

SPECIAL ISSUE
Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Educational Evaluation

education policy analysis
archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,
open access, multilingual journal



Arizona State University

Volume 26 Number 52

April 16, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341

**Toward an Intercultural Approach to Evaluation: A
Perspective from the National Institute for Educational
Evaluation in Mexico (INEE)**

Silvia Schmelkes

National Institute for Educational Evaluation (INEE)
Mexico

Citation: Schmelkes, S. (2018). Toward an intercultural approach to evaluation: A perspective from INEE in Mexico. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(52). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3818>
This article is part of the Special Issue, *Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Educational Evaluation: Dialogues with the International Academy of Education*, guest edited by Lorin W. Anderson, Maria de Ibarrola, and D. C. Phillips.

Abstract: The National Institute for the Evaluation of Education (INEE) in Mexico has begun to meet the challenges in evaluating indigenous children and teachers and the educational programs and policies targeted to them. Several evaluation projects are described in this paper. One is the “Previous, Free and Informed Consultation of Indigenous People,” which focuses on quality of education they receive. A second is the design of a protocol for reducing cultural and linguistic bias in standardized tests, which requires oversampling of indigenous students and the involvement of anthropologists, linguists and indigenous teachers in item development. A third is an indigenous language evaluation for candidates for entry into the teaching profession, which they must pass

Journal website: <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>
Facebook: /EPAAA
Twitter: @epaa_aape

Manuscript received: 1/15/2018
Revisions received: 2/18/2018
Accepted: 2/18/2018

before they can work in indigenous schools. A fourth is the development of a qualitative instrument for evaluating teacher performance. The instrument asks evaluated teachers to contextualize their planning; scorers decide whether the plan is adapted to the cultural context and the characteristics of the children. The projects described are only a starting point. In the near future, several dilemmas, such as the apparent trade-off between contextualization and quality, have to be faced and solved.

Keywords: Educational evaluation; intercultural education; intercultural evaluation

Hacia una evaluación con enfoque intercultural: Una perspectiva desde el Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación de México

Resumen: El Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación de México ha empezado a enfrentar los desafíos que presenta la evaluación de niños y maestros indígenas y los programas y políticas educativas que se dirigen a ellos. Varios proyectos de evaluación se describen en este artículo. Uno de ellos es la Consulta Previa, Libre e Informada a Pueblos y Comunidades Indígenas que se centra en la calidad de la educación que reciben. Un segundo proyecto es el diseño de un protocolo para reducir los sesgos culturales y lingüísticos en las pruebas estandarizadas, que requiera una sobre representación de estudiantes indígenas y el involucramiento de antropólogos, lingüistas y maestros indígenas en el desarrollo de los reactivos. El tercero es la evaluación en lengua indígena para los candidatos para ingresar a la profesión docente, que deben aprobar antes de poder trabajar en escuelas indígenas. El cuarto es el desarrollo de un instrumento cualitativo para evaluar el desempeño de los maestros; el instrumento solicita a los maestros evaluados contextualizar su plan de clase, los evaluadores deciden si el plan se adapta al contexto cultural y a las características de los niños. Los proyectos descritos son apenas un punto de partida. En el futuro inmediato, varios dilemas tales como la tensión entre contextualización y calidad deberán enfrentarse y resolverse.

Palabras-clave: evaluación educativa; educación intercultural; evaluación intercultural

Rumo a uma avaliação com abordagem intercultural: Uma perspectiva do Instituto Nacional de Avaliação da Educação no México

Resumo: O Instituto Nacional de Avaliação Educacional do México começou a enfrentar os desafios da avaliação de crianças e professores indígenas e programas de educação e políticas que os abordam. Vários projetos de avaliação são descritos neste artigo. Uma delas é a Consulta Prévia, Livre e Informada a Povos e Comunidades Indígenas, que se concentra na qualidade da educação que recebem. Um segundo projeto é o desenho de um protocolo para reduzir os vieses culturais e linguísticos em testes padronizados, exigindo super-representação de estudantes indígenas e participação de antropólogos, lingüistas e dos povos indígenas no desenvolvimento de professores reagentes. A terceira é a avaliação em língua indígena para candidatos a ingressarem na profissão docente, que devem passar antes de poder trabalhar em escolas indígenas. A quarta é o desenvolvimento de um instrumento qualitativo para avaliar o desempenho dos professores; o instrumento pede aos professores avaliados contextualizar seu plano de aula, os avaliadores decidir se o plano é adaptado ao contexto cultural e as características das crianças. Os projetos descritos são apenas um ponto de partida. No futuro imediato, vários dilemas, como a tensão entre contextualização e qualidade, terão de ser enfrentados e resolvidos.

