

A Narrative Review of Assessment in Higher Education

Peter Merisi¹ 

Olaitan Ayotunde Shemfe^{2*} 

Raymond Emekako³ 

AFFILIATIONS

¹Department of Languages, Literacies and Literatures, Faculty of Humanities, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

²Department of Economics and Business Management, Faculty of Economic and Financial Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, South Africa.

³Centre for Teaching and Learning and Optencia Research Entity, Faculty of Humanities, North-West University, Vanderbijlpark, South Africa.

CORRESPONDENCE

Email: oshemfe@wsu.ac.za*

EDITORIAL DATES

Received: 24 March 2026

Revised: 27 May 2026

Accepted: 20 June 2026

Published: 16 July 2026

Copyright:

© The Author(s) 2026.

Published by **ERRCDF Forum**.

This is an open access article distributed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence.



DOI: 10.38140/ijer-2026.vol8.2.06

Abstract: Higher education assessment has historically been characterised by high-stakes examinations that frequently promote surface learning and constrain deep understanding. This narrative review traces the evolution of assessment from early merit-based systems to contemporary methodologies that position assessment as a catalyst for learning. Drawing on 65 peer-reviewed and scholarly sources published between 1967 and 2025, the study employs an interpretive thematic synthesis to examine summative, formative, and sustainable assessment, with particular emphasis on feedback practices, peer assessment, and student motivation. The findings indicate that the design of assessment plays a critical role in shaping student engagement and learning outcomes, with transparent, well-aligned tasks corresponding to deeper learning, whereas poorly designed high-stakes assessments contribute to anxiety and disengagement. The review further identifies persistent gaps between student expectations and institutional practices, particularly concerning feedback quality, fairness, and clarity. To address these challenges, the study advocates for the integration of low-stakes formative assessment, enhanced feedback mechanisms, the development of feedback literacy, and more inclusive and context-

sensitive assessment design. Overall, the review underscores the necessity of reconceptualising assessment as a collaborative, equitable, and learning-oriented process in higher education.

Keywords: Assessment for learning, formative assessment, summative assessment, feedback and reflection, peer assessment, student engagement, higher education.

1. Introduction

Assessment is a cornerstone of higher education, serving various purposes such as measuring student learning and informing instructional decisions. In university settings, traditional assessment practices have long been dominated by high-stakes examinations, including invigilated, closed-book, and time-limited tests (Parker et al., 2021). While these formats continue to be prevalent in many disciplines, especially where scalability and academic integrity are paramount, there is increasing evidence of a shift towards more diverse and learning-focused assessment methods. These include open-book exams, continuous coursework, and formative assessment practices—a transition that has been further accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic and the digital transformation in higher education (Khalil et al., 2022; French et al., 2024). The rationale for proctored exams is, in part, to ensure academic integrity (Khalil et al., 2022). However, substantial criticism of high-stakes exams is well established: they encourage superficial learning strategies (Berliner, 2011; French et al., 2024), fail to foster higher-order thinking (Shepard, 2000), induce stress that impairs performance (Kruger et al., 2018), and misalign with the principles of constructive alignment, which require coherence between learning outcomes, teaching methods, and assessment tasks (Biggs & Tang, 2011). In recognition of these limitations, researchers are increasingly exploring innovative approaches that

How to cite this article:

Merisi, P., Shemfe, O. A., & Emekako, R. (2026). A narrative review of assessment in higher education. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Education Research*, 8(2), a06. <https://doi.org/10.38140/ijer-2026.vol8.2.06>

position assessment as a driver of learning rather than merely a mechanism for measurement (Levy-Feldman, 2025; Schellekens et al., 2021).

Despite the growing body of systematic and scoping reviews on assessment in higher education, important gaps remain. While these reviews offer valuable categorisations of assessment concepts and practices, they often emphasise methodological classification over integrative and critical interpretation. This narrative review aims to address this gap by moving beyond categorisation to critically integrate historical, conceptual, and empirical insights, providing a more cohesive account of how assessment practices can be transformed to align with contemporary learning imperatives. The goals of this review are, therefore, to: (a) critically examine the historical evolution of assessment; (b) analyse the shift from summative to formative and sustainable assessment, including feedback; (c) evaluate the role of peer assessment; (d) explore how assessment design influences student motivation; and (e) identify gaps between student expectations and teachers' perceptions, with implications for addressing these challenges.

2. Methodology

This paper employs a narrative review approach, which is well-suited for synthesising a broad range of theoretical, conceptual, and empirical contributions on assessment in higher education. Unlike systematic reviews, which adhere to strict protocols, a narrative review facilitates the interpretive integration of diverse sources, placing greater emphasis on depth of analysis rather than exhaustive coverage (Green, Johnson & Adams, 2006). The review incorporates seminal works, contemporary studies, and policy-oriented literature that have significantly influenced discussions on assessment practices. Priority was given to literature that examines assessment in higher education, addresses formative, summative, sustainable, and peer assessment, and engages with issues of feedback, motivation, and fairness.

