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Foreword

These proceedings bring together papers presented at Nottingham Trent University's Annual Learning and Teaching Conference 2012. The conference theme was 'Assessment for Learning. It was opened by the Vice-Chancellor, who spoke of creating a “Village in the City”, further developing a sense of belonging that extends through courses, Schools and across the University as a whole.

The keynote speaker was Professor David Nicol, Emeritus Professor at the University of Strathclyde. Professor Nicol spoke about the cognitive dimensions of feedback and the mental processes elicited in students’ minds when feedback is delivered, either by lecturers or the students themselves.

The ALTC could not take place without the on-going support and commitment of colleagues who engage in discussion and sharing of practice. This year, as previously, there were a wide range of papers, which included assessment for learning using constructivist techniques; employability informed assessment and enriching the student learning experience through innovative curriculum design.

Thanks are due to all colleagues who presented papers, chaired sessions, planned the programme, attended on the day and supported the event in many other ways.

Jane McNeil
Director of Academic Development
Nottingham Trent University
Annual Learning and Teaching Conference

Welcome address
Professor Neil T. Gorman
Vice-Chancellor

View PowerPoint slides of the presentation

View video of the presentation

Keynote
Professor David Nicol, Emeritus Professor, University of Strathclyde

Feedback on learning: in the hands of the student

View abstract

View PowerPoint slides of the presentation
Using feedback to inform writing for assessment
Sarah Johnson

On returning an assignment to a student, what is the first thing that they do? Generally they look for the grade and then file the assignment away, paying little attention to the feedback that has been included and demonstrating little understanding of how this may feed forward into their next piece of work.

Given Hattie’s assertion (1999), that feedback can help to shape learning and thus future writing for assessment, the aim of this workshop was to showcase a range of resources which can aid students in interpreting and actively engaging with feedback.

Included in the workshop were a range of resources to encourage students to engage with the assessment and feedback process in order to develop self-reflection and self-regulation (Yorke 2004).

The first resource introduced was one which outlines how students can review and reflect on their work prior to submission and note issues and questions they’d particularly like feedback about. Thus the tutor is able to clearly identify areas of the assignment which the student has struggled with and allows them to reflect on how the student has tackled the problems. This can assist in the marking process by making responding easier and more focused for the tutor. This task also provides the student with an opportunity to reflect on the development of their writing and highlight the ways in which it could be improved.

The Wordle resource, as devised by Rebecca Bell at NTU (2010), uses a word cloud to identify key words within the feedback. This approach works by encouraging students to submit all of their module feedback into Wordle (simple cut and paste). The output then consists of a visually appealing ‘word cloud’ with the most common words prominently displayed, helping students to identify their key writing issues.

The final resource was designed to close the gap between a student’s current performance and what is expected of them; encouraging students to identify
and discuss precisely what it is they need to do in order to improve their work, thus enabling them to use their feedback to feed-forward into their next piece of writing.

The workshop was well-received and attendees fed-back that they would like to use the resources, adapting them to suit their discipline or specific module. These and others can be found on NOW: XXASQ10002: Resources to Support Academic Writing and are fully open. For further information on how to access the module, please contact Sarah Johnson.

View PowerPoint slides of the presentation
View self assessment and reflection resource
View Wordle resource
View closing the gap resource
What they say and what they do; exploring post-graduate uses of feedback

Helen Boulton

To date, there has been comparatively little research conducted into how post-graduates cope with the transition from undergraduate to post-graduate in terms of academic study. This paper reports findings from a collaborative study between Nottingham Trent University and Sheffield Hallam University to address this gap. The project was an interpretive, evaluative, action research study that explored the perceptions and uses of feedback by post-graduate trainee teachers, and also investigated the perceptions of their tutors on the use of feedback by their students. Theoretically underpinned by assessment for learning, (Gardner, 2006) the findings indicated that both trainees and their tutors were positive about the uses of feedback to improve academic work.

The purpose of the study was to investigate if, and how post-graduate students used feedback on their work, to try to improve it, and also to ascertain whether or not their tutors agreed with this. The transition from undergraduate to post-graduate study is less well understood than that from school to university (Tobbell, O'Donnell, & Zammit, 2010) and this study aimed to try to go some way towards to alleviating this disparity.

The paper focussed on the experience and expectations of assessment and feedback for post-graduates, and its subsequent impact on their learning experience as they make the transition into post-graduate higher education.

Data from the student questionnaires indicates that most students found their feedback useful, and used it to try to improve their work for next time. The ways in which they used it varied from simply trying to ensure the new assignment progressed from previous ones, to helping to narrow their focus, and also to enable them to apply a better level of thinking and structure to their work. Data from the tutor questionnaires suggests that they felt that all their students used the feedback they gave them to improve their work. There was a range of ways in which they thought this was done, and also, even though the tutors had indicated that they thought their students used their feedback, they also commented on why students might not be doing so.
Whilst both students and tutors agreed on the fact that they used their feedback to improve their work, the qualitative data shows a range of responses that revealed more subtle differences between the two sets of findings. Findings also seem to imply that this transition from under to post-graduate is often difficult for many and one which would benefit from further research.
The aim of this interactive workshop was to introduce two pedagogical approaches – *threshold concepts* and *Assessment For Learning (AFL)*) - and explore how we might combine them to enhance both our teaching and students’ learning. We began by establishing our current understandings of these terms and refined these in the light of key texts (Land *et al.*, 2008; Meyer and Land, 2005; Sambell, 2011).

