation and being more confident in his/her learning is better.

Finally, as a research product, it is possible to say that the institution has promoted the learning assessment taking into account attention to diversity in Higher Education with open invitation to professors; in its structure, besides guiding the practices in the concept of the universal design for the learning articulated to the teaching of the disciplinary knowledge. However, institutional challenges remain, as assessment is a process that requires constant reflection on how to articulate it to learning in order to promote self-determination as a learning process in students with disabilities so that they are prepared for autonomous professional performance.

## REFERENCES

- Alfageme-González, M. B., Miralles Martínez, P., & Monteagudo Fernández, J. (2015). Cómo evalúa el profesorado de Geografía e Historia de Enseñanza Secundaria. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 26(3), 571-589.
- Correa, J. I. (2010). Evaluación psicopedagógica en el contexto de atención a la diversidad. *Revista Senderos Pedagógicos*, 1, 67-74.
- Correa, J. I., Bedoya, S., & Agudelo, G. (2015). Formación de docentes participantes en el programa de educación inclusiva con calidad en Colombia. *Revista Latinoamérica de Educación Inclusiva*, 9(1), 43-61.

- Correa, J. I., & Restrepo, N. (2017). *Modelo para la atención a la diversidad en el Tecnológico de Antioquia centrado en la justicia educativa y la equiparación de oportunidades*. Medellín: Sello Editorial Tecnológico de Antioquia.
- Litwin, E. (1998). *La evaluación: Campo de controversias y paradojas o un lugar para la nueva enseñanza*. Retrieved July 3, 2017 (Available from <https://ciie-r10.wikispaces.com/file/view/Edith+Litwin.pdf>).
- Mato, D (2009). Educación Superior, Colaboración Intercultural y Desarrollo Sostenible /Buen Vivir: Experiencias En América Latina, Modalidades de Colaboración, Logros, Innovaciones, Obstáculos Y Desafíos. In D. Mato (Ed.), *Educación Superior, Colaboración Intercultural y Desarrollo Sostenible / Buen Vivir: Experiencias en América Latina* (pp. 11-64). Caracas: UNESCO. Rerieved July 25, 2017 (Available from [www.iesalc.unesco.org.ve/dmdocuments/biblioteca/libros/version\\_final.pdf](http://www.iesalc.unesco.org.ve/dmdocuments/biblioteca/libros/version_final.pdf)).
- Morales, S., & Zambrano, H. (2016). Coherencia evaluativa en formación universitaria por competencias: Estudio en futuros educadores en Chile. *Revista Infancias e imágenes*, 15(1), 9-26.
- Palou de Maté, M. del C. (2008). La evaluación de las prácticas docentes y la autoevaluación. In A. R. W. de Camilloni, S. Celman, E. Litwin, & M. del C. Paulo de Maté (Eds.), *La evaluación de los aprendizajes en el debate contemporáneo* (pp. 93-132). Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Rojo, J., & Chaverra, J. (2017). El mapa mental y los pictogramas, estrategias de aprendizaje visual en niños y niñas con discapacidad intelectual. In J. I. Correa Alzate, P. P. Moncada, N. Restrepo & N. S. Benitez (Eds.), *Una mirada a la diversidad desde los lenguajes, las representaciones y las mediaciones pedagógicas* (pp. 183-191). Medellín: Sello Editorial Tecnológico de Antioquia.
- Suárez Vallejo, J. P. (2014). Una experiencia de investigación en torno a la inclusión educativa. *Revista Uni-pluri/versidad*, 13(2), 52-60.
- Suárez Vallejo, J. P. (2017). Apartado II Equidad y justicia social: Categorías necesarias para abordar la vulnerabilidad. In J. I. Correa Alzate, P. P. Moncada, N. Restrepo & N. S. Benitez (Eds.), *Aportes a la comprensión de la vulnerabilidad educativa y social: Identidad y equiparación de oportunidades* (pp. 123-127). Medellín: Sello Editorial Tecnológico de Antioquia.
- Valassina, F., Letelier, P., Sandoval, M. J., Maldonado, A. C., Moreno, M., & Fonseca, G. (2014). Propuesta de un modelo orientador para la evaluación de aprendizajes en carreras universitarias. In Centro Interuniversitario de Desarrollo, *Evaluación del aprendizaje en innovaciones curriculares de la educación superior* (pp. 149-190). Santiago: Centro Interuniversitario de Desarrollo. Retrieved July 24, 2017 (Available from <https://www.cinda.cl/download/libros/2014%20%20Evaluaci%C3%B3n%20de%20los%20aprendizajes.pdf>).
- Veleda, C., Rivas, A., & Mezzadra, F. (2011). *La construcción de la justicia educativa: Criterios de redistribución y reconocimiento para la educación Argentina*. Buenos Aires: CIPPEC, UNICEF.

---

Received on: 01/19/2018

Reformulated on: 02/09/2018

Accepted on: 02/15/2018