The search strategy focused on literature published between 1967 and 2025 to encompass both foundational and contemporary developments. Keywords included combinations of terms such as "assessment in higher education," "formative assessment," "summative assessment," "peer assessment," "feedback," and "student motivation." Sources were identified through searches in academic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar, supplemented by manual checks of reference lists and authoritative texts. In total, 65 peer-reviewed and scholarly sources were included in the review, selected through an iterative process based on their relevance to the research objectives and thematic contribution. While formal inclusion and exclusion criteria were not applied, emphasis was placed on widely cited peer-reviewed studies and conceptually influential works. Both classical contributions (Bloom, 1971; Black & Wiliam, 1998) and recent scholarship on digital and sustainable assessment were incorporated to ensure historical depth and contemporary relevance.

Findings were synthesised thematically, focusing on the evolution of assessment, the shift towards formative and sustainable approaches, the role of peer assessment, and the tensions between student expectations and institutional practices. The synthesis integrates empirical, theoretical, and policy-oriented literature to provide both analytical depth and contextual breadth. Given the interpretive nature of narrative reviews, the process was iterative, with themes refined through repeated engagement with the literature. Efforts were made to incorporate diverse perspectives, and reflexivity was maintained to minimise bias in the selection and interpretation of sources. This thematic synthesis facilitated the development of a critical narrative that integrates conceptual debates with practical implications for higher education.

3. Findings of the Review

The findings of this narrative review are presented thematically to elucidate the major developments and debates pertaining to assessment in higher education, as identified across the reviewed

literature. The synthesis underscores five interconnected themes: the evolution of assessment practices, the shift towards formative and sustainable assessment, the role of peer assessment, the influence of assessment on student motivation, and the disparity between student expectations and teachers' perceptions. Collectively, these themes demonstrate how assessment has evolved from a predominantly measurement-oriented activity to a learning-centred process that fosters student engagement, feedback, equity, and lifelong learning, while also revealing persistent challenges that necessitate ongoing attention from educators and higher education institutions.

3.1 Evolution of assessment in higher education

Assessment has long served as a mechanism to select and certify individuals with desired competencies (Brown, 2022; Gipps, 1994). Historically, assessment has been dominated by high-stakes, standardised examinations, many features of which persist in contemporary higher education. The 20th century introduced objective testing formats such as multiple-choice questions to address grading inconsistency, enabling reliability coefficients and formal psychometric frameworks, including item response theory, validity frameworks, and criterion-referenced standard setting (Clauser, 2022). However, critics have consistently argued that high-stakes standardised tests emphasise easily measurable knowledge at the expense of complex learning, constrain instruction towards “teaching to the test,” and may exacerbate inequalities (Bourdieu, 1974; Gipps, 1994). By the late 20th century, scholars distinguished summative assessment (final judgement for grading and certification) from formative assessment, which provides ongoing feedback to shape learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Sadler, 1989). This distinction remains central, though often blurred in practice (Boud, 2007; Brown, 2022). Institutional demands for accountability continue to prioritise summative approaches, often limiting the effectiveness of formative practices (Schellekens et al., 2021; French et al., 2024). Consequently, educators must navigate competing expectations, balancing the need to evaluate learning outcomes with the imperative to support ongoing student development.

More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated shifts towards alternative assessment formats, including open-book, project-based, and authentic assessments. Many of these approaches persist, particularly those aligned with flexibility and real-world skills (Khalil et al., 2022; French et al., 2024). Overall, assessment has evolved from a predominantly certifying function toward more learning-oriented and feedback-centred approaches.

3.2 Formative, summative, and sustainable assessment

A central challenge for educators is ensuring that assessment genuinely serves educational goals. Summative assessments, such as exams, final projects, and course grades, play a crucial role in certifying achievement but are typically conducted at the end of learning cycles, often too late to enable meaningful improvement (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). While the distinction between formative and summative assessment is useful, these practices often serve multiple purposes simultaneously (Bennett, 2011). Additionally, concerns have been raised that when formative assessment becomes institutionalised, it can become proceduralised and lose its intended pedagogical value (Torrance, 2012). Formative assessments support learning throughout the process via activities such as questioning, feedback, and low-stakes tasks (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

Feedback is central to formative assessment, particularly when it is timely, specific, and actionable (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Opportunities for revision further strengthen learning by promoting reflection and self-regulation. The concept of sustainable assessment extends these principles by developing students' capacity for self-evaluation and lifelong learning (Boud, 2007). Practices such as self- and peer-assessment support evaluative judgement and deeper learning. Transparency and fairness are also critical dimensions of effective assessment design. Students are more likely to approach assessments positively when they clearly understand expectations and feel that evaluations are equitable (Knight, 2001). Clear criteria and exemplars enhance student understanding and reduce

perceptions of bias (Knight, 2001). Therefore, effective assessment integrates summative, formative, and sustainable elements to support both immediate and long-term learning.

