This document presents detailed examples of four courses studied at Gordon College and Beit Berl College that employ alternative methods for evaluating the students in the course. After describing the four courses, we will present additional selected examples of alternative evaluation tools used to evaluate the students in other courses at these colleges.

Example #1: Formative Evaluation in the Course “Diagnosis and Teaching of Arithmetic in the Elementary Grades” (in the Special Education Department)

**Course description**

The course enables students to learn and gain experience in the diagnosis and teaching of arithmetic for school students in special education. During the course, the students engage in frontal learning in the classroom, while at the same time gaining experience of teaching special education students who come to the college once a week for an hour and a half. The students help the school students with the problems they encounter in arithmetic, in coordination with the class teacher, parents, consultant, and the principal. In addition to the class lecturer, the students are supervised by two instructors from the college, one in the field of arithmetic and the other in reading.

**Goal of the course**

The goal of the course is to develop the following fields of knowledge and skills among the students: Identifying types of diagnoses; understanding different aspects of the concept of the number as the basis for the development of arithmetical knowledge in early childhood; an ability to diagnose using whole numbers; organizing arithmetical themes with reference to the curriculum; familiarization with learning strategies in mathematics; familiarization with ways to undertake diagnosis (dynamic and static); and ability to analyze findings and write recommendations for a work plan.

**Method of evaluation of the students**

In order to evaluate the knowledge and expertise the students have acquired during the course, a table was prepared to enable the lecturers who instruct the students (including in the workshops) to evaluate cumulative knowledge. Students are required to complete the table by themselves, with the goal of nurturing independent learning skills. The evaluation of the students by the course lecturer takes place immediately after the completion of each of the tasks include in the table, by awarding a numerical grade and textual feedback. The students are required to complete the following table of tasks:

In this table, the students record in each lesson which tasks they worked on, according to the required subjects:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Subject | Date submitted | Weighting in final grade | Grade and feedback  |
| 1 | Writing extended background about the child |  | 5 pts. |  |
| 2 | Diagnosis + writing findings  |  | 10 pts. |  |
| 3 | Writing a work plan  |  | 20 pts. |  |
| 4 | Cumulative knowledge tableImpression of progressing in writing plans (acc. to parameters determined by the individual instructors).Reflective summary – individual or pair |  | 15 pts.10 pts.10 pts. |  |
| 5 | General impression of the student’s conduct: Attendance at all sessions with the child and training sessions; proactive request for instruction/guidance when needed; implementing guidance and material studied in lesson in practice itself; compliance with deadlines for submission of plans and reports; observing rules of behavior during practice; bringing relevant materials to lesson; ability to work in a team. |  | 30 pts. |  |

Example #2: Concluding evaluation of the project based learning (PBL) process in the course “Self-Awareness in Learning Processes” (in the Early Childhood Department)

**Description of the course and the PBL method**

This course was developed on the basis of the problem (or project) based learning method (PBL). This method is based on active and participatory learning, including the completion of a process of inquiry relating to an outcome-oriented project or problem that motivates the students’ activities. Learning in the course requires the completion of complex tasks whose outcome is a tangible deliverable such as a model, policy document, presentation, and so forth. The students introduce their deliverable to an audience (presentation), explain it, defend it, and engage in reflection on the learning process (Zohar, 2014). This method requires several basic conditions entailing a change in the teacher’s status: An autonomous teacher who shapes curricula according to their interest and that of the students; active and thought-rich learning by students, whereby the teacher’s role changes from the transmitted of knowledge to a guide; new and relevant evaluation methods that encourage a complex deliverable (project); and processes of investigative learning, personal and group cooperation.

**The goal of the course**

The goal of the course is to expose the students to learning focusing on problems and dilemmas; to provide familiarity with the developmental process of the learner and the complexity of the various factors that influence learning; an understanding of the process required for the purpose of learning for understanding; the implementation of processes that influence learning; and experience using the active learning method. At the end of the course the students will be capable of composing a productive question; raising problems that require solution in the field; proposing a project that provides a response to their questions; presenting to the class both the process and the finished deliverable; and documenting learning in an academic report.