We also discussed how assessment/feedback (whether formative or summative) is the foundation of a successful learning and teaching dialogue (Boud *et al.*, 2010) and used Montgomery and McDowell (2008) to show that AFL:

- encourages authenticity and complexity rather than only reproduction of knowledge;
- minimises the negative effects of summative assessment and promotes formative assessment;
- enables students to build confidence and capabilities;
- promotes both formal and informal effective feedback on learning;
- develops students’ autonomy as learners and (future) professionals.

Working in disciplinary-based groups, we then identified some important threshold concepts, skills, behaviours or values which our learners need to master in order to progress to an effective grasp of the subject resulting in learning which is:

- **Transformative** - once acquired it shifts perception of the subject.
- **Irreversible** - once learners have come to see the world in terms of the threshold concept they cannot return to their former view
- **Integrative** - acquisition of the threshold concept illuminates the underlying inter-relatedness of aspects of the subject.
We looked at how threshold concepts help demarcate subject boundaries and may also be ‘troublesome’ in that they can be in conflict with ‘common sense’ understandings and therefore can be initially very difficult for learners to engage with, although once grasped, learners can move to new perceptions (Land et al., 2008; Meyer and Land, 2005).

The next task was to create a process map of how we might use AFL to help our learners negotiate a series of threshold concepts via relevant learning activities. Discussion followed on how these might be embedded into the curriculum and we shared instances of good practice, including an innovative application at NTU where dialogue with students around the curriculum is structured in term of threshold concepts. The conclusion of this workshop was that a number of participants were keen to incorporate threshold concepts into their practice as they provide an effective practical and theoretical approach to implementing AFL at the planning, delivery and assessment stages.
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Rittel & Webber (1973) described some characteristics of ‘wicked problems’ as: not being understood until solutions have been developed; solutions which are neither right or wrong and, whose resolution has other (different) consequences.

The presentation included a potpourri of such problems including inter alia:

1. **NTU Common Assessment Regulations.**
   Do students (or staff?) really understand (believe?) assessment being described in S 16c, as "a matter of judgment, not simply of computation and regulation. Marks, grades and percentages are not absolute values but symbols used to communicate examiners’ judgments on different aspects of a student's learning.” –mmm!? However, grade based marking is arguably the right direction- ‘better to be roughly right, than precisely wrong’.

2. **21 day coursework return**
   Reasonable? The University of Nottingham has the same requirement but its SSR is 14.2, compared to NTUs 19.7. A number of delegates think 21 days too short.

3. **Examination papers and their return?**
   How much longer will students hand write examination answers: hard for keyboard writers and illegibility challenges for staff. And what about the inevitability (?)of returning marked papers back to students? Might it be best to avoid student challenges, by only providing a mark and keeping comments separate where necessary? (Swansea already do this).

4. **45,000 students found cheating in the UK over the last 3 years**
   Law students may be reported to the Law Society for cheating, but should this approach be extended? US University of Central Florida has for example, introduced a new Z ‘cheating’ grade to go on course
transcripts. Not my preference but something must be done?

5. **Achilles’ heels:**
   a. **Reliability in assessment and moderation.**
   
   NTU regulations state that “sampling process should concentrate At the boundaries of classification” .....If under 50 students: up to 25 sample, 50 + students: 10% sample, 100-200 + students: less than 10% sample. Where is the logic and reliability in undertaking a smaller sample as the cohort size increases? What about marking (moderating) samples first, and marking the full cohort second?

   **B. External examiners commonly not attending referral boards**
   
   Quite common across the sector, but is this robust and assured enough when re-examining the weakest students? Not really!

6. **How much longer can we defend a no appeals policy against ‘academic judgements’?**
   
   You can appeal against GCSE /A levels and some professional bodies’ exams – and some Canadian universities too. Watch this space—especially as paying students miss a 2.1 by a mark/grade. The likelihood of students being able to appeal against so called academic judgement seems very probable in future years.

7. **The beginning of the end for degree classifications**
   
   How long before grade point averages are adopted? UCL are piloting, other institutions considering including Nottingham, Sheffield, York and Warwick (home of the 17 point system!) - but would it bring new problems?

8. **敢闘賞 Kantō-shō : Sumo Fighting Spirit prize.**
   
   Sumo wrestlers can be awarded Kantō-shō for losing a fight but trying hard. Should first year students have marks for effort as well as attainment? They do at school, so why not as part of transition management? Should we deduct marks for a lack of engagement? A recent national conference, “Retention and Progression in Higher Education” had nothing on attendance - why ? And what about NTU adopting Higher Education Achievement Reports (HEARS) for all complementary participation (engagement) activities?