Palavras-chave: avaliação educacional; educação intercultural; avaliação intercultural

Toward an Intercultural Approach to Evaluation: A Perspective from the National Institute for Educational Evaluation in Mexico (INEE)

Evaluation with an intercultural approach recognizes and values the cultural and linguistic diversity of a society, and it faces daunting challenges. Consider for example Mexico—an especially diverse country. According to information from the National Institute of Geography and Statistics (INEGI, 2015), 26 million Mexicans (21%) consider themselves to be indigenous, and according to the linguistic catalogue of the National Institute of Indigenous Languages (INALI, 2006), there exist 68 clearly differentiated ethnolinguistic groups. An estimated 7.3 million Mexicans speak 364 variations of those 68 languages. But the diversity of Mexico is not the exception. A great number of Latin American countries also have indigenous peoples, and in many countries of the world, the prevailing diversity is growing as a product of migration. Therefore, the intercultural approach in evaluation should not be considered as relevant only for countries with native populations.

Evaluation with an intercultural approach recognizes that educational evaluation should be a tool to comprehend and address diversity. No approach to educational evaluation should be based on the false assumption that the population is homogeneous, nor should it artificially simplify a reality that is complex precisely because of this diversity.

An evaluation that aims to comprehend and address diversity has at least two purposes. First, to obtain information that sheds light on—and therefore enables us to eradicate—educational inequities related to the existence of minority linguistic and cultural groups, and second, to respect and address the characteristic features of each such language and culture.

The purpose of all educational evaluation must be to contribute to the improvement of education. And assuming this principle, evaluations with an intercultural approach should serve to improve the quality of teaching and learning as well as other educational indicators such as school access and retention, to close inequality gaps in these indicators and in educational achievement, and to promote the development of a society that values its diversity.

The National Institute for Educational Evaluation (INEE) has adopted a rights-based approach as its frame of reference, at the center of which is the right of all to a quality education. Within this framework the INEE maintains that the evaluation process (including evaluations based on a multicultural approach) must abide by the following five principles:

1. Evaluation must seek to improve education.
2. Evaluation must pursue equity.
3. Evaluation must value and address diversity.
4. Evaluation must be fair, valid and reliable.
5. Evaluations must be designed with the participation of society, especially the people who are involved in the evaluation process.

The INEE'S Progress toward a Multicultural Approach to Evaluation

In Mexico, the INEE is mandated to evaluate the national education system and all its components, processes and results, including the academic achievement of students, the performance of teachers and principals, the quality of educational provision (including the evaluation of schools and educational institutions), the efficacy of educational programs, and the relevance of educational policies. The INEE is also mandated to issue evidence-based guidelines on educational policy, which is one of the means for evaluation to help improve the quality, equity, relevance, efficacy, and efficiency of education. The INEE also expects to improve education through the use of evaluation results to promote innovation in schools and classrooms.

How has this institution, under these mandates and through a rights-based frame of reference, approached the issue of evaluation with an intercultural orientation? The answer to this question is that this is still an ongoing process. In the first four years since the INEE became an autonomous institution and was given these mandates, it has sought to operationalize the intercultural approach in several ways.

Program Evaluation and Guideline Formulation, which Complement Each Other

The guidelines provided are not only based on the evaluation of educational programs, but also take into consideration results from other evaluations and relevant educational research conducted both within and beyond our borders. At the time of writing, the INEE has issued three sets of guidelines, two of which address matters of diversity. A first set concerns educational attention to girls, boys and adolescents from migrant farm worker families, 40% of which are indigenous. The second set more specifically addresses educational attention to indigenous girls, boys and adolescents.

Standardized Student Assessment

In 2006, the principal of an indigenous school filed a lawsuit before the National Council to Prevent Discrimination (CONAPRED) against the standardized achievement test that was applied at the time: the ENLACE test. The plaintiff considered that it was unjust for a test of achievement that was applied in Spanish and had a certain cultural bias, to have the same consequences for both indigenous and non-indigenous teachers. At the time, the test results were used to define economic incentives for teachers and principals, and partially to determine if the teachers and principals would be promoted within the scheme known as *Carrera Magisterial*.