**Method of evaluation of the students**

During the course the students are required to engage in regular reading of relevant materials; to develop a project through a cooperative process; and to present a rationale and project based on the models and the theoretical background they have studied. Student evaluation is divided into two key components:

1. The cooperative work process in the class and developing the project: 50%.

2. Submitting and presenting a rationale and project based on the models studied and on reading material: 50%.

The first component is based on the evaluation of the cooperative process and the student’s ability to work in a team in order to help their group (and other groups) to make progress. This process is examined by the instructor on an ongoing basis in each lesson and recorded in the table of attendance and social functions. The evaluated parameters relate to involvement and cooperativeness, positive and progress-oriented communication with peers in the group; the ability to work in a term and impart knowledge to others, and so forth.

The second component is based on the evaluation of the project submitted by each group. The project includes a review of the literature, evaluation indices for the project, a detailed description of the work process, collective and individual reflection on the process, etc. The submitted project is evaluated as follows:

Since the grade is individual, every student receives the grade awarded to their group for the project, with the addition of 50% relating to their personal conduct, based on the above-mentioned criteria, such as cooperation, participation, listening, and helping their group and other groups over the course of the semester.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Subject | Date submitted | Weighting in final grade |
| 1 | Selection of criterion (overall goal) from two models learned in the course (the self-awareness of learning processes model and the self-direction in learning model) and defining the subject of the project. |  | 5 pts. |
| 2 | Writing a rationale based on articles (summaries according to APA rules). |  | 25 pts. |
| 3 | Describing the stages of the process according to the selected process, including writing detailed goals for each stage in the process. |  | 30 pts. |
| 4 | Reflection on the learning process according to rubrics, addressing the six “A” questions for shaping a successful project.Recommendation: integrative writing including the components of self-directed learning (cognition, metacognition, motivation, behavioral-motivational factors) and the personal process undergone during the course.  |  | 10 pts. |
| 5 | List of bibliographical sources according to APA rules. |  | 5 pts. |
| 6 | Discussion of the way the presentation will be undertaken and criteria for evaluating the project and the deliverable for the community. |  | 20 pts. |
| 7 | General impression of the work process in the spirit of cooperative and participatory self-learning. |  | 5 pts. |

Example #3: Evaluation rubrics (for video clip deliverables) developed jointly with the learners in the course “Evaluating Teaching Processes” (an in-service training course for teachers)

**Course description**

This course discusses teaching processes in the classroom using video clips recorded by the participating teachers in their classes. The course is intended for elementary school teachers and is conducted using the distance learning method (synchronic online course) using video lectures (blackboard) together with video clips that the teachers record in their classes, upload to the lesson, and analyze together. The learning in the course is characterized by learning through joint action and through discourse and analysis relating to the participant’s own deliverables and those of others. The teachers learn through participatory and self-investigative learning and develop diverse skills, such as entrepreneurship, creative thinking, investigation, asking questions, self-directed learning, and participatory dialogue.

**The goals of the course**

This course has four key goals: 1) To expose the teachers to the essence of meaningful learning processes for teachers and school students, such as: the question of the importance of the order of processes conveyed in the classroom, conditions for cognitive processes that develop metacognition, processes that reinforce motivation to learning, etc. 2) Developing self-awareness as a factor promoting meaningful learning. 3) Nurturing profound thought in learning and teaching, and experience in evaluating authentic teaching processes. 4) Promoting and deepening practice relating to the analysis of learning processes.

**Method of evaluation of the students**

The students in the course are required to upload video clips and to participate in the process of analyzing the clips (50%); to prepare rubrics for evaluation to be used in evaluating the clips uploaded by the teachers, in order to implement peer evaluation, and thereby also improve the evaluation rubrics, which are a secondary deliverable of the course (40%); and to participate actively in the sessions (10%). Evaluation of the teaching deliverables (the video clips) is undertaken by means of peer evaluation, using criteria for evaluating their functioning and for self-evaluation of the functioning of students and teachers in the class. The evaluation criteria are as follows:

• Mediation of knowledge was undertaken

• Several fields of knowledge were integrated

• The lessons clearly reflect cognitive flexibility in teaching and learning – ability is shown to use ancillary materials, such as books, computers, and professionals, while exercising discretion

• A creative approach to the subject

• Illustration

• Developing self-direction in learning – the teacher functions as a guide (allowing the students to ask / think / answer by themselves)

• Dividing work among the students themselves through cooperation – the teacher’s function as a facilitator