9. **“I love teaching but I hate marking”**
   
   “Teaching is a bit like being a comedian at a stand-up club, but comedians don’t have to stay after the show and clear the tables and sweep the floors” (blog). With high SSRs we must find better ways? eg perhaps
   
   - (Slightly) more objective testing; less essay type questions
   - More random ‘pop’ assessment exercises and less end of year exam pile ups?
   - Less lone marking; more team mark-ins?
   - More formative assessment, more learning; radically less summative assessment. Dumbing down? – not necessarily!

10. **Students at the heart of the university system?**
    
    Yes, but no, but yes but no but,..... as there are times when the premise that ‘the customer is always right’ is sometimes wrong ,and as one delegate argued, “look after your staff please; happy staff =happy students”.
Not one of the above issues, drew any unanimous agreement though there was some confirmative nodding around the more realistic marking times and the greater chances of academic judgement appeals in the future. However, the general tenor of the session underlined the need for less, but smarter forms of summative assessment and moderation, simpler reporting formats (grades and GPSs), recognition and reward for effort as well as attainment – and crucially, looking after staff (first) as the way to support students being at the heart of the system.
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This presentation brings to light the practices which are involved in marking both as an individual and within a team. The literature on marking and moderation practices is relatively modest although marking has begun to be addressed. Marking practices are shaped jointly by University, departmental contexts and guidelines and also by personal beliefs about effective marking and feedback.

A study of the marking and moderation practices at NTU was conducted. Twelve academics from four different Schools were interviewed on their approach to marking as a process, encompassing marking individual scripts, marking an entire set of scripts and moderation.

**Marking an individual script**

NTU colleagues described three different approaches in how they generate feedback and this was tied in to the process of elaborating judgement on a particular response. The different approaches place a different emphasis on how feedback is provided. A third approach was also described by colleagues and this involves marking scripts in sets and this is dealt with in the section of ‘Marking as a sequence’. The two main approaches are described below:

- **Synoptic feedback then annotations**
  This approach consisted in paying attention to the text as a whole firstly, and then considering its parts. These markers first focused on making a holistic summary and then turned to criteria and selected a few key relevant points to communicate feedback to the student. Annotations were then written to illustrate the key points in the synoptic feedback.

- **Annotations then synoptic feedback**
  The first stage combines two tasks, providing detailed feedback (annotations) simultaneously with the formulation of the judgement. The second stage consists of re-reading, glancing at annotations, and constructing the synoptic feedback.
Marking as a sequence
NTU colleagues reported a number of strategies to maintain consistency before, during and after marking.

- **Pre-marking**
  - *start marking and then review:* start reading and marking some scripts and review marking criteria
  - *sorting scripts by bands of achievement:* pre-sorting scripts according to a first impression on quality of work

- **During marking**
  - *marking in sets:* read, construct feedback for a set of scripts (and not one individually)
  - *comparing to other students’ work during marking:* compare students’ work to check performance
  - *marking across the range of marks:* check the distribution of marks
  - *use marking criteria*

- **Post-marking comparisons and checks:** similar to the checks above but at the end of marking
- **No self-moderation:** no checks apart from marking criteria.

Moderating
Colleagues indicated that their approach to moderation varied according to different emphasis and types. Colleagues adopted different approaches to moderation according to their emphasis on reaching a consensus on marks or performing checks on the consistency in marking of their peers. Differences were also found in the amount and type of moderation. Few colleagues did pre-marking moderation whilst most did post-marking.

Effectiveness and time
The literature on marking and moderation and its suggestions on effective practice are in contrast with the variety of practices found. A full discussion of these contrasts can be found by following the website link shown below.

Marking and moderating text based coursework

View PowerPoint slides of the presentation
The focus of the session was how e-portfolios can be used to assess how students develop their own skills and knowledge in their subject content. According to Stefani, Mason and Pegler (2008) there are 3 applications for an e-portfolio:

1. Course (module) portfolio
   - Students “document and reflect upon the ways in which they [they have] met the outcomes for that particular course.” (pp.11)

2. Programme portfolio
   - “Students … document the work they have completed, the skills they have learned, and the outcomes they have met in a programme.” (pp.11)

3. Institutional portfolio
   - A personal development planning tool.

In the last academic year (2010 – 2011) the Centre for Design and Technology Education used e-portfolios primarily as course/module portfolios for students to reflect on the development of their knowledge and skills. Different forms were used, such as blogs, NOW presentations and PowerPoint presentations, with students choosing their preferred form for submission. Analysing these e-portfolios showed that students were able to reflect, using photographs, videos and pages from sketch books, on their own development.

