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About 200 delegates from 22 countries.

• Choice of 5 masterclasses

• 2 keynote speakers

• 77 research papers/practice exchanges in 10 parallel sessions

• Poster and pitch sessions

• For Twitter activity see #AssessmentHEConf

“The friendly conference”
Conference themes

• Exploring contemporary approaches to assessment and feedback in higher education.

• Enhancing assessment and feedback at programme and institutional level.

• Cultivating assessment literacy.

• Integrating digital tools and technologies for assessment.

• Developing academic integrity and academic literacies through assessment.

• Assessment for social justice.
Keynote presentations

Dr Jan McArthur, Lancaster University
*The dark arts of assessment: From SMART to social justice*

Professor Denise Whitelock, The Open University
*Technology enhanced assessment: Do we have a wolf in sheep’s clothing?*
Three research papers and practice exchanges to share with you….

Carole Sutton, Jane Collings and Joanne Sellick, Plymouth University

Models of Examination Feedback

Judy Cohen and Catherine Robinson, University of Kent

Exploring the effects of radical change to assessment and feedback processes: Applying Team-based learning in a social science module.

Liz Austen and Cathy Malone, Sheffield Hallam University

Exploring student perceptions of effective feedback
Models of examination feedback

‘Not many students would admit to enjoying taking exams but if you want to get a degree they’re an ordeal you have to survive.’

Guardian (2013)

Jo Sellick, Carole Sutton, and Jane Collings
School of Law, Criminology and Government & Teaching and Learning Support
Planning assessment using feed-in, feed-forward & feedback

**Feed-in**
Well designed assessment, briefing & preparation, DLE assessment resources practice papers & sessions, assessment & marking criteria

**Feed-forward**
Formative ‘feedback’, cues, discussion, mid-way reviews, tutor, peer & self-review and feedback

**Feedback**
end of exams, written, verbal, mp3, YouTube, 1:1, generic feedback. constructive legible feedback

---

Examination Feedback Project

- Pre-survey student experiences to gain student voice.
- Literature review informed the development of a toolkit.
- Staff toolkit production
- Post-survey student experiences.
Outcomes of the project

1. Change to the University of Plymouth Assessment Policy

‘Receive constructive feedback after all assessments including examinations.’


2. Examinations toolkit for staff
   – Generic feedback after exams
   – 1:1 feedback session with students with examination scripts

Examination Feedback Toolkit

Key Factors

- Exam type & purpose of the exam (linked to learning outcomes)
- Cohort Size
- Location & type of student
- Timing and time scales
- Access to exam scripts
- Within a module
  - Formative and Summative assessment approach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of feedback to formative and summative examinations and tests</th>
<th>Suggestions how to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic written</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary covering minimum requirements and linked to learning outcomes – could be based on distinguishing between classifications</td>
<td>Email, Moodle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Model’ answers and/or exemplars bank that can be accessed by students on-demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic verbal/ audio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A session</td>
<td>Timetabled session (note potential of content capture). Moodle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer discussion/ feedback (e.g. of individual formative and/or exemplars)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcast/ video</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual written</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template/ summary feedback form with minimum requirements and linked to learning outcomes with specific reference on how to improve/ what to do next</td>
<td>Hard copy (collected from/distributed by tutor/ support office). Moodle, PebblePad, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual verbal / audio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 appointment with exam marker using script (formative mock and/or summative)</td>
<td>Generally promoted with on-demand appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Personal Tutor who has received reports from markers as part of PDP process</td>
<td>Blocked out periods for appointments (‘exam open day’/ ‘feedback week’ etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination ‘open day’ to look through papers with tutors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual audio recording such as podcast</td>
<td>Moodle, PebblePad, Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case study: Sociology

Process

Module: Stage 3: Social and Political Theory. Autumn Semester

Assessment: Seen exam paper essay style (2 questions in 2 hours)

Formative

Feed-in:
Dec/Jan: Exam release, support sessions, exam answer outlines

Summative

Feedback:
February: Group feedback, exam script review, invitation for 1 to 1 feedback

Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Avg. Exam mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>53.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>44.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>49.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>56.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>54.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>53.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>63.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>65.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sociology: student feedback

**Feed-in**

- Understanding of the assessed learning outcomes
- Expectations and focussed preparation
- Managing anxiety

**Feedback**

- Enhanced understanding of marks achieved
- Enhanced preparation leading to improved performance over previous years
- Staff were interested in my performance
- Sense of achievement
- Reduction in need to seek additional staff feedback.
Staff Challenges

• Practical arrangements, including timetabling 1:1 slots and scheduling for the re-sit examination.
• Time management and large cohorts.
• To sensitively balance exam script return with the need for grade privacy when conducting group feedback.
• To ensure feedback is as useful as feed-in.
• Establishing a clear, concrete link between exam feedback and improvements across academic years.
Emerging themes

• Exams are just another form of assessment that students should expect feedback to understand and improve their performance.