• Active and cooperative dialogue – asking questions to stimulate thought

• Direction to thought through exploration (leading the children in thinking rather than thinking for them)

• Leaving space for trial and error

• Meeting timetables – proper and efficient management of time, including weekly progress toward the outcome

• Reviewing the literature according to the project content, conveying the message to the community, developing a project with added value

• Ability to write and integrate texts; punctuation, separation into paragraphs, citing references

• Experience in producing a deliverable. Experience in the process, including reflection and drawing conclusions about the process

• Ability to evaluate during the course of the work, relating to what was said to me, my actions, and the task

• Reflective ability on completing the task

• Empowerment from the students

Example #4: Evaluation using an alternative task set in the course “Evaluation of Educational Programs and Projects” (in the MA track in Planning and Evaluation of Studies)

**Course description**

The course addresses basic concepts relating to the evaluation of educational projects and programs, exposing the students to key components in the evaluation process and in the work of the evaluator. The course employs a hybrid method combining frontal lessons and distance learning lessons (using the Moodle system). The teaching in the course is undertaken using lectures, distributing articles and chapters for reading, uploading concluding presentations, undertaking tasks that support learning, including group discussions, and so forth.

**The goals of the course**

The goals of the course are: 1) To raise awareness among the learners about the importance of evaluating educational programs and projects in frameworks in the education system. 2) To provide theoretical and methodological knowledge in planning and executing the evaluation of curricula and educational projects. 3) To develop basic evaluation skills relating to the function of the evaluator. 4) To raise awareness of the standards to be met by an evaluator.

**Method of evaluating the students**

During the course the students are required to undertake various tasks relating to different aspects of their learning, in an effort to connect the theoretical knowledge they have acquired to practices relating to the evaluator’s work in the field. Some of the evaluation tasks are undertaken individual and others as a group. The students are required to complete the tasks during the course, save them as an individual kit, and submit the kit at the end of the course. At the beginning of the course the students are given a file including the list of tasks comprising the kit and the relative weight of each task in the final grade. The tasks are alternative evaluation tasks, some of which have an authentic character and are relevant to practice, while others are based on the learner’s personal connection to various themes and cognitive tasks on a high thought level (such as preparing a map of concepts). One of the tasks requires peer evaluation, and at the end of the course each student is required to submit a written personal reflection relating to the learning process in the course. Evaluation rubrics are attached to the course tasks, helping the students to understand what is expected of them and enabling the lecturer and students to implement evaluation on the basis of clear criteria.

**The rationale behind presenting a number of “small” tasks, undertaken during the course, rather than a single “large” project at the end, is based on several considerations:**

1) Creating an ongoing learning process throughout the course, leading to the inculcation of the content and serving as a foundation for the following content of the course;

2) Enabling the use of diverse evaluation tools with different characteristics, reflecting the variance among the learners and the adaptation of different tools for different goals. This approach also enables the evaluation of a wider range of content and skills;

3) Students enjoy several opportunities to demonstrate their achievements and abilities, since the grade is not based on a single task (even if they are less successful in one task, this does not significantly damage their grade);

4) Formative evaluation for teaching enabling the lecturer to receive feedback during the course itself. The students’ comments and the difficulties then encounter may help the lecturer to identify difficulties in understanding the material and to adjust their teaching accordingly (whether by providing additional explanations and examples for the class as a whole, making various changes to the task itself, or providing individual assistance to students who have encountered difficulties);

5) Meeting a minimum basket of criteria. The students must gain a “pass” grade in each of their tasks, thereby controlling the quality of learning in the course in components that the lecturer has defined as vital and essential in the area.

**Details of the course tasks (and the weight of each task in the final grade):**

⭘ Task #1 – developing a **map of concepts (10%)**

 In this task the students were asked to read a chapter from a book discussing the social and historical context of the concept of evaluation. The chapter includes a large number of concepts relating to different periods, figures, perceptions, and approaches. The students were required to develop a map of concepts including 20 concepts (10 of which were given to them as “compulsory concepts” and 10 additional concepts they were asked to extract from the chapter). They were given the rubrics for evaluating the map of concepts (see appendix) together with the instructions for the task.