The success of this practice, as well as the lecturers’ own experience of using NOW presentations on the PGCHE programme and responding to Strategic Platform 1 (NTU, 2010) combining experiential learning with digital
literacy, the programme has embedded the use of e-portfolios into the assessment of four modules.

The e-portfolios in this academic year (2011-12) are a combination of programme and course portfolios (Stefani et al., 2008), with an emphasis on module portfolios for year 1 and programme portfolios in year 2. Our emphasis for the e-portfolio is more student led than teacher led, as the student is creating their own document of their knowledge and skills using established criteria from the professional body for Design and Technology Education.

In the presentation, we reported on our initial findings based on our experiences in preparing the students for using the e-portfolio, how we have prepared for assessing the e-portfolios and the e-portfolios effectiveness as an assessment tool with undergraduates.

Evidence from the reflections and the completed e-portfolios have led us to believe that the tool has had a positive benefit in helping students organise their knowledge and structure their work. In drawing conclusions from the analysis of the findings we have identified the importance of the module learning outcomes (assessment criteria) in supporting the students with their individual progress and identification of the next steps within their learning. We have begun to look towards knowledge organisation, through the e-portfolio presentation tool, as a precursor to knowledge construction.

The authors have identified that through structured organisation, the students are being selective in promoting evidence of important knowledge they had gained and they are using the tool to record information, with the growing start of some future reflection.
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Bolstering employability: ideas for innovative assessments to benefit students’ CVs

Vivienne Brunsden

Despite students developing a sophisticated transferable skill set during their University studies they can often fail to recognise this, which can have serious implications for their future employability. Similarly employers’ organisations, such as the CBI in their Annual Education & Skills Survey, repeatedly express concerns about graduates’ skill sets.

The development of a robust CV can allow students to present themselves in the best possible light, as well as providing a solid platform for discussions with potential employers; one that is both informed, comprehensive and evidence based. However, the need for the explicit teaching of employability skills can be controversial given other pressures on the curriculum. There can also be resistance to this from academics, likely to see themselves as disciplinary experts who prefer to use the ‘traditional’ academic assessment modes of essays and exams; and who do not see their remit as including careers guidance.

Increasingly there is a recognition in the pedagogic literature about the problems of both essays and exams and a call for more ecologically valid and reliable forms of assessment. The counter argument is that innovative assessments fail to capture sufficiently traditional academic skill sets or to address appropriately the disciplinary concerns.

Vivienne contended, however, that assessments can be designed in ways that bring employability benefits but still fully maintain appropriate academic standards; and that the employability benefits can be so obvious that students cannot fail to notice and highlight these when approaching employers.

A range of such possible assessments were addressed in the presentation. All of the examples given are already in use within the Psychology Division at NTU and could easily be adapted for use within any discipline. Methods
highlighted ranged from tasks that are formative only and carry no formal grade to those that are either formative or summative and formally assessed. Within these assessments students begin to recognise the additions they should be making to their CV because this is explicitly addressed and directed during the learning and assessment processes.

Taking this approach to assessment not only brings employability benefits but can also bring additional advantages in terms of raising levels of student satisfaction; not only because of their appreciation of the concrete added value they are receiving but also because of their pleasure at engaging with meaningful and purposive assessment tasks.
Assessment for learning using constructivist techniques

Jon Tepper

This session describes an innovative approach to assessment design that enables first year undergraduate students from a variety of computing and technology backgrounds to learn taught concepts in a way that is relevant to them and promotes deep learning.

All 200+ first year undergraduate computing and technology students at NTU have to attend the core 30 credit point module, Introduction to Systems Analysis and Design, where students learn about the systems development lifecycle (SDLC) businesses go through to develop, enhance or maintain a computer-based product or service (e.g. from a mobile phone or laptop to an online ordering system or a new VLE). This requires students to develop a wide range of technical and inter-personal skills such as working in teams, constructing project plans and applying systems thinking and modelling techniques in order to identify and solve system problems. The concepts taught are fundamental to any subject relating to the computing and technological sciences.

Although efficient from a programme design perspective, an issue of such large common modules is how to ensure relevance to the individual programme and associated student body. Previously, students had been given assessments that focused on the development of a common information system as it enabled the Module Leader to provide target answers/models and ensure high degrees of assessment reliability and validity across a team of five Module Tutors. However, students subsequently complained of the perceived lack of relevance of the module to them.

To address the issue of relevance, the approach taken this academic year (2011/12) was to build on the success of McCrindle (2010) who used the notion of developing a physical prototype of a board game to facilitate 1st year Software Engineering students to understand the principles of software engineering at the University of Reading. McCrindle has used such an approach with 200+ first year students for over 6 years and reported much success in getting students from a variety of computing and technology degree programmes to participate in the deep learning of software engineering concepts and acquiring strong inter-personal skills.