One of the first things the INEE did was commission an external assessment of the ENLACE and EXCALE tests—the latter being the standardized test that the INEE applied for several years, before becoming autonomous, to representative samples of students in key grades. As a consequence of this assessment a new test was generated, called PLANEA (National Plan to Assess Learning). Its most prominent feature was that it would no longer affect teacher promotions or incentives. Thus, the fundamental cause of injustice that originated the lawsuit against ENLACE test was eliminated.

Beyond that, however, other modifications to previous tests were also implemented—tests that were intended to assess “key learning”, meaning all the knowledge a child should have, irrespective of the culture he or she belongs to, and which curricular changes would not affect. Thus understood, these tests play a very important role in the detection of school achievement inequalities.

Lastly, an international team of experts helped INEE design a protocol for cultural validity that aims to control cultural bias during test development. The result was that the presence of anthropologists, linguists and indigenous teachers was assured through the whole process, from the design of the table of specifications to the construction and validation of test items. All graphic and contextual information included in the questions is carefully reviewed. A team of judges focuses specifically on rigorously inspecting the questions to detect any presence of cultural bias. Also, pilot projects are implemented, over-representing the indigenous population. A statistical bias analysis is carried out and generalizability tests (Zúñiga-Brenes & Montero Rojas, 2007) are undertaken for various cultural groups. All this is intended to ensure that test results are indeed comparable, and that what is measured accurately reflects reality (is valid) because it is not filtered through the cultural bias of the contents of the test.

These measures only ensure that the tests will not discriminate against the students for being part of diverse cultural groups. These tests do not address issues of linguistic diversity or the difficulties the students might have when answering the test if their native language is not Spanish.

The question that emerges from this experience is whether it is possible to expect more from a standardized test whose aim is to compare populations, and whether other examinations are required—perhaps more localized and intended for training purposes—that could complement these standardized, national tests.

Evaluation of Teachers for the Professional Teaching Service¹

Before 2014, teachers working in indigenous schools were high-school graduates who were sent to the classroom after having undertaken a six-month-long induction training course on intercultural bilingual teaching. While in service, they had to complete the Bachelor's degree in Preschool and Primary Education for Indigenous Contexts, in a semi-open system, at the Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (UPN). This is clearly an unjust situation for indigenous peoples, because the teachers assigned to their communities are not professional educators. This is also the case of the people who live in small communities and are attended by community instructors—now called “Leaders in Community Education” through the system of Community Courses of the National Council for Educational Promotion (CONAFE). Moreover, before 2014, there was no way of ensuring that indigenous teachers would be assigned to a community that spoke their same indigenous native language. Around 30% of indigenous teachers are linguistically dislocated or do not speak an indigenous language at all. In the early days of the indigenous education subsystem in 1978, the decision was made to hire high school graduates because there were no professional indigenous teachers, but at least they made sure they spoke the language of their students. However, over time a greater injustice emerged: not only were many indigenous teachers non-professional, they did not speak the same language as their students.

Starting in 2014, with the newly established Professional Teaching Service, any new teachers accepted to work with indigenous people attending schools within the aforementioned subsystem must have a bachelor's degree in education or a related degree, exactly like the teachers who work with students in the regular subsystem. Furthermore, besides taking the same examinations to assess curricular knowledge, thinking skills, and ethical and professional responsibilities as the rest of the teacher candidates, they must also take an indigenous language proficiency test, applied by native speakers, which evaluates oral comprehension, oral expression, out-loud reading and reading comprehension in the language in question. Ideal candidates are entered in priority placement lists to enter the teaching service, and there are separate lists for every language, so that they are assigned to communities that speak their same native tongue. This is a first step in ensuring an intercultural approach in the evaluation of indigenous teachers.