3.3 Peer assessment

Peer assessment involves students evaluating each other's work and is rooted in social constructivist theory (Ashenafi, 2017). This approach enhances learning by engaging students in applying assessment criteria, developing critical thinking, and fostering self-regulation (Colthorpe et al., 2014). Research shows that peer review of essays, for example, leads to better internalisation of assessment criteria and improved performance in future tasks (Mowl & Pain, 1995). Consequently, peer assessment serves both as a learning activity and an assessment tool. Evidence suggests that students benefit equally from providing feedback as they do from receiving it (Culver, 2023). Therefore, even when peer ratings are not factored into grades, the process remains a valuable learning exercise.

Successful implementation requires careful scaffolding. Without guidance, students may struggle to provide effective feedback, emphasising the need for training and clearly defined criteria (Burgess et al., 2020) and highlighting the importance of formal training in feedback skills (Natesan et al., 2023). While initial resistance is common, students generally come to recognise the value of peer assessment over time (Planas Lladó et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2002). In the absence of guidance, peer feedback may be superficial or inaccurate. However, when facilitated properly, peer feedback can be as effective as instructor feedback in enhancing students' work (Cho & MacArthur, 2010).

The feedback aspect of peer assessment is its most significant advantage. Articulating feedback deepens the reviewers' understanding of the subject, while recipients gain insights that a single instructor may not provide. Additionally, peer assessment addresses motivational factors by shifting the focus from competition to collaboration, thereby increasing students' sense of ownership over their learning. However, its effectiveness is not consistent across different contexts. In educational cultures that are more hierarchical or collectivist, where critiquing peers may be viewed as inappropriate or uncomfortable, students might hesitate to give critical feedback or may prioritise social harmony over evaluative accuracy. Thus, the success of peer assessment relies on careful scaffolding, cultural sensitivity, and explicit training to support constructive feedback practices in diverse learning environments. Furthermore, it aligns with sustainable assessment by providing students with practice in evaluative judgement, which is exactly the kind of critical peer review expected in professional settings. While further cross-disciplinary research is necessary, there is consensus that well-implemented peer assessment significantly enriches the educational experience. However, it also presents challenges, including concerns about reliability, bias, and social dynamics. The effectiveness of peer assessment, therefore, hinges on structured implementation, training, and contextual sensitivity.

3.4 Assessment and student motivation for learning

Assessment practices, such as peer assessment discussed in the previous section, demonstrate how design choices can influence both cognitive engagement and motivational outcomes, highlighting the interconnected nature of assessment processes. Student motivation is a crucial factor affecting the effectiveness of these practices. In higher education, motivation refers to the effort and engagement students dedicate to learning tasks, which is influenced by their perceptions of the value, fairness, and relevance of assessments (Wentzel & Wigfield, 2009).

The design of assessments plays a central role in shaping this motivation. High-stakes assessments, like final examinations, often encourage effort due to their significant consequences; however, they can also induce anxiety that detracts from performance (Von der Embse & Witmer, 2014). In contrast, low-stakes assessments may alleviate pressure but can lead to diminished student effort when tasks are viewed as unimportant (Wise & DeMars, 2010; Liu et al., 2012). This creates a key tension: the same design element that promotes effort may also impede meaningful engagement. Furthermore,

students' perceptions of assessments are equally influential. When assessment tasks are clearly aligned with learning outcomes and considered relevant to future professional practice, students are more likely to engage deeply (Struyven et al., 2005; Mirzaei et al., 2025). Conversely, assessments perceived as unclear, unfair, or disconnected from course content tend to encourage superficial learning strategies.

From a theoretical standpoint, self-determination theory offers a valuable framework for understanding these dynamics (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The theory differentiates between intrinsic motivation (engaging in learning for its own sake) and extrinsic motivation (driven by external rewards such as grades). Assessment designs that promote autonomy, provide meaningful feedback, and emphasise relevance are more likely to cultivate intrinsic motivation. In contrast, assessments that focus heavily on grades and impose high pressure tend to reinforce extrinsic motivation.