We therefore adapted McCrindle’s model for the NTU module such that first
year students were required to design a board game to “teach management about a systems development methodology of the student’s choice”. Although students could base the board game on an existing popular board game (such as monopoly or trivial pursuit) the theme of game must be a systems development methodology relevant to their programme of study. This immediately focused the students on making the assessment relevant to them. This is an innovative shift away from the more popular “digital” games approach to supporting learning and teaching (Ulicsak and Wright, 2010; Groff, Howells and Cranmer 2010 and Van Eck 2006). In part fulfilment of the coursework, student groups are also required to construct concept maps (Novak & Gowin, 1983) of their group knowledge and describe how it has evolved according to criteria developed by Kinchin, Hay and Adams(2000).

During this session we presented a number of board game designs produced by the students and reviewed the evolution of their concepts maps to graphically visualise their learning. A student evaluation of the approach revealed that it generally helped them to understand the principles of the module by going through the stages of the SDLC themselves to design and model their game. As with previous years, students found concept mapping enabled them to visualise the bigger picture and to reflect on what they had learnt. However, the mapping task appeared very difficult initially suggesting more support is needed. A subsequent analysis of the resulting marks with respect to a 3 year average revealed a 28% improvement in the minimum mark (42%) showing that the more challenged students were better able to engage with the module. Improvements of 4% and 7% over the 3 year average mean and median mark respectively were also observed (61.3% mean and 62% median mark). Unfortunately, 8% poorer performance (at 81%) was observed for the maximum mark. This is however not entirely unexpected as previous assessment scenarios were closed rather than open-ended and this naturally placed more demand on students as they had to contextualise the assessment themselves.
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The importance and power of student voice for prompting informal, formative assessment

Cyndy Hawkins and Pat Wallis

This workshop introduced delegates to how through student centred sessions we encourage students to reflect and evaluate their own learning culminating in an assignment which assesses their process of learning in a HE environment.

‘It is said with increasing regularity and growing sadness that students’ attitudes towards learning are shaped by a narrow instrumental priority of passing the assessments. Passing assessments is said to need abilities to remember or reproduce more and better knowledge of the subject, when these are the main learning outcomes that define success, plus skills in breaking knowledge into manageable bits to assimilate and practice recall. An assessment through performing a set task is reduced to contributory parts. Students may believe they will be more successful at assignments if what must be done to succeed is clarified and simplified for them by the tutor. They may say: *When the tutor tells me exactly what I must know and/or do, then I can learn effectively.* The instrumentalism and dependence of this caricature of student learning are well known and sometimes described as *surface learning.*’ (Ovens et al., 2011, p.10).

‘As if knowledge is a commodity to be delivered and taken possession of, some students ‘clutch’ onto transmissive learning, expressing satisfaction when receiving a handout, as if the tutor has ‘given’ them a ‘piece of knowledge’. A major characteristic of this approach to learning to learn is the cultivation of attitudes of dependence and conformity. There may not be a need for a student to question, evaluate, hypothesise or criticise the learning outcomes – just get on and learn them! This *dependence* is exacerbated if the criteria of assessment are not understood by a student. A student’s judgment of how well s/he has performed an assessment may only be how well it complies with the mechanical and technical formalities of presentational format and coverage. Having seen the mark or grade, the only important information, students may ignore comments which explain
and justify assessment, because they deepen the mystery.’ (Ovens et al., 2011, p10)

Taking a ‘student centred approach’ inquiry, research and reflection are integral elements of the Inquiry into Learning modules. Module organisation provides the frame for cycles of collaborative learning inquiries determined by students, with tutors’ guidance. (Rogers, 1994) This follows Julius Nyerere’s principle that *People cannot be developed, they can only develop themselves* (Nyerere, 1973, p.5). We set expectations for our students to embark on a journey of self development and believe that they must take responsibility for it from the outset, while we create an environment that provides the necessary encouragement and support.

Throughout the academic year students investigate areas of their learning and maintain a reflective journal. Periodically students write a series of short pieces, called ‘patches’ about their learning experience. These pieces of work, together with their reflective journal and their contributions to various discussion boards, form the basis of their final assessment. Additionally, informal peer formative feedback is built into the process to encourage collaborative, progressive learning. The assessment criteria focus on the processes of learning. In harmony with values and beliefs about learning, the method of assessments taking the form of a ‘patchwork text’. (Winter, 2003)

Discussion after the presentation focused on student engagement in the module and their participation in discussion boards. A range of scaffolding activities were outlined together with examples of student feedback.
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To me, to you: peer feedback as a tool for meaningful assessment
Helen Puntha and Lisa Clughen

The session explored the use of peer feedback within and outside assessments. Defined as the observation, commenting upon and at times assessing of student work by other students, it was acknowledged that peer feedback could be conducted in-person or online and that it could be formative or summative in nature. The following rationale was given for using this method of feedback, ‘...if we want students to develop critical thinking, judgement and autonomy in assignment production they should be provided with high-level evaluative experiences similar to those of experts. Peer review, students evaluating and commenting on each other's work, is one way to achieve this’ (Nicol, n.d.). A further potential benefit is enhanced staff understanding of the kinds of feedback valued by students. Any form of feedback should be both understandable and useful to the recipient; to this end, the presenters discussed the need for preparation and scaffolding when introducing peer feedback to students. In addition to practical knowledge, preparation should include discussion of the purposes of feedback as a developmental learning activity and the idea of the university as a place of collaborative learning. Similarly, peer feedback activities should be scaffolded to allow students time to familiarise themselves with the techniques of peer feedback. Information which might support the introduction of peer feedback can be found in the effective feedback resource on the CADQ website.