As of this writing, teaching performance evaluations for indigenous teachers have been postponed to 2018, precisely because of the difficulties inherent in ensuring that these evaluations apply similar standards to all teachers, and the need to avoid reproducing educational inequities. However, INEE is also aware of the imperative to take into account the specific working conditions

¹ The General Law of the Professional Teaching Service was launched in September 2013, and regulates entry, promotions, recognitions and permanence in the profession. Evaluation, which INEE has the responsibility to regulate, is the main mechanism for each of these processes, including the evaluation of teacher performance. Merit is the basis for access, promotion and permanence in the profession, and is considered a means for the professionalization of teachers and principals, and as a way for improving teaching practice and, ultimately, student achievement (INEE, 2015a).

of these teachers. Most teachers in indigenous schools work in diverse cultural environments—and often in conditions of poverty, both of the population they work with and within the school itself.² The design of the 2017 performance evaluation enables teachers to contextualize their reality, school and class, and assess their own ability to adapt the planning of their teaching to the specific context and teaching conditions they face. However, in the case of indigenous teachers, it will also be necessary to evaluate the teachers' mastery and teaching skills in the indigenous language, as well as the integration of the community's culture into the curriculum, so they are able to teach using an intercultural approach.

Evaluation of Educational Provision

In 2015, the INEE carried out the evaluation of Teaching and Learning Conditions in primary schools (INEE, 2016b). This evaluation was careful to over-represent indigenous schools, so as to more deeply understand their conditions based on a sufficiently large number of cases. This study unveiled problems in infrastructure, equipment, school management, learning management and school climate that in many cases are more common in indigenous schools than in other schools. In addition, it specifically examined whether children have been punished for speaking their indigenous language at school or in the classroom. To everyone's surprise, the study detected that these punishments are present in 5% of the schools with indigenous-speaking students, but that they are much more prevalent (11%) in fully indigenous schools.

Development of Indicators on the Status of the National Education System

Since its beginnings in 2002 as a decentralized organization that was part of the Secretariat of Public Education (SEP), the INEE has developed indicators relating to the national education system, which it publishes annually in the *Panorama Educativo Nacional* (National Education at a Glance; INEE 2015b). The 2014 edition contains a special chapter on indigenous students (INEE, 2015a). Given this background, the Organization of Ibero-American States requested the INEE to coordinate the *Miradas* report (OEI, 2016), which is also published annually in order to take stock of progress made in the attainment of the 2021 goals. The 2016 *Miradas* report was a thematic issue dedicated to indigenous and Afro-Ibero-American peoples. In addition, with the support of UNICEF, the INEE also published its report "Panorama de la Educación para la Población Indígena" (Education for the Indigenous Population at a Glance; INEE, 2016a), which will henceforth be published annually (INEE 2017b).

Free, Prior and Informed Consultation of Indigenous Peoples in Educational Evaluation

In response to the aforementioned principle that evaluation should value and address diversity, during 2014 and 2015 the INEE conducted a Free, Prior and Informed Consultation on educational evaluation (INEE, 2016c). This engaged 49 indigenous communities belonging to 28 different peoples, in order to obtain their perspective as to how educational attainment of students and performance of teachers and school authorities should be evaluated. To achieve this, however, it was necessary to ask these communities about what they think of the education they receive and the education they want to receive. This is ultimately what must be evaluated.

This consultation was implemented in three stages. The first, which involved informing the communities so that they could decide whether they wanted to participate in the consultation, lasted

² The Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Conditions study, implemented by the INEE in elementary schools during 2015 (INEE, 2016b) and to which I refer later in this text, clearly reveals the disadvantage that indigenous schools face in matters of Infrastructure, equipment and materials.

two months. The second was the consultation proper, implemented in the language in use in the communities and respecting their traditional forms of decision-making. This stage lasted another two months. Finally, the third stage comprised the documentation and publication of results. The consultation was implemented by indigenous persons from the community or from neighboring communities, who spoke the language, were knowledgeable of the community's culture, had been previously accepted by the communities for this purpose. They received training in the methodology designed for its implementation. In communities where women do not participate in community assemblies, consultation meetings were conducted specifically with them. In addition, children and adolescents were also consulted in all communities with a special methodology that UNICEF had previously designed and tested in similar contexts.

The communities provided their own perspectives on the nature of educational evaluation. Thus, regarding assessment of student learning, they suggested that it should evaluate the contents that are taught in school, including the indigenous language and other elements of the community's culture, attitudes, behaviors and, as part of the latter, participation in community practices. The assessment should adapt to the context of the students. They proposed that, in addition to examinations, other forms of assessment be used that allow for a better appreciation of learning: oral, written, and performance-based assessments; observation of attitudes, evaluations within the classroom and outside of it, individual and collective assessment before parents and the community, self-evaluation and peer evaluation. Communities emphasize that evaluation must be used for the improvement of education. In addition to teachers, parents should also participate in this evaluation. It emerged that parents must also be informed about the school's educational purposes.