Effective assessment design, therefore, requires a balance between accountability and engagement. Offering students some degree of choice, ensuring transparency in expectations, and integrating feedback opportunities can enhance motivation by fostering a sense of control and competence (Kessels et al., 2024; Hall, 2007). At the same time, minimising unnecessary stressors—such as clustered deadlines or excessive assessment loads—can help prevent disengagement and support sustained effort (Kusurkar et al., 2023). Ultimately, assessment serves not only as a measure of learning but also as a critical driver of student motivation. Designing assessments that are aligned, meaningful, and supportive of autonomy is essential for promoting deeper engagement and more effective learning outcomes.

3.5 Student expectations vs. teachers' perceptions

Despite broad agreement on the principles of good assessment, there remains a persistent disconnect between what students expect from assessment and what faculty perceive as effective. Expectation gaps manifest in several ways: students desire more feedback than they receive, expect clearer grading criteria, and seek assessments that are more relevant to professional contexts (Jones et al., 2016). Studies employing service quality models consistently report discrepancies between students' expectations and their perceived assessment quality. Asefi et al. (2017) identified an overall quality gap of -0.77 on a five-point scale, highlighting significant shortfalls in feedback quality, staff responsiveness, and empathy towards student circumstances. Similar gaps have also been reported in various higher education contexts, including South Africa and Europe (Pather & Dorasamy, 2018; Sarrico & Rosa, 2014). These gaps diminish student satisfaction, trust, and the effectiveness of assessment as a learning tool. Students frequently express dissatisfaction with key aspects of assessment, as outlined below:

3.5.1 Clarity of criteria and expectations

Students need clear guidance on what is expected in assignments and examinations. When rubrics are vague or criteria are poorly communicated, assessments can seem arbitrary to students. Andrade and Du (2005) found that involving students in discussions about rubrics enhances their understanding of quality standards. Additionally, Jonsson (2014) emphasises the importance of explicit criteria and exemplars in helping students align their work with expected outcomes. Many students report that expectations are unclear or implicit, underscoring the necessity for transparency (Cook-Sather, 2020; Bovill et al., 2011). Conversely, when expectations are not made explicit, an expectation gap arises, leading to frustration and perceptions of bias (Sadler, 2005).

3.5.2 Quality and timeliness of feedback

Instructors often assume that the feedback is adequate; however, students frequently report dissatisfaction with its depth and timeliness. Hattie and Timperley (2007) argue that effective feedback addresses three questions: Where am I going? How am I going? And where to next?

Delayed or vague feedback diminishes effectiveness. Additionally, students report feedback as generic or disconnected from their learning needs, which reinforces the importance of feedback as a dialogic process (Cook-Sather, 2020; Bovill et al., 2011). Dialogic feedback fosters reflection and self-regulation (Carless, 2006; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Systems that prioritise prompt, specific, and forward-looking feedback cultivate a culture of continuous learning rather than detached judgment.

3.5.3 Alignment with learning

Students expect a coherent relationship between the content delivered in lectures and the assessments they undertake. When assessments appear misaligned with lecture material, students perceive the process as unjust and may resort to surface learning strategies, such as rote memorisation and examination prediction, rather than cultivating a genuine understanding (Ramsden, 2003). As Biggs (1999) argues, effective teaching necessitates an explicit linkage among intended learning outcomes, teaching activities, and assessment tasks. This alignment fosters self-regulation and deeper engagement (Nicol, 2009). However, achieving comprehensive alignment in practice can be problematic due to institutional and contextual constraints, including varied backgrounds, expectations, and approaches to engaging with knowledge (Knight, 2002; Haggis, 2003). When assessments encompass content that extends beyond what has been taught without adequate scaffolding, trust and motivation diminish, rendering constructive alignment not merely a pedagogical ideal but a practical necessity. Consequently, misalignment compromises both trust and motivation.

3.5.4 Support and fairness

Perceived empathy and flexibility in assessment practices significantly enhance students' sense of fairness and belonging (Hagenauer & Volet, 2014). Conversely, rigid assessment policies and a lack of responsiveness can undermine trust in academic institutions. Equitable assessment necessitates transparency and the provision of genuine opportunities for all students to demonstrate their learning (Nieminen, 2025). Involving students in feedback and rubric processes fosters a sense of ownership and engagement (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Additionally, practices such as mid-semester feedback mechanisms facilitate real-time improvements in teaching and assessment (Wickramasinghe & Timpson, 2006; Sözer & Zeybekoğlu, 2019). Such approaches reinforce fairness through transparency rather than compromising academic standards.

4. Implications: Bridging the Gap in Assessment Practices and Recommendations

This review elucidates that, although scholarship has established comprehensive principles and innovative strategies for effective assessment, actual practice in numerous higher education environments has not yet fully aligned. Bridging the divide between theory and practice necessitates deliberate modifications at both the classroom and policy levels. In the context of higher education, these modifications must consider structural constraints such as large class sizes, disciplinary silos, an increasing reliance on part-time teaching staff, and the competing demands of research and teaching responsibilities.

