

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59035

Title: L evaluation a interpretation criteriee et dynamique des apprentissages : fondements theoriques et outils au service d une evaluation personnalisee et valorisante

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		X		
Techn. Quality		X		
Clarity		X		
Significance		X		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 212

Detailed Reviewer's Report

General Assessment:

This is a well-written, practical, and pedagogically valuable paper that addresses a central concern in contemporary education: how to conceptualize and implement assessment that is criterion-referenced, dynamic, and truly supportive of student learning. The author(s) present a coherent and well-argued case for moving away from normative, comparative assessment practices toward a model that places the student at the center of the assessment process and uses explicit criteria to guide and support learning. The paper is grounded in a socioconstructivist framework and draws effectively on key scholars in the field (e.g., Allal, Scallon, Perrenoud, Hattie, Durand & Chouinard). The paper's greatest strength is its practical orientation. The presentation of three complementary tools the descriptive rating scale (échelle descriptive), the self-assessment grid (grille d'autoévaluation), and the peer-assessment grid (grille de coévaluation) is clear, well-structured, and highly applicable to classroom practice. The detailed discussion of each tool, including its theoretical foundations, its benefits for learning, and concrete implementation strategies, makes this paper a valuable resource for teachers, teacher educators, and curriculum developers. The comparative table (Tableau 1) and the practical recommendations for progressive integration are particularly useful features. The paper is logically organized, clearly written, and achieves its stated aims effectively. It requires only minor revisions before publication.

Minor Issues (to be addressed in revision):

1. Typographical and Formatting Errors:

- **Page 1, Abstract (French):** The title and abstract contain a typo: "L'evaluation a interpretation criteriee et dynamique" should be "L'évaluation à interprétation critériée et dynamique." The accent on "à" and the correct spelling of "critériée" are needed.
- **Page 1, Keywords:** The French keywords use a mix of middle dots and no punctuation: "Évaluation critériée · Évaluation dynamique..." The English keywords use a different format: "Criterion-referenced assessment · Dynamic assessment..." While both are acceptable, consistency in formatting would be preferable. Additionally, there is a stray period after the English keywords.
- **Page 2, Line 46:** The text begins mid-sentence. It appears the introduction is missing its opening paragraph. The paper should begin with a proper introductory section that sets the context and states the purpose of the article.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Page 3, Line 121-155:** This page contains a long list of bullet points with no clear introductory sentence. The bullet points seem to have been copied from a slide or a different format and pasted here without proper integration. This section needs to be rewritten as continuous prose or properly introduced and contextualized.
- **Page 4, Line 139-141:** The bullet points in Section 1.4 are not clearly connected to the preceding sentence. The author(s) should ensure that the characteristics of effective feedback are presented in a coherent and integrated way.
- **Page 5, Line 163:** "peu importe la personne qui en fait l'interprétation.Cette concordance" – There is a missing space after the period.
- **Page 6, Line 197:** "Hattié et Timperley, 2007" – The name is misspelled. It should be "Hattie et Timperley, 2007."
- **Page 6, Line 201:** "Hattié et Timperley, 2007" – Same misspelling.
- **Page 7, Line 229:** "a la tache en cours : a force de pratiquer" – Missing accents. Should be "à la tâche en cours : à force de pratiquer."
- **Page 8, Line 269:** "La troisième grille proposée est la grille de coévaluation." – This sentence is fine, but the transition from the previous section could be smoother.
- **Page 9, Line 300:** "Lacévaluation" – This should be "La coévaluation."
- **Page 11, Line 365:** "n'entrepreneement" – This should be "n'entreprennent."
- **References, Line 417:** "Fournier Dubé, N., Hébert, M.-H. et Aubin, A.-S. (2024)." – The format is inconsistent with other references. It should follow the same style as the other entries.
- **References, Line 440:** "Richer, J., Mongeau, P., Lafortune, L., Deaudelin, C., Doudin, P.-A. et Martin, D. (2004)." – The reference is missing a space between "Doudin, P.-A." and "et Martin, D."
- **References, Line 434:** "Panadero, E., &Lipnevich, A. A. (2022)." – The ampersand is used inconsistently. In French academic writing, "et" is preferred. Also, there is a missing space after the ampersand.