Regarding teacher evaluation, the communities consider that all the aspects that they deem desirable in a teacher must be evaluated, from training to community participation, classroom performance and personal attitudes. Different evaluation activities are proposed: class observation, interviews with students and parents, following up on the progress in the work schedule, observation of progress in learning. They believe that the principal is directly responsible for the evaluation of teacher performance; several communities propose that parents and community authorities, other teachers and even the students themselves should also evaluate the teachers. Other communities demand that they be informed of the progress attained and that their opinion on the performance of the teachers be heard. Higher-level authorities and specialists could also participate.

As for the evaluation of school authorities, it is agreed that their evaluation must reflect the operation of all the different functions of the school: teacher compliance, student learning (including learning of the community's culture and values), infrastructure improvement; community outreach. However, their attitudes, relationship with the community, and respect for its values and culture must also be considered. The principal is expected to inform the community about the functioning of the school and to receive from it the evaluation of his or her performance. Community assemblies would be the space for this exchange to take place. Teachers may also comment on the performance of school authorities, and higher-level educational authorities also participate in this evaluation.

As has been mentioned, this Consultation was one of the main underpinnings of the Guidelines for the Educational of Indigenous Children and Youth (INEE, 2017b), which were published and to which the federal and the 32 state national education authorities responded within the 60-day limit established by law. Seventeen state authorities included a Plan of Action as part of their response. All of them accepted the guidelines.

Finally, regarding the evaluation of the school itself, the communities believe that all the traits that have been mentioned above must be evaluated. This includes: learning of national and community contents; student behavior (especially their participation in community life); the physical

conditions of the school; the teacher/student ratio; compliance with regulations; and community-school linkages. Supervisors should evaluate schools by visiting them frequently and considering all of the above traits, but communities and other educational authorities must also participate in this evaluation.³

The Interculturalization of Formative Evaluation

The approach outlined in this chapter does not rule out the possibility of going further in the attempts to make the evaluation of students, teachers, principals and schools more intercultural. However, any truly intercultural evaluation must have formative qualities, that is, it should not be a standardized evaluation for accountability or summative purposes. Rather, it is only the evaluation that takes place continuously within the school and classroom—that involves the participation of the community and integrates its aspirations and concerns, that enhances teacher practice, that gathers elements to better contextualize its teachings to the reality and the culture of the community, and that improves the operation of the school—that can truly aspire to be fully intercultural. Implementing such an evaluation requires training teachers and principals in the purposes and methodologies of formative evaluation, and it also requires permanent support from the institutional structure. This abides by the principle of placing the school at the center of the national education system and follows up on the standards set by in the General Law on the Professional Teaching Service regarding the Technical Assistance Service for Schools, which must also adopt an intercultural approach.

In this regard, the INEE is currently carrying out a pilot project of self-evaluation in schools, with 30 primary schools of various kinds in three states (Querétaro, Estado de México and Puebla). This project gathers the proposals obtained in the Consultation and seeks to develop tools to use the results of external evaluation and self-evaluation of the schools and students to improve management and teaching practice. This project is ongoing and does not yet offer any results. However it is expected that after its implementation for an entire school year, a toolkit can be constructed that can be presented as a collection of evaluation procedures. Schools of various kinds will then be able to choose from this collection and implement whichever method is better suited to their processes and realities so that formative evaluation can better improve the education they offer.

The Dilemmas

In conclusion, it is important to consider the dilemmas posed when the two major issues of educational evaluation and an intercultural approach in education intersect. A first crucial dilemma appears when considering standardized tests of school achievement and the compromise that must be taken between standardization and attention to diversity. The question at hand is: how should we address diversity through standardized testing without undermining equity? Addressing diversity might be understood as “tailor-making evaluation”. The problem arises when this implies not only modifying standards, but also lowering them. This has serious implications for educational equity at a national scale.

