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Understanding relationship between technology-mediated peer and teacher feedback and feedback uptake and literacy

1. Feedback literacy & paradigm shifts
2. The USM Model
3. Online Feedback practices & methodology
4. Results and discussion
5. Implications & conclusions
Feedback is powerful! But…

**Introduction**

The most powerful single influence on achievement is feedback but impacts are highly variable, which indicates the complexity of maximising benefits from feedback (Hattie 2009). Feedback processes in higher education are commonly misunderstood, difficult to carry out effectively and do not fulfil their potential.
For feedback to be effective...

It must be used to ‘alter the gap’ (Sadler, 1989)
For feedback to be effective...

It must be used to ‘alter the gap’ (Sadler, 1989)

Half of students fail to collect feedback, or engage with it poorly (Evans, 2013; Handley, Price & Millar, 2011)

Problems exacerbated by view of feedback as transmission (Er et al., 2020; Molloy et al., 2019)

However
Feedback literacy

How can it be developed?

Through, analysing exemplars, working with assessment criteria Peer feedback etc. (Carless and Boud, 2018)

Dialogues may enhance benefits of these processes (Carless, 2015; Zhu & Carless, 2018)

Student Feedback Literacy
(Adapted from Carless and Boud 2018; Molloy et al. 2020)

- Appreciate feedback
- Refine evaluative judgments
- Take action in response to feedback
- Work with emotions productively

(Carless & Winstone, 2020)
The changing context of feedback practice

COVID-19—going online changes message and relational and practical aspects of feedback—mediate the effects of the practice (Winstone et al., 2017)

Gap in dialogic studies in digital settings that target feedback uptake & literacy (Ajjawi & Boud, 2017; Steen-Utheim & Hopfenbeck, 2018)

Need for new perspectives on feedback uptake & literacy for digital environments
What is the impact of dialogic feedback on feedback uptake in the literature?

Helped ‘negotiate meaning’ (Zhu & Carless, 2018) and develop feedback literacy overtime (Reddy et al. 2020; Han & Xu, 2019)
What is the impact of dialogic feedback on feedback uptake in the literature?

Helped ‘negotiate meaning’ (Zhu & Carless, 2018) and develop feedback literacy overtime (Reddy et al. 2020; Han & Xu, 2019)

Limitations of dialogic feedback in practice

Dialogic peer feedback met ‘contextual difficulties’ (Zhu & Carless, 2018)

Affective and relational issues involved (Han & Xu, 2019)
The dialogic USM model of feedback uptake & literacy (blended and online) (Wood, 2020)
(simplified)
Formative assessment and technology-mediated dialogic peer feedback (Nicol 2010; Carless, 2015)

Feedback viewed as social and constructed dialogic process (Nicol, 2010; Price et al., 2011)
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Self-assessment, goal setting & regulation

The dialogic USM model of feedback uptake & literacy (blended and online) (Wood, 2020) (simplified)
• Dialogic and technology-mediated peer (and teacher) feedback (Nicol 2010; Carless, 2015)
• Feedback as social and constructed dialogic process (Nicol, 2010; Price et al., 2011)
• Emphasis on student role in making feedback processes effective (Nash and Winstone, 2017)
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**Self-assessment, goal setting & regulation**

**Motivation** affect & receptivity

Ongoing technology-mediated dialogues support navigation of the USM processes through co-regulation (Panadero et al., 2018; Er et al., 2020)

The dialogic USM model of feedback uptake & literacy (blended and online) (Wood, 2020) (simplified)

**Improved Feedback Uptake & Literacy**
Online feedback practices (based on USM)

Google Drive and Docs for peer feedback, (and screencast/Doc) teacher-student feedback (to enable discussion) on a 1,200-word essay over 16 week course)

Stages:

1. Preparation: socialisation, exemplars, criteria, modelling and practice of good fb in drive. Introduce concepts of dialogic feedback, ZPD, growth mindset as ‘priming for receptivity’.