4.1 Integrating assessment with learning

Assessment should function as an integral component of the teaching-learning continuum rather than merely a mechanism for assigning grades. Shepard (2000) argues that the conventional separation between instruction and assessment undermines deeper cognitive engagement, advocating instead for a learning culture in which assessment and instruction are interdependent. From a constructivist perspective, assessment tasks ought to challenge students to engage with ideas, articulate reasoning, and comprehend content rather than merely recalling facts. Black and Wiliam's (1998) foundational work similarly underscores the importance of low-stakes, frequent assessments

that provide diagnostic information and promote metacognition. When thoughtfully integrated into the learning process, assessment fosters continuous improvement, enabling students to actively interpret and apply feedback to refine their understanding and enhance the quality of their work (Carney et al., 2022).

Realising this vision places significant demands on faculty: educators require not only content expertise but also assessment literacy, which includes skills in data interpretation, task design, and facilitating learner reflection (Schildkamp et al., 2020). These challenges are particularly pronounced in large-enrolment courses, where time and resource constraints often limit the feasibility of continuous formative assessment and detailed feedback. Furthermore, the increasing reliance on part-time or sessional staff further highlights the necessity for clear assessment frameworks and shared standards to ensure consistency across modules.

In the absence of adequate institutional support, lecturers often revert to traditional summative assessments, perceiving them as quicker or more reliable. Universities should provide ongoing professional development, mentorship, and collaborative forums that assist educators in designing meaningful low-stakes assessments and managing feedback effectively. Institutional policies must also acknowledge assessment as essential academic work by adjusting teaching loads and rewarding innovative practices, thereby ensuring that the responsibility is shared rather than placed solely on individual instructors.

4.2 Ensuring equity and fairness

Assessment practices can either promote or reinforce inequality, depending on their design. Equitable assessment necessitates the provision of multiple, culturally responsive methods for students to demonstrate their learning. This approach must take into account linguistic diversity, accommodations for disabilities, and varying prior educational experiences (Watermeyer, 2012). Transparency is crucial; unclear or ambiguous grading criteria disadvantage students who may not have prior experience navigating academic expectations. For valid assessments and to build student trust, clarity in criteria, exemplars, and feedback processes is essential (Knight, 2001). Universities should mandate the clear communication of assessment criteria, encourage the use of exemplars, and ensure the moderation of grading practices. Reforming assessment is therefore both a pedagogical and a social justice imperative, aimed at ensuring that higher education facilitates success for all learners, rather than perpetuating structural inequalities. Moreover, assessment practices must be attuned to disciplinary differences, as expectations regarding knowledge production and evaluation can vary significantly across fields.

4.3 Enhancing feedback mechanisms

Quality feedback lies at the core of formative assessment. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) underscore that feedback functions best as a dialogue supporting self-regulated learning rather than as a one-way transmission of comments. When feedback is delayed or superficial, its efficacy is greatly diminished (Evans, 2013). To make feedback feasible on a larger scale, institutions can adopt technological tools such as automated quizzes and learning analytics to address basic misunderstandings, freeing instructors' time for nuanced commentary on deeper tasks. This is especially critical in massified higher education systems, where high student-staff ratios necessitate scalable feedback strategies. Crucially, the impact of feedback also depends on students' capacity to engage with it. Carless and Boud (2018) introduced the concept of feedback literacy, defined as the knowledge and dispositions students need to make sense of and act on feedback. Developing feedback literacy is enhanced through peer review, exemplar analysis, and iterative revision processes. Policies should embed structured peer feedback cycles and allow iterative submission to frame feedback as ongoing dialogue rather than terminal evaluation.

4.4 Addressing student motivation

Educators and institutional leaders must shape assessment systems that actively foster student buy-in. When students clearly understand how an assessment connects to their learning goals or future professional practice, they are more likely to view it as meaningful (Mirzaei et al., 2025). Providing autonomy in assessment format or topic enhances motivation by supporting students' sense of control and ownership (Kessels et al., 2024). Equally important is reducing unnecessary stressors. Overloading students with clustered deadlines or punitive grading schemes provokes avoidance behaviours and diminishes learning orientation (Kusurkar et al., 2023). Spacing assessments, allowing formative practice, and distributing deadlines evenly can lower affective barriers. Institutional policy should coordinate scheduling across courses and embed support mechanisms, such as study strategy workshops and stress management resources, to acknowledge the emotional dimension of assessment.