A second dilemma arises when evaluating teacher performance. The issue at hand refers to the way in which context might be taken into account beyond the existing practices described above,

³ This is a brief synthesis of the results of the Consultation. The full version can be found in *Consulta Previa, Libre e Informada a Pueblos y Comunidades Indígenas sobre Evaluación Educativa*. (INEE, 2016c)

ultimately accounting for inequalities in the working conditions that teachers face. On a deeper level, the question must be raised about the possible interculturalization of these evaluations.

Regarding these two dilemmas it likely is impossible for a single instrument to account for all the different situations and address the relevant priorities. However, if the evaluations address issues that aren't relevant to certain groups, what do these evaluations really tell us that is useful? And perhaps, then, the most important question is: what can we do with them?

A related concern is how to design standardized tests that are relevant to people who belong to greatly diverse groups. Teachers complained about exams based on complex cases, which feature several multiple-choice questions that must be answered using curricular and pedagogical knowledge as well as ethical considerations. This format was chosen because it was considered that the cases would most closely resemble the teachers' actual experiences. However, in general terms, the teachers felt that the cases posed in the exam didn't reflect their teaching experience, and therefore that the evaluation was asking questions that they had no reason to know how to answer because they weren't related to their reality.⁴ That is to say, the teachers whose situation wasn't portrayed in these questions were placed in a disadvantage, because they had never even had the chance to reflect on the situations in question.⁵ The quandaries that emerge from these circumstances are worrying when the exams have consequences on the subjects—as is the case with the teacher performance evaluation—or when the objective is to use the results of these evaluations to improve teaching and learning.

A Pending Issue: Evaluating Interculturality in All Students

When the topic of evaluation with an intercultural approach is being addressed, one question arises: how can we achieve an intercultural orientation in the student population as a whole? In multicultural countries like Mexico—and in an increasing number of countries—respect and appreciation for individual and cultural differences are essential components of national and global citizenship, and they are difficult to achieve. This is an urgent matter that needs to be addressed in the immediate future.

References

- INALI. (2008). *Catálogo Nacional de Lenguas Indígenas*. Retrieved 13 June 2017, http://www.inali.gob.mx/pdf/CLIN_completo.pdf
- INEE (2015a). *Reforma Educativa: Marco Normativo*. Mexico: INEE. Retrieved 13 June 2017, <http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/buscadorPub/P1/E/101/P1E101.pdf>
- INEE. (2015b). *Panorama Educativo de México: Indicadores del Sistema Educativo Nacional 2014*. Mexico: INEE. Retrieved 13 June 2017, http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/buscadorPub//P1/B/114/P1B114_01E01.pdf

⁴ These complaints by teachers led to a reframing of curricular and pedagogic knowledge examinations, which will no longer be based on cases, but rather on more orthodox questions.

⁵ Two relevant examples: one of the cases hypothesized a dam overflowing near the community—the teachers insisted that this does not concern them, because there are no dams near their community. A second example deals with the presence of a child with Asperger's in the classroom—the teachers remarked that they do not have any such students in their classrooms and therefore they have no reason to know how to answer the questions related to this case.

- INEE. (2016a). *Panorama Educativo de la Población Indígena 2015*. Mexico: INEE. Retrieved 13 June 2017, <http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/buscadorPub/P3/B/106/P3B106.pdf>
- INEE. (2016b). *Informe de la Educación Obligatoria 2016*. Mexico: INEE. Retrieved 13 June 2017, <http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/buscadorPub/P1/I/241/P1I241.pdf>
- INEE. (2016c). *Consulta Previa, Libre e Informada a Pueblos y Comunidades Indígenas sobre Evaluación Educativa*. Mexico: INEE. Retrieved 13 June 2017, <http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/buscadorPub/P1/D/245/P1D245.pdf>
- INEE. (2017a). “Breve Panorama Educativo de la Población Indígena”. Mexico: INEE. Retrieved 13 June 2017, <http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/buscadorPub/P3/B/107/P3B107.pdf>.
- INEE. (2017b). *Directrices para Mejorar la Atención Educativa a Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes Indígenas*. Mexico: INEE. Retrieved 13 June 2017, <http://publicaciones.inee.edu.mx/buscadorPub/P1/F/104/P1F104.pdf>
- INEGI. (2015). *Encuesta Intercensal*. Mexico, INEGI. Retrieved 13 June 2017, <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/especiales/intercensal/>
- Organization of Ibero-American States. (2016). *Miradas sobre la Educación en Iberoamérica 2015*. Retrieved 3 June 2017, <http://www.oei.es/historico/noticias/spip.php?article15354>.