 The students developed a hierarchical map of concepts, including key concepts, secondary concepts, arrows linking the different concepts, and connecting words/phrases on the arrows. This process required the students to gain a profound understanding of the various concepts, and particularly of the relationships between them. The students must also undertake analysis in order to locate the key concepts and the derived secondary concepts, and finally undertake synthesis in order to present all the concepts as a single coherent system. The students are also required to distinguish between principal and secondary details and to show a high level of conceptualization regarding the connections between the concepts.

 The process of preparing the map in itself often leads the student to “self-discussion,” prevarications, doubts, re-readings of the chapter, deletions, and numerous attempts to produce a product that meets the requirements. The students’ reports show that while the task requires a considerable cognitive effort, after developing the map they have a sense of satisfaction and enjoyment with their success in meeting the challenge, and feel that they have a much deeper understanding of the chapter than they would have if they had not prepared the map.

 ⭘ Task #2 (individual) – **composing a focused question (5%) and answering a peer’s question (10%)**

In this task the students were asked to read an article and compose an open question focusing on a high level of thought, the answer to which is around half a page of text. The questions were presented to the forum on the course website, so that they were exposed to all the students. A week later, the students were asked to choose and answer one of the questions composed by their peers.

 This task is based on the perception that in order to ask a question (and particularly in the case of questions at a high level of thought), you must understand what you are asking. To this end, the students were required to read the article and understand it thoroughly. However, the approach that it is the students who raise the questions, rather than the lecturer, shifts the responsibility to the learners and allows them to connect to relevant issues that interest them. The basic difference between a passive learner (who is the subject and recipient of evaluation) and an active learner (who plays an active role in shaping evaluation) motivates processes of meaningful and more relevant learning, enhances motivation among the learners, and creates possibilities to make learning more accessible and more responsive to the high level of variance in the class.

 The **element of choice** granted to the students, both in composing their question and in answering a question raised by a peer in the course, is an important and meaningful component in the students’ experience of performing evaluation tasks. Students who are given an opportunity to choose feel that they bear responsibility, are trusted, and are recognized as committed to making an informed choice. In most cases this improves motivation, satisfaction, and the desire to complete the evaluation task to a high standard.

⭘ Task #3 + #4 (group) – **authentic tasks (25%).**

 These two tasks were given as group tasks, with the goal of stimulating discussion and multidimensional thought, and of raising diverse proposals for solutions. In the first task the students were asked to analyze an evaluation report according to conceptual dimensions. In the second, they were required to compose evaluation questions based on the CIPP model studied in the course. These two tasks give students a chance to experience the work of an evaluator in practice, complementing their study of the theories that underlie this work. The connection to the daily work of evaluators makes these tasks authentic, relevant, and practical. The transition from theory to practice cannot be taken for granted, and must be experienced in order to provide the learner with a first opportunity to bridge these two dimensions.

⭘ Task #5 (individual) – **developing a “theory of the program” (10%) + peer evaluation (5%).**

 In this task the students were first asked to draw the “theory of the program” – a concept they studied in one of the lessons. This term basically refers to a type of flowchart presenting the status quo and showing the components of the program that are expected to exert an influence and create the desire situation. The students are required to show a thorough understanding of the existing and the desired reality, and of the possible theoretical components that could lead to change. Naturally, there is no single correct answer for the diagram the students are required to draw. However, any diagram must show a solid rationale. All the diagrams are uploaded onto the forum on the website, and each student is asked to evaluate the deliverable of one of the other students, applying criteria determined jointly by the lecturer and the students.

 The grade for this task is based on the lecturer’s evaluation and the peer evaluation.

⭘ Task #6 (individual) – 10% - **writing a personal reflection.**

 In this task the students were asked to write a reflection relating to the learning process in the course. In order to help the students understand the concept of reflection, they were given a number of guiding reflective questions relating to difficulties, challenges, successes, and disappointments they experienced during the learning process; personal insights; the distance between where they were at the beginning of the course and the end; changed perceptions or attitudes; an evaluation of the work of the team and their personal functioning within the team; aspects that with hindsight they would do differently; and so on. They were required to address at least five of the ten questions presented to them. The students’ reflections enable them to engage in introspection regarding the processes they underwent during their learning in the course. Just as importantly, they provide the lecturer with meaningful feedback facilitating the informed development and planning of future courses.