The presenters described ‘the Crit’ (or ‘critical review’), a peer feedback method used widely in design-based / project-based subjects. It is a technique which simulates professional practice and involves students presenting their work-in-progress and receiving comments from staff, student peers and sometimes external professionals/experts. The transferability of the Crit to non-design based subjects was discussed. More
information about the Crit can be found on the CADQ web pages.

Presenter Lisa Clughen who uses peer feedback within her own teaching, gave examples of peer feedback techniques to demonstrate how the feedback method can be used in different contexts / disciplines such as grammar games (e.g. Spanish Language), punctuation and syntax (e.g. Academic Support), essay writing (e.g. History), understanding and application of course content (e.g. Social Theory). Delegates participated in a peer feedback exercise designed to support in-class recall and application. The activity tested the delegates recall of the information presented so far in the session (e.g. delegates were asked to cite a benefit of peer feedback and a consideration for its implementation). The activity also supported delegates in considering the potential for integrating peer feedback techniques into their own teaching; delegates were asked to give an example of how they might use peer feedback whilst meeting the considerations discussed.

The presenters considered how colleagues might encourage a student culture of feedback. Introducing peer feedback methods for in class activities, assessments and suggesting extra-curricular feedback opportunities such as writing groups, journal groups or simply reading and commenting on each other’s work were discussed.
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Assessment for Learning (AFL) was a commonly heard cry in schools after the turn of the millennium. It was a feature of many high and low level initiatives from the National Strategies down. As a teaching ‘new recruit’, fresh from a PGCE, I was in its vanguard. Moving to NTU, completing a PGCHE, and attending lots of associated CPD, I was perplexed that such a cornerstone as AFL seemed to have skipped higher education (HE). Then, this “Assessment for Learning” conference, prompted me to reflect on this omission and my experience of AFL in both environments. Was AFL applicable to HE? Were my strategies really AFL or merely edu-tainment? If so, were they any less worthy if helping learning?

My intent for the session was to answer these questions and, by exemplifying AFL in action through audience participation, to spread its merits. The session started with a summary of the pedagogy behind AFL in schools, in order to make attendees aware of its utility. Glossing over some of the ‘policy’ baggage, AFL was considered in its broadest sense as any assessment with the “purpose of promoting learners’ learning” (Black et al., 2002). As such it was acknowledged that “good teachers would continue to assess pupils” whether mandated to or not (Naylor & Keogh, 2004).

I then related my understanding and experience of the practice of AFL in secondary education, and continued by reflecting on the pedagogic value of some of the AFL tools that I carried over into practice in HE. As my teaching developed, my focus evolved into having pupils actively manifest their understanding in ways that peers and I could see, assess and therefore positively influence. This could be achieved through activities and games, which created cognitive conflict and promoted social learning, and which could become quite entertaining and enjoyable. I introduced the idea of dialogic teaching, something I stumbled across researching the session, which also describes my intentions well. As espoused by Alexander (2008), this is “distinct from the question-answer and listen-tell routines of mainstream teaching, aiming to be more consistently searching, reciprocal and extended”.

AFL or Edu-ainment? Perspectives from outside HE
Richard Humphries
Moving into HE created new challenges, but the principles of learning and assessment are consistent throughout education so key tenets of my AfL philosophy remained: to find out what learners already know; to actively seek and address misconceptions; and to improve discourse and metacognition.

There was time within the session to introduce some AfL games and strategies that had endured my transition and the audience contributed some ideas from their experience. In contemplating whether such approaches might be termed *edu-tainment*, I shared my contention that undergraduates are more open to enjoying and taking risks in such activities than school age pupils. I hope that I convinced the audience of the value of an AfL approach, which includes the capacity to help address transition themes and has at its heart the intention to enhance the “quality of interaction between student and teacher that is at the heart of pedagogy” (Black & Wiliam, 1998)
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Authentive assessment for critical modules in Art & Design
Matt Hawthorne

This paper outlined the underpinning methodology of the curriculum design in the Critical Practices modules in BA Theatre Design and BA Costume Design & Making. The module strand forms a 3 year process of teaching research methods and practice to undergraduate designers. The curriculum design is built around the process of assessment for learning, with students undertaking a rapid process of fortnightly projects to build and embed knowledge and elements of method with ongoing self and tutor assessment framed into a collaboratively written document. The focus here is developing an understanding of research which is authentic to the context of an undergraduate design curriculum, and can allow for a diversity of student approaches to research, from theoretical to applied forms.