About the Authors

Sylvia Schmelkes

National Institute for the Evaluation of Education

Sylvia Schmelkes is a sociologist with an MA degree in Educational Research from the Universidad Iberoamericana. Sylvia Irene Schmelkes del Valle’s professional experience has been in educational research, in which she has worked since 1970. She has published more than 150 books, articles and chapters on quality of education, values education, adult education and intercultural education. She founded and was coordinator general of Intercultural and Bilingual Education in the Ministry of Education in Mexico from 2001 to 2007. She chaired the OECD Center for Educational Research and Innovation’s Governing Board from 2002 to 2004. In 2008 she received the Comenius Medal, awarded by the Czech Republic and by UNESCO. She headed the Institute for Research in the Development of Education of the Universidad Iberoamericana in Mexico from 2007 to 2013. She was the first President of the National Institute for the Evaluation of Education since it became autonomous. At present she is a member of its Governing Board, and she is a Mexican National Researcher, level III.

About the Guest Editors

Lorin W. Anderson

University of South Carolina (Emeritus)

anderson.lorinw@gmail.com

Lorin W. Anderson is a Carolina Distinguished Professor Emeritus at the University of South Carolina, where he served on the faculty from August, 1973, until his retirement in August, 2006. During his tenure at the University he taught graduate courses in research design, classroom assessment, curriculum studies, and teacher effectiveness. He received his Ph.D. in Measurement, Evaluation, and Statistical Analysis from the University of Chicago, where he was a student of Benjamin S. Bloom. He holds a master’s degree from the University of Minnesota and a bachelor’s degree from Macalester College. Professor Anderson has authored and/or edited 18 books and has had 40 journal articles published. His most recognized and impactful works are *Increasing Teacher*

Effectiveness, Second Edition, published by UNESCO in 2004, and *A Taxonomy of Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*, published by Pearson in 2001. He is a co-founder of the Center of Excellence for Preparing Teachers of Children of Poverty, which is celebrating its 14th anniversary this year. In addition, he has established a scholarship program for first-generation college students who plan to become teachers.

Maria de Ibarrola

Center for Research and Advanced Studies

mdeibarrola@gmail.com

Maria de Ibarrola is a Professor and high-ranking National Researcher in Mexico, where since 1977 she has been a faculty-member in the Department of Educational Research at the Center for Research and Advanced Studies. Her undergraduate training was in sociology at the National Autonomous University of Mexico, and she also holds a master's degree in sociology from the University of Montreal (Canada) and a doctorate from the Center for Research and Advanced Studies in Mexico. At the Center she leads a research program in the politics, institutions and actors that shape the relations between education and work; and with the agreement of her Center and the National Union of Educational Workers, for the years 1989-1998 she served as General Director of the Union's Foundation for the improvement of teachers' culture and training. Maria has served as President of the Mexican Council of Educational Research, and as an adviser to UNESCO and various regional and national bodies. She has published more than 50 research papers, 35 book chapters, and 20 books; and she is a Past-President of the International Academy of Education.

D. C. Phillips

Stanford University

d.c.phillips@gmail.com

D. C. Phillips was born, educated, and began his professional life in Australia; he holds a B.Sc., B.Ed., M. Ed., and Ph.D. from the University of Melbourne. After teaching in high schools and at Monash University, he moved to Stanford University in the USA in 1974, where for a period he served as Associate Dean and later as Interim Dean of the School of Education, and where he is currently Professor Emeritus of Education and Philosophy. He is a philosopher of education and of social science, and has taught courses and also has published widely on the philosophers of science Popper, Kuhn and Lakatos; on philosophical issues in educational research and in program evaluation; on John Dewey and William James; and on social and psychological constructivism. For several years at Stanford he directed the Evaluation Training Program, and he also chaired a national Task Force representing eleven prominent Schools of Education that had received Spencer Foundation grants to make innovations to their doctoral-level research training programs. He is a Fellow of the IAE, and a member of the U.S. National Academy of Education, and has been a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Among his most recent publications are the *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy* (Sage; editor) and *A Companion to John Dewey's "Democracy and Education"* (University of Chicago Press).