2. Submit first draft: for technology-mediated peer feedback & ongoing dialogue (1 week)
Online feedback practices (based on USM)

Google Drive and Docs for peer feedback, (and screencast/Doc) teacher-student feedback (to enable discussion) on a 1,200-word essay over 16 week course)

Stages:

1. **Preparation**: socialisation, exemplars, criteria, modelling and practice of good fb in drive. Introduce concepts of dialogic feedback, ZPD, growth mindset as ‘priming for receptivity’.

2. **Submit first draft**: for technology-mediated peer feedback & ongoing dialogue (1 week)

3. **Submit to teacher**: Teacher screencast feedback, and dialogue, (1 week) for social presence and enhanced feedback message

4. **Final submission to teacher**: (screencast feedback and Google Docs dialogue) teacher feedback followed by a reflection task
Research question

What were the perceived effects on feedback uptake of technology-mediated dialogic feedback practice, based on the USM model?
Methodology

**Insider research**, UCL ethics and BERA 2018 guidelines

**Participants**: 14 South Korean students on advanced academic writing course (16 weeks)

**Socio-constructivist**, process-oriented interpretivist perspective
Methods

Reflective writing (N=14) (writing-to-learn tasks) and Questionnaires (N=14)

Provided progressive focus for:
Methods

Reflective writing (N=14) (writing-to-learn tasks) and Questionnaires (N=14)

Provided progressive focus for:
Semi-structured interviews (N=13), Inductive thematic coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006)
Deductive analysis against model
Results and discussion
Feedback is useless if no one can get what it means

(Jenny interview)
1. Facilitates ‘negotiation of meaning’ development of peer feedback points

This class was special because the feedback was more two-way...I could question the feedback, and why the peer thought I should revise that part of the essay. This aspect of the activities was the most helpful for me.  

(Questionnaire 9)

Also I can ask and refute the feedback...Through this process, I can reflect and develop the feedback and eventually improve my writing.  

(Questionnaire 7)
1. Facilitates ‘negotiation of meaning’
   development of peer feedback points

   This class was special because the feedback was more two-way...I could question the feedback, and why the peer thought I should revise that part of the essay. This aspect of the activities was the most helpful for me.
   (Questionnaire 9)

   Also I can ask and refute the feedback...Through this process, I can reflect and develop the feedback and eventually improve my writing.
   (Questionnaire 7)

   I could understand better what others commented about my writing, and also I could make my points clearer and delivered better when they didn't understand them.
   (Questionnaire 3)

   Without dialogue there will be no result of the feedback. Feedback is useless if no one can get what it means, having a discussion and having time to clarify it can make that feedback useful.
   (Jenny Interview)
After the cancellation of the Constellation program in 2009 and the retirement of the Space Shuttle in 2011, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has begun development of the heavy-lift Space Launch System (SLS) as the launch vehicle of its “Journey to Mars” campaign. As specified by NASA’s SLS Fact Sheet (2017), utilizing existing Shuttle technology, the initial Block 1 and Block 1B configurations will be capable of lifting 70 and 105 metric tons (MT), respectively, to low Earth orbit (LEO), and be used in lunar orbital test flights. In addition, Block 2 is to consist of more advanced boosters, lift over 150MT to LEO, and engage in Mars operations. However, there has been widespread criticism of its high expenses; private space advocacy groups have argued that funding SLS will compromise other NASA projects while failing to lower launch costs (Space Frontier Foundation, 2015; The Planetary Society, 2011). In contrast, the commercial spaceflight market, led by SpaceX, has become increasingly competitive over the past decade. With revolutionary rocket recovery techniques and exceedingly low costs, SpaceX’s share of the commercial launch market has grown to a projected 64% in 2018 (Hughes, 2017). The recent success of the Falcon Heavy (FH) launch has further demonstrated its innovations and reliability. In addition, NASA has awarded contracts to SpaceX, Blue Origin and ULA for various services including satellite launches and supply missions to the ISS. In view of the quickly expanding private sector, there has been a plethora of arguments over whether SLS should be cancelled in favor of outsourcing rocket development to commercial companies. This essay will show that outsourcing
2. Multiple Learning cycles in online learning communities

Usually if it [peer review] was in paper form it would be a one-way thing and it would finish, but here I could do a follow-up question or ask them for feedback on my answer “oh is it okay now?” and they would say “oh I think it’s much better”.