We will now present some selected additional examples of alternative evaluation in academic courses. We begin with several possibilities for alternative examinations, followed by discussion of the possible use of class presentations:

**Alternative examinations**

The concept “alternative examinations” refers to examinations in which the conditions or format of examination differ from those of traditional examinations, which are characterized by a high level of standardization (uniform time allocation, venue, examination conditions and environment, and examination paper). In most standard examinations, students are not permitted to bring in ancillary materials. In addition, the examination questions are often synthetic, requiring learning by rote and the memorizing of extensive study material, and having a single “correct” answer (particularly in multiple choice examinations). However, the disadvantages of traditional examinations – both in terms of the cognitive skills examined and in terms of the impact of emotional and psychological aspects (such as anxiety, pressure, high expectations, etc.) on learners’ achievements – different formats have been developed over the years for undertaking examinations. We will give three examples here of alternative examinations used in various courses:

A. Home examination. In the “Evaluation in Education” course, which introduces theories, issues, and basic concepts in the field of educational measurement and evaluation, the students were evaluated at the end of the course by means of a “home examination.” This examination was conducted on a uniform date with a fixed time allocation (four hours), but the students were allowed to choose the venue where they wished to complete the examination, provided that they sat at a computer connected to the internet. The examination paper was sent to the students as a file on the course website, and the solution was sent to the lecturer by each student after completing the examination.

 The rationale behind allocating similar time to that given for standard examinations is to prevent a situation where the “examination” becomes a “concluding course project.” In other words, the idea is to maintain the format of an examination in terms of the focus on the questions, the relatively limited scope of the answers, the number of questions adapted to the allocated time, and so forth.

 The students are allowed to use any material in their possession, but they are not permitted to contact other students during the examination. It is important to note that the problem of copying, which is encountered in the submission of projects, also exists in this form of examination.

 The examination questions were geared to the implementation of the study material in different contexts, such as: comparing a model the students had studied with a new model presented to them; analyzing a video clip using the concepts they learned; questions relating to sections to which the students had not yet been exposed (from an academic or journalistic article, book, etc.) but that related to the ideas studied in the course. The examination required profound understanding and application of the material; accordingly, in most cases, the fact that the examination took place “at home,” with open material, did not help students who lacked a command of the studied themes.

 The students who participated and were examined in this course reported that the possibility to choose the examination setting, shape it to meet their needs, and use the study material freely significantly reduced the pressure and anxiety they faced during the examination.

B. An examination comprised mainly of questions composed by the students. The course “Evaluation: Toward Effective Educational Leadership” (MA in Educational Policy and Administration”) exposed the students to the diverse components of educational evaluation: evaluation of school students and educational staff, evaluation of programs, evaluation tools for effective management, etc.). At the end of the course, the students were evaluated by means of a concluding examination. The course was a distance learning one, and students were required to study 14 lessons independently. After completing each lesson, every student was required to compose three questions based on the content of the lesson: two multiple choice questions, one at a low level of thought and one at a high level of thought (the students studied the distinction between these levels of thought in another course as part of their degree studies), and one “focused open” question (requiring an answer of up to five lines). The students uploaded the questions to a forum reserved for this purpose during the lesson, so that all the students were exposed to the range of questions composed by their peers.

 At the end of the course, the students took an examination in which 80 points were allocated to questions from the pool of questions composed by the students themselves during the course (the questions were selected by the lecturer according to content, level of difficulty, and type of question), and 20 points for two open questions composed by the lecturer.

 On the one hand, this method allows the students to come to the examination with a high level of confidence, since they have already been exposed to and studied most of the examination questions (thereby significantly reducing the element of surprise when they receive the examination). On the other hand, the inclusion of the lecturer’s questions means that they must study all the material, and not confine themselves to the pool of questions created during the course. It is important to note that students who study courses using the distance learning method often feel that they lack any indication of their level of understanding of the study material during the course of their learning. This method, which provides the students with numerous questions for examining themselves for each lesson, can give learners a good indication of their command of the material and their capabilities.

C. Examination with “crib sheets:” As part of the course “Quantitative Research Methods,” which taught basic concepts in research methods and descriptive statistics, the students were evaluated at the end of the course by means of an examination in which they were permitted to bring in five “crib sheets” they had prepared themselves in advance. **We can suggest three main advantages to allowing students to bring some crib sheets into the examination:**

 Firstly, the students are not required to memorize the material, but they must show higher cognitive capabilities, such as applying the concepts in new research situations, synthesizing different fields of content they have learned, and evaluating the quality of the methodological sections in a given study.