It is the contention of the paper that the process of a collaboratively written document, can and should form the basis for an understanding of effective e-assessment.

This work has been presented as a case study for the National Teaching Fellow Project on alternatives to traditional dissertations at University of Gloucestershire

http://insight.glos.ac.uk/tli/activities/ntf/creativehops/examples/Pages/Arts,MediaandHumanitiesExamples.aspx

The work has also been presented to the staff panel for the British Conference of Undergraduate Research at University of Central Lancashire, April 2011.
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Inclusive assessment workshop
Ann Ord, Sarah Baldwin, Alison Hardy and Lindsay Evett

Nottingham Trent University defines Inclusion as: Enabling a full and equitable participation in and progression through higher education for all prospective and existing students.

Assessment is one focus of the University Priorities in 2011/12 and developments are taking place in many aspects of this including; feedback turnaround times, e-submission and computer based assessment. Inclusion is an aspect of assessment which is considered in all assessment developments and at the design stage of new programmes.

Considering inclusive practice at the design stage of a programme is intended to decrease the need for adjustments for individuals at the summative stage of assessment.

A fully inclusive approach to assessment ensures that all students have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of learning outcomes, and are not disadvantaged by the nature of the assessment method.

This workshop did not seek to provide definitive answers to designing the perfect inclusive assessment. Rather, to look at inclusion from differing perspectives within the University, promote discussion and inform further developments in this area.

Colleagues with experience of employing inclusive or alternative assessment methods and those with knowledge of the experiences of students with disabilities presented their papers and participated in a chaired panel.

This workshop took the form of three short presentations on different perceptions and experiences of assessment

Student perception
Led by Dr Lindsay Evett from the School of Science and Technology this presentation represented both the perceptions of a disabled student who had successfully completed a BA (Hons) Degree and the perspective of the academic in providing the support required to facilitate this success. Lindsay
also discussed the accessibility agenda and guidelines within the University.

**Academic perception**
Alison Hardy from the School of Education shared her experience of working with a high percentage of dyslexic students in one cohort. Alison discussed the unknowns, the constraints and progress made and presented some suggestions for development which would support colleagues in the future.

**Professional Services**
Sarah Baldwin from Student Support Services presented a case study of the experience of supporting students and academics in designing alternative and inclusive assessments. This also included information on the availability and procedures for accessing support in the University.

There followed group discussions which elicited some useful suggestions for progressing the development of inclusive practice in the University. These and discussions from previous events, will contribute to the development of NTU policy on inclusion.

[View PowerPoint slides of presentation by Sarah Baldwin]
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**Employability informed assessment: the concept, a design and how it worked (or didn’t)**

Jeffrey Goatcher

This paper reports the findings of a trial of an assessment designed to enhance employability skills in social science graduates. The assessment sought to combine elements of ‘real-world’ skills with the academic aims and objectives of a level 3 optional module.

The importance of employability and demonstrable transferable skills, particularly for degrees with no obvious career training element in their purpose - social sciences and humanities - is a growing area of importance. But academics, particularly in the social sciences and humanities dislike talk of ‘employability’. Any hint of sacrificing space in the curriculum for employer led incursions into the academic curriculum where depth and breadth of the specific discipline currently reside draws suspicion and resistance.

Nonetheless, our graduates must get jobs, and each year there are thousands of other graduates who must also get jobs. How might the students we send into the world distinguish themselves from all the other graduates?

Approaches which can identify and enhance employability crucial transferable skills but do not detract from the academic content of modules, are of particular value, in any economic climate. The session offered an account of an attempt to meet this challenge via a carefully designed assessment strategy.

The assessment required the students to construct a book proposal to submit to a publisher, to a template derived from actual publisher instructions. Students were to include a cover letter setting out the rationale and market for the book as well as providing a sample of the writing that will appear in the book. The book must take the form of a ‘reader’, so they must demonstrate a wide understanding of the relevant literature. The subject of the book is entirely up to the student, within the bounds of the
module subject (the sociology of disaster, in this case).

How the assessment was implemented, the difficulties experienced and, reflexive adaptations to the assessment were reported. Implications arising from the experience, for the rest of the curriculum were also discussed.
Enriching the student learning experience through innovative curriculum design

Melanie Currie

Abstract

This paper discusses a major set of curriculum changes with a business school that were aimed at improving not only the employability of our students but increasing their engagement, interest and passion for the subjects they have chosen to study. Building on grounded theory and changes in policy that are requiring universities to become more business focused, this project was focused on rethinking our offering and improving the student learning experience. A particular focus of the work was around assessment design and ensuring that the experiential learning opportunities had an appropriate balance of theoretical and practical assessments.