(Judy interview)

…I can expand upon that feedback, and like not just clarify the meaning...if someone said this part of my sentence is wrong so I could, for example, say “what about this part, is this part okay” and they would say “that’s okay, but in conjunction with my above feedback if you could combine this to make this, that’ll be even better”.

(Juno Interview)

The cycles happened three or four times, I think it was four

(Hayley interview)
Discussion of 1 & 2

1. Negotiating meaning

Also noted by Zhu & Carless, (2018) but ‘contextual difficulties’ were also noted.

In this study: Multiple online exchanges occurred over time

Negotiation of meaning of peer and feedback led to perception of enhanced uptake and use and improved quality of action on feedback (theorised by Er et al., 2020b)

2. Facilitated collective learning cycles in learning communities

Learners had opportunity to elicit and collaborate on creation of additional scaffolding to improve actionability of feedback

Students go through complete feedback cycles with peers online to confirm achievements in digital learning communities (see Reddy et al. 2020).
3. Dialogue
Reduced impact of cultural and emotional barriers to peer feedback engagement

In Korea, having “red marks” all over your paper means a bad thing. It usually implies that there is something very ‘wrong’ with the paper and many may consider this as criticism rather than helpful suggestions.

(Judy reflection)

Enabling feedback to be like a two-way conversation helps in several ways. First, this creates a sense of relationship with peers and thus students feel more comfortable in giving many comments to each other because they know that they are not criticizing each other but rather helping.

(Questionnaire 3)

I thought at first feedback was just like marking...now I know that it's helping each other, it's for others and for me, also giving the feedback would also help mine improve later... the barriers went down

(Kevin interview)
4. Mutually supportive relationships – a pedagogic alliance of peers?

It made me more motivated to actually fix it, so I know that everyone’s engaged and people are putting their time and effort in doing my feedback...it would be a sin to not use it...I think it's just like a motivator, it's like a synergy effect...

(Judy Interview)

I feel I'm being an important person, so everyone is helping me to be a better writer, that emotion itself helped me a lot in writing.

(Kevin interview)

I'm not doing this work alone and there is someone who are so looking forward to my improving...I think it was support and feedback that make me really motivated to work hard and improve.

(Jenny interview)
Discussion of 3 & 4

Culture can negatively influence understanding of the concept and function of feedback (Evans, 2013; Ryan & Henderson, 2018) and emotional reactions to it (Tian & Lowe, 2013).

The need to manage affect is widely acknowledged in feedback literacy research (Forsythe & Johnson, 2017; Pitt & Norton, 2017; Price et al. 2011; Carless & Boud, 2018).

Results show technology-mediation:

- Enhanced ability to positively handle affect (Carless and Boud, 2018)

And

- the relational aspects of peer feedback practice – a ‘pedagogic alliance’ (Leighton & Bustos Gómez, 2018) of peers
5. Online peer feedback processes nurtured feedback literacy (Carless and Boud 2018)

Appreciating feedback

I learned that we can give feedback when we have opinion, advice and feelings. All this can help writer to reflect readers. Methods such as... google drive made us give or get feedback anywhere anytime, the practices made us freely talking with people regardless of position (whether superior or inferior).

(Questionnaire 7)

My biggest take-away is that feedback is open to everyone, everywhere and every time. It made me feel feedback more comfortable and easier. This led me to actively participate in feedback process.

(Questionnaire 10)

Hmm, I just want more feedback now, on all my works

(Holly interview)

I couldn't think of any value of the feedback before, but this course made me think the feedback is really valuable and really appreciate someone giving me feedback and helping me improve.

(Nahyun interview)
Online peer feedback processes
nurtured feedback literacy

5. Online peer feedback processes
nurtured feedback literacy

Making and refining judgments

Q: How did you understand what good standards are?