4.5 Continuous improvement through feedback loops

Continuous review of assessment practices is essential for maintaining relevance, quality, and fairness. Institutions should embed regular evaluation of assessment systems into quality assurance frameworks, establishing assessment committees that draw on student performance data, external moderation reports, and curriculum reviews to identify gaps or misalignments (Palomba & Banta, 1999). This approach shifts institutional culture from compliance to improvement; when a course consistently records poor student performance, the appropriate response is to examine whether assessment design and support systems require adjustment, rather than questioning student ability. However, the effectiveness of such approaches depends on institutional capacity. While many universities already have assessment or quality assurance committees, these bodies often face constraints related to limited authority, insufficient resources, and competing institutional priorities, which can hinder meaningful implementation of recommended changes. Addressing these barriers requires not only structural mechanisms but also institutional commitment, adequate resources, and alignment between policy and practice. Constructive use of student evaluations and reflective input from instructors ensures that feedback informs tangible changes in practice (Bolt et al., 2013). Regular training for academic staff on assessment design should be institutionalised to sustain consistency and innovation across programmes.

5. Conclusion

Assessment in higher education is at a crossroads between tradition and innovation. This review has traced how historical practices have shaped the familiar landscape of exams and grades, while educational research has illuminated pathways to make assessment more engaging, fair, and effective. Bridging this gap is a central challenge for contemporary higher education. Evidence suggests that an overemphasis on high-stakes summative assessment undermines student motivation and learning. Incorporating formative assessments, rich feedback, and authentic tasks can significantly enhance outcomes, but their effectiveness relies on assessment literacy and sustained institutional support.

This review contributes by integrating insights from psychometrics, motivation theory, classroom practices, and student experience to provide a more cohesive understanding of assessment in higher education. While effective strategies are well established in the literature, their implementation is uneven in practice. This review emphasises that the challenge lies less in identifying effective practices than in consistently implementing them across institutional contexts. Bridging the gap between sound assessment theory and real-world application remains both a scholarly and institutional imperative.

This review is subject to several limitations. As a narrative review, the selection and interpretation of sources were guided by relevance rather than formal inclusion and exclusion criteria, which may

introduce selection bias. Additionally, the review primarily draws on English-language sources, potentially limiting the representation of scholarship from non-English-speaking contexts. These limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings and conclusions presented.

Future research should explore how online and remote assessments, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, can be secured while supporting meaningful and engaging learning experiences. Emerging approaches, including learning analytics and adaptive assessment, raise important questions regarding transparency, data privacy, and student agency. The long-term impact of sustainable assessment practices on graduates' professional capabilities remains underexplored, necessitating further longitudinal research. Furthermore, culturally responsive assessment design requires more sustained attention, particularly in diverse and postcolonial higher education contexts, where dominant academic discourses may systematically disadvantage specific student groups. As Barnett (2000) noted, educators are preparing students for an age of super complexity. Therefore, assessment practices must evolve to cultivate adaptable and reflective learners. Aligning assessment practices with these aims is essential for ensuring that higher education supports meaningful and sustained student success.

6. Declarations

Author Contributions: Conceptualisations (P.M., O.A.S. & R.E.); Literature review (P.M., O.A.S. & R.E.); methodology (P.M., O.A.S. & R.E.); software (N/A.); validation (R.P.M., O.A.S. & R.E.); formal analysis (N/A); investigation (P.M., O.A.S. & R.E.); data curation (P.M., O.A.S. & E.R.); drafting and preparation (P.M., O.A.S. & R.E.); review and editing (P.M., O.A.S. & R.E.); supervision (N/A); project administration (P.M.); funding acquisition (N/A). All authors have read and approved the published version of the article.

Funding: This research did not receive any external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement: This review is based entirely on publicly available data and information sourced from peer-reviewed articles, reports, and other academic publications cited in the manuscript. No new primary data were generated or analysed during this study. Readers may refer to the cited sources for detailed information.

References

- Andrade, H. L., & Du, Y. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Educational & Counselling Psychology Faculty Scholarship*, 10(3), 1–12.
- Asefi, F., Delaram, M., & Deris, F. (2017). Gap between the expectations and perceptions of students regarding the educational services offered in a school of nursing and midwifery. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*, 11(4), JC01–JC04. <https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2017/21483.9640>
- Ashenafi, M. M. (2017). Peer-assessment in higher education: Twenty-first-century practices, challenges and the way forward. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(2), 226–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711>
- Barnett, R. (2000). *Realizing the university in an age of supercomplexity*. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: A critical review. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2010.513678>
- Berliner, D. (2011). Rational responses to high stakes testing: The case of curriculum narrowing and the harm that follows. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(3), 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2011.607151>
- Biggs, J. (1999). What the student does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 18(1), 57–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2012.642839>

- Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (4th ed.). Maidenhead, UK: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5(1), 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Bloom, B. S. (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning*. McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Bolt, S., Perrin, B. J., & Porter, S. (2013). Closing the loop with collegiate conversations in an Australian voluntary peer review of teaching program. *International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 19(3), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9494/CGP/v19i03/48643>
- Bourdieu, P. (1974). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. In J. Eggleston (Ed.), *Contemporary research in the sociology of education*. London: Methuen.
- Bovill, C., Cook-Sather, A., & Felten, P. (2011). Students as co-creators of teaching approaches, course design, and curricula: Implications for academic developers. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 16(2), 133-145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2011.568690>
- Brown, G. T. L. (2022). The past, present and future of educational assessment: A transdisciplinary perspective. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 1060633. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1060633>
- Burgess, A., van Diggele, C., Roberts, C., & Mellis, C. (2020). Feedback in the clinical setting. *BMC Medical Education*, 20(Suppl 2), 460. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-02280-5>
- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 219-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572132>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Carney, E. A., Zhang, X., Charsha, A., Taylor, J. N., & Hoshaw, J. P. (2022). Formative assessment helps students learn over time: Why aren't we paying more attention to it? *Intersection: A journal at the intersection of assessment and learning*, 4(1), n1. <https://doi.org/10.61669/001c.38391>
- Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 328–338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.006>
- Clauser, B. E. (2022). A history of classical test theory. In B. E. Clauser & M. B. Bunch (Eds.), *The history of educational measurement: Key advancements in theory, policy, and practice* (pp. 13–32). Routledge.
- Colthorpe, K., Chen, X., & Zimbardi, K. (2014). Peer feedback enhances a "journal club" for undergraduate science students that develops oral communication and critical evaluation skills. *Journal of Learning Design*, 7(2), 105-119. <https://doi.org/10.5204/jld.v7i2.198>
- Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Respecting voices: How the co-creation of teaching and learning can support academic staff, underrepresented students, and equitable practices. *Higher Education*, 79, 885–901. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00445-w>
- Culver, C. (2023). Learning as a peer assessor: Evaluating peer-assessment strategies. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(5), 581-597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2107167>
- Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 70–120. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350>
- French, S., Dickerson, A., & Mulder, R. A. (2024). A review of the benefits and drawbacks of high-stakes final examinations in higher education. *Higher Education*, 88(3), 893–918. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01148-z>
- Gipps, C. (1994). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London: Falmer Press.
- Green, B. N., Johnson, C. D., & Adams, A. (2006). Writing narrative literature reviews for peer-reviewed journals: Secrets of the trade. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 5(3), 101–117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467\(07\)60142-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3467(07)60142-6)

- Hagenauer, G., & Volet, S. E. (2014). Teacher-student relationship at university: An important yet under-researched field. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(3), 370-388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2014.921613>
- Haggis, T. (2003). Constructing images of ourselves? A critical investigation into 'approaches to learning' research in higher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(1), 89-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0141192032000057401>
- Hall, T. S. (2007). *Improving self-efficacy in problem solving: Learning from errors and feedback*. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Jones, H., Yeoman, K., Gaskell, E., & Prendergast, J. (2016). Perceptions of university assessment and feedback among post-16 school pupils. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(8), 1233-1246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1259388>
- Jonsson, A. (2014). Rubrics as a way of providing transparency in assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 840-852. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.875117>
- Kessels, G., Xu, K., & Dirkx, K. (2024). Flexible assessments as a tool to improve student motivation: An explorative study on student motivation for flexible assessments. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1290977. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1290977>
- Khalil, M., Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2022). In the nexus of integrity and surveillance: Proctoring (re)considered. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(6), 1589-1602. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12713>
- Knight, P. T. (2001). A briefing on key concepts: Formative and summative, criterion and norm-referenced assessment (Assessment Series No. 7). York, UK: LTSN Generic Centre.
- Knight, P. T. (2002). Summative assessment in higher education: Practices in disarray. *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(3), 275-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070220000662>
- Kruger, L. J., Wandle, C., & Struzziero, J. (2018). Coping with the stress of high stakes testing. *High Stakes Testing*, 109-128.
- Kusurkar, R. A., Orsini, C., Somra, S., Artino Jr, A. R., Daelmans, H. E., Schoonmade, L. J., & van der Vleuten, C. (2023). The effect of assessments on student motivation for learning and its outcomes in health professions education: A review and realist synthesis. *Academic Medicine*, 98(9), 1083-1092. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000005263>
- Levy-Feldman, I. (2025). The role of assessment in improving education and promoting educational equity. *Education Sciences*, 15(2), 224. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020224>
- Liu, O. L., Bridgeman, B., & Adler, R. M. (2012). Measuring learning outcomes in higher education: Motivation matters. *Educational Researcher*, 41(9), 352-362. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12459679>
- Mirzaei, M., Hoseini Shavoun, A., & Ahmari Tehran, H. (2025). Enhancing student motivation in higher education: Evidence-based strategies for effective teaching. *Medical Education Bulletin*, 6(1), 1005-1014.
- Mowl, G., & Pain, R. (1995). Using self and peer assessment to improve students' essay writing: A case study from geography. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 32(4), 324-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1355800950320404>
- Natesan, S., Jordan, J., Sheng, A., Carmelli, G., Barbas, B., King, A., & Gottlieb, M. (2023). Feedback in medical education: An evidence-based guide to best practices from the Council of Residency Directors in Emergency Medicine. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 24(3), 479. <https://doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2020.4.46060>
- Nicol, D. (2009). Assessment for learner self-regulation: Enhancing achievement in the first year using learning technologies. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(3), 335-352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930802255139>

- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Nieminen, J. H. (2025). The paradox of inclusive assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 50(4), 564-576. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2419604>
- Palomba, C., & Banta, T. W. (1999). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education*. Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Parker, A.M., Watson, E., Dyck, N., & Carey, J.P. (2021). *Traditional versus open-book exams in remote course delivery: A narrative review of the literature*. Proceedings of the Canadian Engineering Education Association (CEEAA).
- Pather, S., & Dorasamy, N. (2018). The mismatch between first-year students' expectations and experience alongside university access and success: A South African university case study. *Journal of Student Affairs in Africa*, 6(1), 49-64. <https://doi.org/10.24085/jsaa.v6i1.3065>
- Planas Lladó, A., Soley, L. F., Fraguell Sansbelló, R. M., Pujolras, G. A., Planella, J. P., Roura-Pascual, N., ... & Moreno, L. M. (2014). Student perceptions of peer assessment: An interdisciplinary study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(5), 592-610. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.860077>
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge Falmer. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203507711>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Sadler, D.R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18, 119-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>
- Sadler, D. R. (2005). Interpretations of criteria-based assessment and grading in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(2), 175-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000264262>
- Sarrico, C.S., & Rosa, M.J. (2014). Student satisfaction with Portuguese higher education institutions: The view of different types of students. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20, 165-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2014.900108>
- Schellekens, L. H., Bok, H. G., De Jong, L. H., Van der Schaaf, M. F., Kremer, W. D., & Van der Vleuten, C. P. (2021). A scoping review on the notions of assessment as learning (AaL), assessment for learning (AfL), and assessment of learning (AoL). *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 71, 101094. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101094>
- Schildkamp, K., van der Kleij, F. M., Heitink, M. C., Kippers, W. B., & Veldkamp, B. P. (2020). Formative assessment: A systematic review of critical teacher prerequisites for classroom practice. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 103, 101602. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101602>
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 4-14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029007004>
- Smith, H., Cooper, A., & Lancaster, L. (2002). Improving the quality of undergraduate peer assessment: A case for student and staff development. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 39(1), 71-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13558000110102904>
- Sozer, E. M., Zeybekoglu, Z., & Kaya, M. (2019). Using mid-semester course evaluation as a feedback tool for improving learning and teaching in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(7), 1003-1016. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1564810>
- Struyven, K., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2005). Students' Perceptions about Evaluation and Assessment in Higher Education: A review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 30(4), 325-341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500099102>

- Torrance, H. (2012). Formative assessment at the crossroads: Conformative, deformative and transformative assessment. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(3), 323-342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2012.689693>
- Von der Embse, N. P., & Witmer, S. E. (2014). High-stakes accountability: Student anxiety and large-scale testing. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 30(2), 132-156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377903.2014.888529>
- Watermeyer, R. (2012). From engagement to impact? Articulating the public value of academic research. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 18(2), 115-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2011.641578>
- Wentzel, K. R., & Wigfield, A. (Eds.). (2009). Introduction to motivation at school. In *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 1-6). New York: Routledge.
- Wickramasinghe, S. R., & Timpson, W. M. (2006). Mid-semester student feedback enhances student learning. *Education for Chemical Engineers*, 1(1), 126-133. <https://doi.org/10.1205/ece06012>
- Wise, S. L., & DeMars, C. E. (2010). Low examinee effort in low-stakes assessment: Problems and potential solutions. *Educational Assessment*, 10(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326977ea1001_1

Disclaimer: The views, perspectives, information, and data contained within all publications are exclusively those of the respective author(s) and contributor(s) and do not represent or reflect the positions of ERRCD Forum and/or its editor(s). ERRCD Forum and its editor(s) expressly disclaim responsibility for any damages to persons or property arising from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referenced in the content.