• Logistical considerations
  – Retention of the exam script does not prevent feedback
  – Constrained by exam timetable
  – Requires adaption of feedback to meet the time constraints
  – No equivalence of e-submission for exams
  – Challenges for feedback, especially Semester 2

• Staff workload allocation
  – adjustments to align to other forms of assessment
Exploring the effects of radical change to assessment and feedback processes / Applying Team-based learning in a social science module

Judy Cohen and Catherine Robinson (KBS)

Funded through the Faculty Learning and Teaching Enhancement Fund
Outline of the presentation

- Economics module
- What is Team Based Learning?
- How was it implemented?
- Lessons learned
- Next steps
Economics for Business 2

Stage 2 module (109)
Optional for B&M
Diverse student base
Poor attendance
Poor engagement
Mediocre marks

(Image source: http://www.mbacrystalball.com/blog/economics/macroeconomics/)
What is Team-Based Learning?

- More than group work
- A form of flipped learning
- Comprises of 3 key elements:
  - The Readiness Assurance Process (RAP)
  - Application exercises
  - Peer evaluation
- Applications need to meet the 4S criteria (Sibley and Ostafichuk (2014))
  - Significant; Same; Specific; Simultaneous
Assessment for Learning

- Pre-reading
- Readiness Assurance Process
- Appeals
- Corrective Instruction
- 4 S application…
Implementation

Challenges – working with what we’ve got...

• Module choice
• Institutional constraints of
  ➢ Physical space
  ➢ Module assessment
Implementation: How did we do it?

• 110 students split into teams of 6/7
  • Named after famous economists

• Lecture slots used to test the students’ readiness and the individual scores used as assessments
  • Continual assessment at 5 points during the 12 week course
  • Highest 3 scores were taken as their MCQ mark (worth 10% in total)

• This was administered using TurningPoint devices registered to individual students.
  • 5 MCQs at the start, followed by team breakout time….
Was it worth it?

2015/2016 and 2016/2017

Attendance in seminars

↑ male 68.4% to 71%
↑ home students 69.3 to 79.8%
↑ female 80.4% to 75.3%
↓ overseas students 75.9% to 72.1

Performance in final exam

↑ Cohort average from 56.3% (standard deviation 12) to 63.0% in 2016/2017 (standard deviation 11.4)
↑ Anecdotal evidence of improved quality of writing
Student comments

Viewpoint A

- This module was taught differently which I enjoyed. I enjoyed the team working element which promoted and encouraged learning and participation.

Viewpoint B

- Never studied economics before, so layout of this module where you read at home then come in and do test with no lectures was difficult for me. Difficult to understand terminology.
What I’d do differently

• More acknowledgement of the difference between novice and expert learners

• Changes to delivery
  • 2 hour workshop

• More on-line resources
  • KentPlayer

• Improvements to peer-evaluation system
Any questions?

Thank you
THE UK’S EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY
Exploring student perceptions of effective feedback

Liz Austen and Cathy Malone

l.austen@shu.ac.uk @lizaustenbooth; c.malone@shu.ac.uk
Aim

To present selected findings of a mixed methods research project which analysed the characteristics of feedback that students valued.
Research Methodology

This triangulated student opinions about feedback (collected through focus groups) with their evaluations of feedback texts. Student evaluations informed corpus construction and contrastive analysis.

Focus Groups: 5 activity based student focus groups 2016.
- n=28, 4 UG Social Science courses, all levels
- supporting student annotations
- thematic coding of verbal discussions

Student Evaluations of Feedback Texts
- 95 pieces of individual written feedback evaluated, criteria adapted from the work of Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick (2007)
- texts marked twice, ranked to create mini corpora of high and low ranking feedback
Findings

- Praise
- Length
- Achievement
- Detail
- Interpersonal
- Forward orientation
- Error
Praise: The importance of managing affective needs of the reader

"If I had got that back I would have gone 'The tutor hates me. I don’t want to go back'.'"

• very few students commented on a positive tone and the discussion focused on negativity and the demotivating impact this has
• feedback which highlighted what was wrong, without providing support for development, was frequently discussed as a lived experience
• students discussed the importance of receiving praise
• praise was seen as necessary, even on work that was of a low standard
• clear comments about what has been done well was needed to highlight which aspect of the work can be repeated in forthcoming assessments
Do students prefer longer feedback? How long is the optimum feedback in your subject area?
Length: Do students prefer longer feedback?