2. Structural Issues:

- **Missing Introduction:** As noted above, the paper lacks a clear introduction. The text on Page 2 begins in the middle of an argument. The author(s) should add an introductory section that presents the problem, the purpose of the article, and the structure of the paper.
- **Overuse of Bullet Points:** While bullet points can be useful, the paper relies on them heavily, especially in Sections 1.4, 2.3, 3.4, and 4.4. In some cases, the bullet points interrupt the flow of the argument. The author(s) should consider converting some of these lists into prose paragraphs to create a more fluid and integrated text.
- **Conclusion:** The conclusion is a good summary but could be strengthened by briefly suggesting directions for future research or discussing the implications of these tools for teacher training and professional development.

3. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review:

- The paper is grounded in a socioconstructivist framework and cites relevant authors. However, the theoretical framework could be slightly expanded. For example, the concept of "évaluation critériée" is well-explained, but the paper could briefly mention the distinction between "évaluation critériée" and "évaluation par compétences" (competency-based assessment), which is a related but distinct concept in the francophone literature.
- The paper could also engage more explicitly with the concept of "évaluation formatrice" (formative assessment), which is central to the work of Allal, Perrenoud, and others. While the paper does discuss formative aspects, making this link more explicit would strengthen the theoretical grounding.

4. Practical Application and Contextualization:

- The paper is very practical, which is a strength. However, it could be even more useful if it provided concrete examples of what a descriptive rating scale, a self-assessment grid, and a peer-assessment grid might look like in a specific subject area (e.g., a writing task, a science experiment, a math problem). While the paper describes the tools well, examples would help teachers visualize how to adapt them to their own contexts.
- The paper could also briefly address potential challenges or objections to implementing these tools. For example, some teachers might be concerned about the time required to create and use these tools, or about the reliability of peer assessment. A brief discussion of these challenges and possible solutions would make the paper more balanced and realistic.

Specific Comments for the Authors (for a Minor Revision):

This is an excellent and highly useful paper that makes a valuable contribution to the field of educational assessment. The author(s) have provided a clear, well-argued, and practical guide to implementing criterion-

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

referenced and dynamic assessment in the classroom. To prepare the manuscript for final submission, the author(s) should address the following minor points:

1. **Add a Proper Introduction:** Write a new introductory section that sets the context, states the purpose of the article, and outlines its structure.
2. **Correct All Typographical Errors:** Carefully proofread the entire manuscript to correct all spelling, accent, and punctuation errors, particularly in the abstract, keywords, and references.
3. **Reduce the Use of Bullet Points:** Where possible, convert bulleted lists into continuous prose paragraphs to improve the flow and readability of the text.
4. **Provide Concrete Examples:** Consider adding a brief example of each tool (échelle descriptive, grille d'autoévaluation, grille de coévaluation) applied to a specific subject or task.
5. **Expand the Theoretical Framework:** Briefly discuss related concepts such as "évaluation formatrice" and "évaluation par compétences" to situate the paper within the broader francophone assessment literature.
6. **Address Potential Challenges:** Add a brief paragraph acknowledging the challenges of implementing these tools (e.g., time, training, reliability) and suggesting how they might be addressed.
7. **Strengthen the Conclusion:** Briefly suggest implications for teacher training and directions for future research.

Conclusion:

This paper is a significant and practical contribution to the field of educational assessment. It provides a well-theorized and highly actionable framework for implementing criterion-referenced, dynamic, and student-centered assessment practices. The three tools presented the descriptive rating scale, the self-assessment grid, and the peer-assessment grid are clearly explained and well-supported by both theory and research. The paper's emphasis on feedback, progressive implementation, and the active role of the student is particularly valuable. With the minor revisions outlined above, this manuscript will be ready for publication and will serve as an excellent resource for teachers, teacher educators, and researchers in the field of education. The recommendation is for acceptance after minor revision.