SPECIAL ISSUE
Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Educational Evaluation

education policy analysis archives

Volume 26 Number 52

April 16, 2018

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, and distribute this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, it is distributed for non-commercial purposes only, and no alteration or transformation is made in the work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. All other uses must be approved by the author(s) or **EPAA**. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank; SCOPUS, Socolar (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at Audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join **EPAA's Facebook community** at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Scott Marley, Iveta Silova, Maria Teresa Tatto** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro San Diego State University

Gary Anderson New York University

Michael W. Apple University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale OISE, University of Toronto, Canada

Aaron Bevanot SUNY Albany

David C. Berliner Arizona State University

Henry Braun Boston College

Casey Cobb University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig San Jose State University

Linda Darling-Hammond Stanford University

Elizabeth H. DeBray University of Georgia

Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy

John Diamond University of Wisconsin, Madison

Matthew Di Carlo Albert Shanker Institute

Sherman Dorn Arizona State University

Michael J. Dumas University of California, Berkeley

Kathy Escamilla University of Colorado, Boulder

Yariv Feniger Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Melissa Lynn Freeman Adams State College

Rachael Gabriel University of Connecticut

Amy Garrett Dikkers University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Gene V Glass Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of California, Santa Cruz

Jacob P. K. Gross University of Louisville

Eric M. Haas WestEd

Julian Vasquez Heilig California State University, Sacramento

Kimberly Kappler Hewitt University of North Carolina Greensboro

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland

Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Jessica Nina Lester Indiana University

Amanda E. Lewis University of Illinois, Chicago

Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana University

Christopher Lubienski Indiana University

Sarah Lubienski Indiana University

William J. Mathis University of Colorado, Boulder

Michele S. Moses University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss Deakin University, Australia

Sharon Nichols University of Texas, San Antonio

Eric Parsons University of Missouri-Columbia

Amanda U. Potterton University of Kentucky

Susan L. Robertson Bristol University

Gloria M. Rodriguez University of California, Davis

R. Anthony Rolle University of Houston

A. G. Rud Washington State University

Patricia Sánchez University of University of Texas, San Antonio

Janelle Scott University of California, Berkeley

Jack Schneider College of the Holy Cross

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera Virginia Commonwealth University

Tina Trujillo University of California, Berkeley

Federico R. Waitoller University of Illinois, Chicago

Larisa Warhol University of Connecticut

John Weathers University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Kevin Welner University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley Center for Applied Linguistics

John Willinsky Stanford University

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth University of South Florida

Kyo Yamashiro Claremont Graduate University

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas
consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Asociados: **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Jason Beech**, (Universidad de San Andrés), **Angelica Buendía**, (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **Ezequiel Gomez Caride**, (Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina), **Antonio Luzon**, (Universidad de Granada), **José Luis Ramírez**, Universidad de Sonora)

Claudio Almonacid

Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México

Xavier Besalú Costa

Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia

Universidad de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner Universidad Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez

Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación, México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV,

México

Pedro Flores Crespo Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ana María García de Fanelli

Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad (CEDES) CONICET, Argentina

Juan Carlos González Faraco

Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé

Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez

Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM, México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez, Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, México

Miguel Pereyra Universidad de Granada, España

Mónica Pini Universidad Nacional de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves

Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico (IDEP)

José Luis Ramírez Romero

Universidad Autónoma de Sonora, México

Paula Razquin Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina

José Ignacio Rivas Flores

Universidad de Málaga, España

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas

Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez

Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Jurjo Torres Santomé, Universidad de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón

Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal

Universidad Diego Portales Santiago, Chile

Antoni Verger Planells

Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Catalina Wainerman

Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina

Juan Carlos Yáñez Velazco

Universidad de Colima, México

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editoras Associadas: **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV, Brazil), **Geovana Mendonça Lunardi Mendes** (Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **Marcia Pletsch, Sandra Regina Sales** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso

Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz

Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá

Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,
Brasil

Jane Paiva

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Maria Helena Bonilla

Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira

Universidade do Estado de Mato
Grosso, Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes

Universidade Estadual de Ponta
Grossa, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal do Mato
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes

Universidade Federal Fluminense e
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Brasil

António Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Suzana Feldens Schwertner

Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Debora Nunes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Norte, Brasil

Lílian do Valle

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Alda Junqueira Marin

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira

Universidade Federal de Minas
Gerais, Brasil