Q: How did you judge the quality of your work?

Peer review! It was a little bit hard to try to be critical of three other writings, but I learned how to be more critical of my own writing.

(Judy reflection)

Giving feedback also helps me, because I learn a lot about good writing itself when I'm giving feedback...if I see other people's writing, then it's much more clear to me what can be done better, compared to looking at my own writing

(Kylie Interview)

I got more empirical grounds for why feedback is useful... more examples of the evidence base... seeing that over and over and experiencing it myself, hmm you know it totally affected me, it totally made me believe that feedback is so important and then this change of belief I think it will continue even after taking this class because it's kind of change of your attitude.

(Kylie interview)
6. Overcoming barriers/opening new learning spaces

You know like on normal projects...that's really hard for people to synchronize their time, so they usually have very few meetings close to the deadline and then that's it. But drive didn't have a time limit, so it was able to facilitate conversation at all times,...that helped a lot. (Juno interview)

Using Drive for peer feedback gives peer and me enough time to think about each other's works. I think it helps us to give higher quality feedback, making us more motivated.

(Questionnaire 4)

The essay was like, eight pages, but the comments on the sides were like ten, twenty pages, so I don’t think we could have done that much and that extensively if you were doing just on paper or during class or just talking about it face-to-face...

(Juno interview)
6. Overcoming barriers/opening new learning spaces

It was also efficient in terms of feedback because we had this unified platform/place where we can find all of each other's works, read them, comment on them, get immediate notifications when getting comments on our work, etc...
Using Drive greatly motivated me to actively participate in feedback.

(Questionnaire 10)

I think the technology that we use during the class was really important for facilitating engagement of the feedback process...because it's way easier, and way faster, way [more] approachable than not having it

(Kylie Interview)

I think the best thing is that you can access the class materials on mobile (Reading things on subway is extremely convenient).

(Questionnaire 6)
Discussion of 6: Overcoming barriers/opening new learning spaces

Undergraduates report: more likely to engage with simple unified & convenient feedback technology (Winstone et al. 2020)

These results suggest:

- **convenience** (unified platform)
- **notifications**
- **mobile platforms**
- **time to engage**

Relate to:

- Strong *engagement* in *digital* settings
- Opening *new spaces* for learning with peers

Lowered ‘behavioural friction’ (see Behavioural Insights Team, 2014)
Implications

Helps inform gap regarding impact of dialogic peer feedback practices in online settings on assessment literacy.

Demonstrates how logistical, spatial and resource limitations of dialogic feedback can be overcome (synchronous discussion through Zoom also beneficial).

Illustrates that the processes involved in feedback uptake and literacy (Winstone et al. 2017; Carless & Winstone 2020) can be supported through online peer dialogue.

Positive implications for contexts with large cohorts.

Workload positive.
USM Offers insight into designing for uptake, & handling relational & practical issues for online & blended environments.

Teacher Feedback Literacy
- Designing for uptake
- Relational sensitivities
- Managing practicalities

Student Feedback Literacy
(Adapted from Carless and Boud 2018; Molloy et al. 2020)
- Appreciate feedback
- Refine evaluative judgments
- Take action in response to feedback
- Work with emotions productively

(Carless and Winstone, 2020)
Limitations

Limit to claims about perceptions, generalisability.

Deployability will vary.

Purely online environments need more social presence (Carless and Winstone, 2020) and socialisation processes to inculcate trust, for example, 5-step socialisation model (see Salmon, 2013).

Feedback uptake and literacy is also related to university engagement, digital literacy (see Gourlay and Oliver 2018) and ecological (Chong, 2020) or sociomaterial factors (Gravett, 2020).
Future research

**Generalisability** - Study could be replicated in different contexts and utilising cohort studies to determine impact on attainment and satisfaction.