 Secondly, the process of preparing the crib sheets is in itself a learning process, both in terms of the need to review all the study material and in terms of individual thought regarding the best way to present the material on a limited number of pages. This allows students to choose the most effective and convenient preparation method for themselves, thereby responding to the variance among learners in terms of their command of different subjects, the difficulties they encounter in subjects, and their preferred form of presentation. By way of example, some students will prefer to present the material in a visual and diagrammatic way, while others will choose to include a large amount of text, summarize in bullet points, or include examples of a range of possible exercises. In addition, in order for the crib sheets to be useful during the examination, they must be legible, clear, and organized according to an order that is logical to the learner and allows rapid and easy location during the examination.

 Thirdly, bringing ancillary material into the examination helps the student in emotional terms. When asked to complete a short survey after the examination relating to the benefit of the crib sheets, the students reported that bringing in the sheets significantly reduced their stress level and their fears before and during the examination, increased their motivation to study and succeed in the examination, helped them demonstrated their capabilities during the examination, and made them feel that the examination was fairer. It is important to note that allowing the use of ancillary material did not lead to “grade inflation” – the distribution of grades received was within the accepted distribution range in academia.

**Presentations of deliverables from tasks and peer evaluation**

The following example combines several principles of alternative evaluation as reflected in the evaluation of students in the course “Evaluation for Promoting Learning,” which was provided for trainee teachers. The course exposes the students to the changes that have occurred in attitudes to teaching-learning-evaluation, focusing on alternative approaches for the evaluation of achievements and practical tools for applying these approaches.

During the second part of the course, after the students have acquired theoretical knowledge and the principles of the alternative approaches to evaluation, they are required to develop a practical task that they will be able to use with their students in the future. The task they develop must be from their field of specialization and intended for a specific population. It must evaluate clear goals that the students must define, and must meet all the main characteristics of a practical task. The task is implemented as a group, with the goal of ensuring that the group discourse and the ideas contributed by each participants help to define an original, authentic, interesting, and challenging task that requires complex cognitive performances and constitutes meaningful learning for the students for whom it is intended. Since the development of a practical task is a complex process combining a wide range of skills and fields of intelligence, group work allows the expression of the different fields of intelligence in the group.

The instructions given to the students include two rubrics: rubrics to be used by the lecturer in evaluating their work, and rubrics for peer evaluation. The task was implemented partly in class, with the lecturer’s guidance and direction, and partly outside class. The final three lessons in the course are devoted to presenting the tasks to the class and to peer evaluation. The students are asked to present the task they have developed to the class, treating the group of students as if they were the group of school students for whom the task is intended. Thus they must use any method they have chosen (a brief activity, video clip, presentation, poster, etc.) to stimulate the students’ interest in performing the task, just as they are required to do in the classroom where they will use the task.

While the group presents its deliverables, peer evaluation is undertaken. Each student is asked to use a “peer evaluation rubrics” sheet to evaluate the deliverable presented by their peers on the course, based on the criteria detailed in the rubrics. The students are asked to evaluate and address each criterion, so that the presenting group can improve and enrich its deliverable with the help of the evaluation. Each group is allocated 15 minutes to present its deliverable, after which five minutes are allocated for writing the peer evaluation. Up to five minutes are also allocated for a brief discussion of the task presented, offering an opportunity for the students to share their feelings and experiences and to thank the presenters. At the end of the presentation, all evaluations completed by the students are forwarded to the group that made the presentation, so that is can make improvements ahead of the final submission.

**The class presentations and the peer evaluation in the format presented benefit the students in several respects:**

A. Since the peer evaluation is undertaken before the final submission to the lecturer, it functions as formative evaluation enabling correction and improvement in order to produce a better task.

B. The students are exposed to diverse examples of tasks they can use in the future in their function as teachers. The students report that the exposure to their peers’ deliverables during the course was a peak aspect of this course and one that created a close connection between the content studied in the course and practice.

C. Peer evaluation using clear criteria develops the students’ abilities in self-evaluation regarding their own tasks, as well as their skill in providing feedback – a vital and essential component in the work of the teacher. We should add that the involvement of students in evaluating their peers deepens and influences their perception of evaluation as a complex and multidimensional concept.