There is a moderate correlation (0.51) between length of feedback text and overall student evaluation:

- although better scoring feedback tends to be longer, the longest pieces of feedback were evaluated negatively. 
  "Too long!"  *Text length 399*

- feedback texts below 120 words in length of plain text are more likely to elicit negative comments
  "Too short, no real feedback given. Wouldn't be useful to me."  *Text length 66*

- short/no free text comments viewed as "rushed"

### Comparison Overall length Corpus A & B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Corpus A (top 25 texts)</th>
<th>Corpus B (bottom 25 texts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Word count</td>
<td>4840</td>
<td>2943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average text length</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of text lengths</td>
<td>116-321</td>
<td>0-402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average sentence length</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range sentence length</td>
<td>10-29 words /sentence</td>
<td>0-20 words /sentence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achievement: What is identified as 'good'?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong> introduction. (x1)</td>
<td>good point(s) x7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>good</strong> summaries overall</td>
<td>good (critical) thinking x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>good</strong> arguments here</td>
<td>good work (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>good</strong> links to the causes of crime/ the riots (x2)</td>
<td>good conclusion (x1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a <strong>good</strong> clarification of key terms</td>
<td>good answer (x1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good breadth of theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good academic critique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you started to do this near the end, which was good...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your recommendations were unusually clear, which is good but need more discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the evidence that these are good?

- 'good' appears with similar frequency in both corpora
- In Corpus A what is described as good is much more detailed and precise.
- 'good' is also used to label topic development
- Corpus B good describes something fairly generic, followed by immediate criticism
• Who appears in your feedback?

I / you/ your... /we
Interpersonal:
Who is in the feedback? You, I, we?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus A (top 25 texts)</th>
<th>Corpus B (bottom 25 texts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- compared to British National Corpus written (BNC 6 million words) 'you' and 'your' appear with very high keyness figures across the whole sample.
- 'we' doesn't occur in either corpus

Analysis:
- Corpus A is more interactive than B
- introduction of the self into the text makes the feedback more balanced
- 'I' is used to soften critical statements
Conclusions

Student evaluations of feedback revealed distinct differences in language used in the two corpora. These need to be interpreted in the light of student commentary on the process.

• This research highlights the importance of the affective response of student readers to feedback, & how this mediates student engagement with feedback messages.

• It also draws attention to institutional processes that encourage production of objective, structured and criteria based feedback.

• Different aspects of feedback all contribute to discursive orientation, and agency, of student reader within the text.

• In terms of implications for practice these findings should be considered holistically, rather than as separate components which function independently.
Sample use of Feedback Form.
These comments follow a marking grid.

Your best work was when:
Provided a critique of the theoretical application to particular riot responses.
Showed a detailed knowledge of riot responses.

To improve, you need to work on:
- More ‘analysis’ related to critical thinking about policy (related to punishment) in broader terms.
- Distinguishing between criminal justice and social policy developments in respect of trends in punishment responses.
- Show a more detailed and nuanced understanding of theory itself. Use it for an even more powerful critique.
- Accurately reference all online sources e.g. place for books and page numbers for articles.

Resources recommended to help you improve your work (with hyperlinks where applicable):
The Definitive Referencing Guide available via the Library Gateway
CTCM Screencast Lecture on Critically Analysing Policy (videos 1 & 2)
CTCM Screencast Lecture on Critically Analysing Case Studies and Reports
CTCM Screencast Lecture on Critically Analysing Theory (videos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7)

Remember to discuss this feedback with your Academic Advisor to assist your academic development ☺
# Example: A style guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Don't</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>Write at least 100 words - free text for summative assessment</td>
<td>Write less than 100 or more than 300 words for summative assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td>Identify what the student has done well. Find one thing you like about this piece of writing.</td>
<td>Evaluate first year work by third year standards. Don't qualify every positive statement you make - it reads as criticism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detailed</strong></td>
<td>Comment with precision. Make a clear the connection between assessment criteria and this sample of student writing. Unpack it, explain why it's effective.</td>
<td>Use generic comments that apply across grade boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tone</strong></td>
<td>Be positive, encouraging, and inclusive.</td>
<td>Be sarcastic, or overly directive or harshly critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forward orientation</strong></td>
<td>Sum up your response to their work in 2/3 take home messages that can be applied to their next task. Make explicit the connection between performance in text (poor range of sources) and underlying study practices (need to read more) - this may require a lot of modelling.</td>
<td>Don't focus exclusively on inadequacies of the last text, and how that could have been done better. Don't leave them to interpret your feedback or deduce from detailed textual commentary what they should do differently next time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error</strong></td>
<td>Spellcheck</td>
<td>Use acronyms, or obscure terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Carole Sutton, Jane Collings and Joanne Sellick, Plymouth University

Models of Examination Feedback

Judy Cohen and Catherine Robinson, University of Kent

Exploring the effects of radical change to assessment and feedback processes: Applying Team-based learning in a social science module.

Liz Austen and Cathy Malone, Sheffield Hallam University

Exploring student perceptions of effective feedback
For the future, watch out for:

Special issue of *Practitioner Research in Higher Education (PRHE) Journal.*

Keynote speaker: Professor Kay Sambell


AHE web https://aheconference.com/
Webinar Session feedback

With thanks from your hosts

Professor Geoff Crisp,
PVC Education, University of New South Wales
g.crisp[at]unsw.edu.au

Dr Mathew Hillier,
Office of the Vice-Provost Learning & Teaching
Monash University
mathew.hillier[at]monash.edu

Recording available
http://transformingassessment.com