**Scalability**, workload neutrality, training and technology acceptance issues

**Online only vs blended environments**
Final Conclusions

Demonstrated potential of online feedback practices based on the USM model for feedback literacy

Informs *teacher feedback literacy* for digital settings (Carless and Winstone, 2020)

Exemplifies how benefits of online environments can be leveraged in ‘Transforming Assessment’ practices
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Questions?
Inclusive assessment design: what can we learn from assessment adjustments?

Joanna Tai, Mary Dracup, Merrin McCracken, Yasmin Mobayad

Transforming Assessment webinar series
AHE conference panel: looking ahead to 2021
15 July 2020
Inclusive Assessment: Why is it important?

Increasing numbers of students with a disability in higher education (Grimes et al 2017)

We are morally and legally obliged to ensure students have the same opportunities to demonstrate achievement (Disability Discrimination Act (Cth) 1992; Disability Standards for Education (Cth) 2005)

Adjustments do not address student needs (Waterfield & West 2006) AND there is a lack of evidence (Weis & Beauchemin 2019)

Some students do not disclose their condition (Grimes et al 2019)
Inclusive Assessment Design

‘the design and use of fair and effective assessment methods and practices that enable all students to demonstrate to their full potential what they know, understand and can do’  
(Hockings 2010, 34)

• Linked to Universal Design for Learning (CAST 2018)
• Many guides for inclusive assessment design exist (e.g. University of Plymouth – Waterfield & West 2006)
Current Problems in the Real World

Staff are less confident about inclusive assessment design (Morris, Milton & Goldstone 2019)

Students are still experiencing considerable disadvantage in assessment (Grimes et al 2019)

Inclusion could be also considered more broadly (Stentiford & Koutsouris 2020)

How should we direct our efforts?
Research Question & Aims

What are the priorities for inclusive assessment design?

Who requests assessment adjustments?
What is the nature of the adjustments requested?
Methods

2018 Disability Resource Centre Access Plan records

Descriptive statistics

Qualitative analysis of open-text entries

Ethics waiver for accessing de-identified University held records
Results

Total 2860 Access Plans created in 2018

72% students had an ongoing condition
17% had more than one condition
54% reported a mental health condition
31% reported a medical condition
54% of students report a mental health condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Of any disability</th>
<th>Of mental health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipolar</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizoaffective disorders &amp; psychosis</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panic attacks</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adjustment types

Exams - 2016 (71%)
Online tests – 1038 (36%)
Assignments
  Group work – 319 (11%)
  Oral presentations – 239 (8%)
  Lab report & practical tasks – 177 (6%)
In class participation – 256 (9%)
## Exam adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of adjustment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of all APs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rest breaks</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional exam time</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional reading time</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative comments about adjustments

Ongoing communication and negotiation should take place

Group work is important but not always possible

  Students felt bad about letting others down

In-person, in-class tasks can be difficult

Temporal flexibility is valued
Implications for assessment design

How can we be responsive to conditions with fluctuating or variable impact?
- Implement student choice and flexibility in assessment
- Consider assessment programmatically

How can we ensure equivalence of standards across tasks?
- Use an invitational metaphor for criteria (Bearman and Ajjawi 2019)
Implications for assessment design pt. 2

For exams:
- Improve ease of access to adjustments
- Online exams paradoxically may provide benefits (location; input options)

For in-class assessment:
- Certainty about participation & presentation schedules
- Alternative options (pre-recorded; video link)

For group assignments:
- Set up communication/participation agreements
- Include contingency plans to manage expectations


*Disability Standards for Education* (2005) Commonwealth of Australia


Assessment & digital competences: building capacity with academic staff

The DCU-IUA Enhancing Digital Teaching and Learning Project

Suzanne Stone & Rob Lowney
Teaching Enhancement Unit, Dublin City University
suzanne.stone@dcu.ie ; rob.lowney@dcu.ie
@suzielearning ; @lowneyrob

Slides at: bit.ly/EDTLAHE20
Overview

Background to the EDTL project
Structure of project
#IUADigEd Community
DCU pilot development
Technology-enhanced assessment professional learning programme
Post-pilot implementation
Adapting to the Covid-19 crisis
Background to project: Europe

New Skills Agenda for Europe 2016 - Digital technologies are driving change in the global economy and we need to ensure our students are suitably prepared

EU Digital Education Action Plan 2018 - 11 actions to support technology use and the development of digital competences in education:
1. Making better use of digital technology for teaching and learning
2. Developing digital competences and skills
Background to project: National

National Skills Strategy 2025 - technology is one of the key drivers of change and improved digital skills will be vital for Ireland’s future

National Strategy for Higher Education to 2030 - teaching methods should increasingly be accompanied by e-learning and blended learning opportunities
Background to project: National

Digital Strategy for Schools 2015-2020 - provide rationale and action plan for embedding digital technologies in teaching, learning and assessment

Courtesy of Dr Sharon Flynn, IUA
Background to project:
Sectoral / Local

**IUA Universities Charter 2018** - need to build on the quality of the student experience in a digital age, commit to developing a coherent national programme in digital learning

**DCU Strategic Plan 2017-2022** - University-wide curriculum review and an increase in digital learning initiatives and blended learning modules
Opportunity

IUA devised the project

Applied for funding under HEA Innovation and Transformation Call 2018

Digital learning programme
Enhancing Digital Teaching and Learning (EDTL)

Three-year nationally-funded project.
Project aim:
- enhance the digital attributes and educational experiences of Irish university students.
- develop, pilot, review and roll out an ambitious staff development programme to enhance the digital confidence, skills and competences of those who teach in Irish universities.
Approach

This project aims to mainstream digital in teaching and learning activities in Irish Universities, by addressing the professional development of all who teach or support teaching and learning.
Approach

Not starting from zero

Pedagogy first

Discipline focus

Students as Partners
Pedagogy first - DigCompEdu

European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators (DigCompEdu)
Project structure

Steering group
○ Senior management
IUA project manager
○ Dr Sharon Flynn
Project team
○ Project leads in 7 universities
○ Student intern working at national project level
○ Local level interns at each university

See edtl.blog for more information
# One pilot, seven flavours

Courtesy of Dr Sharon Flynn, IUA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Focus on assessment through structured workshops and development activities, involving 3 pilot groups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College Dublin</td>
<td>Redesigning an accredited module in Technology Enhanced Learning to focus on the Flipped Classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Dublin</td>
<td>Leveraging digital for student feedback in the College of Science with the move to the new VLE; initial needs analysis in College of Engineering, focus on creation of interactive animations for engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynooth University</td>
<td>Conducted a needs assessment with 3 separate pilot groups, focus on information literacy and student skills, and aligning the learning outcomes of a new accredited module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College Cork</td>
<td>Leveraging the move to the new VLE to focus on staff digital skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Limerick</td>
<td>Conducting a needs assessment with 2 pilot groups, enhancing staff and student digital skills to support peer and self-assessment/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUI Galway</td>
<td>Focus on curriculum (re)design and development of digital resources through a structured approach. Alignment with existing accredited CPD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#IUADigEd Community

EDTL Approach: Consider Content & Activities, Project Team, Monday 20 July.
International Perspectives on Teaching Online, panel session with Maha Bali, Jesse Stommel and Sukaina Waljil, hosted by Kate Molloy, Monday 27 July at 4pm.
EDTL Approach: Consider Communication & Engagement, Project Team, Monday 10 August.
EDTL Approach: Consider Assessment & Feedback, Project Team, Monday 17 August.

See edtl.blog for more information

#IUADigEd webinars
DCU Pilot phase (Sep-Dec 2019)

DCU’s focus: technology-enhanced assessment (TEA)

Why assessment?
4 work packages:

- Staff Development Programme
- Development and Maintenance of Online Resources
- Ongoing Technical Enhancements for the VLE (Moodle)
- Communications and Dissemination

Staff development programme based around suite of 10 workshops drawing on established professional learning opportunities and staff expertise
DCU Pilot phase (Sep-Dec 2019)

Staff development Programme: Underlying principles

- **Not starting from zero**: Starting point: workshops already offered by TEU
- **Pedagogy first**: Focus on ‘Why’ of TEA, ‘How to’ later
- **Discipline focus**: Refine workshops for discipline specific needs
- **Students as Partners**: Input to come later
Project structure

Development of suite of Digital assessment workshops

Discipline specific needs analysis: Education & Psychology

Custom workshop development

Planning a TEA assessment

Individual/group consultancies

Workshop x3 engagement

Pre-workshop learning

Ongoing support

Implement TEA assessment

Review and refine

Iterate and sustain

Discipline specific needs analysis:
EducaAon & Psychology

Project structure

Development of suite of Digital assessment workshops

Discipline specific needs analysis: Education & Psychology

Custom workshop development

Planning a TEA assessment

Individual/group consultancies

Workshop x3 engagement

Pre-workshop learning

Ongoing support

Implement TEA assessment

Review and refine

Iterate and sustain

Icons courtesy of Fontawesome.com
Staff Development Programme: Lessons/Adaptations

Timing is crucial! Early engagement with schools required
Flexibility needed for delivery Even before Covid-19!
Discussion more important than practical work - removed
Pedagogy focused workshop needs to be followed by technology ‘how to’ workshop - now built into programme
Pre-workshop tasks too time consuming - removed

DigCompEdu: Participants need scaffolding to engage. Gamification
Digital Pursuit adapted from Jisc Digital Pursuit*

Development of additional online resources (non-tech focused) required - work ongoing, collaborations with participants explored

Evaluation underway
Student voice = key - focus groups
Bamber’s framework - beyond quantitative data towards evidence of impact on practice
National Forum badge on offer to participants

Reference
Adapting to Covid-19

At national level - project refocused to support the blended/online delivery for 2020/2021

EDTL approach - curation of resources/framework

Crisis = Opportunity: Alternative assessment

Impact of pilot: EDTL participants felt prepared for crisis particularly in respect of designing alternative assessments (anecdotal feedback)
In summary

Driven by identified needs at various levels
Discipline-specific
Tailored to participants’ needs
Scaffolded and ongoing support
Student voice central to align skills development for staff with student needs
Mixture of type of engagement
Adaptation to needs resulting from Covid-19 crisis - a real opportunity
Participants: Testimonials

“I was delighted to have the opportunity to partake in the EDTL Project. The team were fantastic and provided a great platform for learning. It was very practical. There was a great system of support provided when we were trying the new techniques which gave me confidence in using these. I enjoyed embedding these new strategies in my teaching as I could feel the level of engagement [from students] rising. The students were definitely engaged and enjoyed asking questions (e.g. mentimeter) and receiving feedback on their learning (E.g. in Kahoot)! Feedback from the students on these techniques was very positive. These were definitely informing teaching and learning”
DCU Pilot phase (Sep-Dec 2019)

Participants: Testimonials

“Participating in the EDTL workshops benefitted me because while there was an overall framework for the CPD, the detail was built around the identified needs of the group in question and this was really useful and one of the key reasons (I think) that staff engaged well with the initiative.”
Purposefully different, consistently excellent

Assessment and digital competences: building capacity with academic staff

The DCU-IUA Enhancing Digital Teaching and Learning Project

Suzanne Stone & Rob Lowney
Teaching Enhancement Unit
suzanne.stone@dcu.ie ; rob.lowney@dcu.ie
@suzielearning ; @lowneyrob

Slides at: https://bit.ly/EDTLAHE20
Webinar Series feedback

With thanks from your hosts

Professor Geoff Crisp,
Deputy Vice-Chancellor & Vice-President Academic
University of Canberra
g.crisp[at]canberra.edu.au

Dr Mathew Hillier,
Macquarie University
mathew.hillier[at]gmail.com

Recording available
http://transformingassessment.com

Next session 5 Aug 2020
Adapting to COVID19 by
ignoring proctoring:
catalysing alignment of
online teaching, learning
and assessment
Register
http://taw.fi/5aug2020