Overview of Session

A report ‘Beyond the Curriculum Opportunities to enhance employability and future life choices’ (Nov 2009) called on universities to consider opportunities to go beyond the curriculum. The report (compiled by the 1994 group) outlines that Employers (including businesses, charities, voluntary organisations and the public sector) greatly value the knowledge and skills that graduates develop whilst studying at university, along with the skills and experience they gain from undertaking extra activities beyond the curriculum. The most employable graduates are those who not only possess such skills, but are able to reflect and articulate how they have developed their skills and why they are important. The current UG portfolio reflects some of these significant changes and ideas, however there was clearly a need to look at the ‘pockets of excellence’ within our programmes and consider if there was a way to deliver innovation and leading edge opportunities to all of our students.

This presentation explored the UG Curriculum Redesign at Level 2 in NBS that was implemented in 2011-2012 The table below outlines the innovative offerings that this project has embedded within the core curriculum. This curriculum redesign was in part to provide a unique selling point to prospective students, not only as Higher Education will become a more
competitive space, but also to provide opportunities for students that will enable them to compete more effectively as graduates of NTU

**Level 2 Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First half year (Oct-Jan) 60 cpts</th>
<th>Second half year (Feb -June)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3x20 cpts</td>
<td>Opportunity 1.  continue with study 3x20 cpts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x20 xpts</td>
<td>Opportunity 2.  Study abroad (one of four partner institutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x20 cpts</td>
<td>Opportunity 3.  Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity 4.  Enterprise Project (in conjunction with the HIVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity 5.  Community Project (in conjunction with SIFE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The School prides itself in innovation in the UG programmes but it was apparent that not all opportunities were available to all students and that the development of a Level 2 framework would enable some of this innovation, particularly in experiential learning, enterprise, internships and community projects to be positioned within the curriculum. It is this unique proposal to place these within (and not as co-curricular activities) that provided new and challenging learning experiences for our students. It is this element which will also set us apart from our competitors.

Embedding these opportunities within the curriculum required programme and subject teams to consider the learning experience of the students and, in particular whether, it was valid to have the learning experiences as outlined in the projects. The move from traditional learning to student centered pedagogy was a greater leap of faith for some programmes than others. It was clear that there was room to develop a framework that builds on these learnings and evidenced for the student the importance of the theoretical and practical academic needs of their programme of study.

The session outlined the design of the framework, the learning from the design process and the initial implementation of the framework within the curriculum on 2011-2012.
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Into the light: the role of peer feedback and interaction on academic skills for mature, part-time HE learners

Belinda Ferguson and Jackie Scruton

Piaget (1932) claimed that ‘Criticism is borne of discussion and discussion is only possible amongst equals’ (pg. 409).

This action research study set out to identify how peer feedback and interaction supports mature, part-time HE learners in developing academic skills and keeping them focused and on track. By creating opportunities for learners to engage in planned discussions with their peers, who could be regarded as their equals, the impact that this had on their writing, thinking, critical and analytical skills as well as their confidence and motivation was explored.

The findings reveal that the learners value the process of giving and receiving feedback which they believed improved their critical thinking skills and gave them confidence and reassurance that they were on track with their studies. It was evident, however, that there were drawbacks to the process when learners did not consider themselves to be equal and the quality of feedback varied.

It was found that there was a correlation between learners who gave helpful feedback and achieved high marks and those who gave limited feedback or chose not to participate and achieved lower marks.

The findings lead to the development of further strategies to support learners in both giving and using valuable feedback in order to improve academic skills.
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How black men and boys successfully navigate the further education curriculum
Sheine Peart

This paper examined the different strategies independently developed by Black men and boys, to support their learning and to enable them to achieve academic success when studying college based vocational qualifications, often after failing to achieve within the statutory education sector.

Researching through phenomenological inquiry, primary data was collected in two city based colleges located in the East Midlands (England) over a 15 month period. An extensive variety of qualitative research tools were used to gather data and to ensure the integrity of the participants’ unique voices were retained. Focus groups and individual interviews were used to assemble the majority of the data, supplemented with classroom and recreation based observations and photo records compiled by some of the participants. This data was used to build a rich, in-depth picture of the participants’ daily experiences when studying within college and to document the distinctive approaches they employed to enable them to successfully remain within college and to achieve sought after academic qualifications.

The paper continued to develop the theme of student self help support systems and puts forward recommendations for college management teams and tutors, working in conjunction with learners, which could help to positively influence the academic attainment of this group.

The paper concluded by suggesting further strategies that colleges could usefully consider to promote equality and access within colleges to enhance achievement of Black male learners.
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Thinking global, teaching local: sustainability as a tool for meaningful learning and innovative assessment

Helen Puntha, Richard Howarth and Petra Molthan-Hill

The session provided an explanation of the sustainability element of the NTU Graduate Attribute of Global Citizenship and a discussion of the relationship between sustainability and assessment (and feedback) in different disciplines. Definitions identify that sustainability encompasses the environment, economy and society; the interconnectedness of these three dimensions was highlighted and discussed. It was noted that certain sustainability problems such as poverty or climate change manifest as ‘wicked problems’ as a result of their many interdependencies, many stakeholders, resilience to resolution and where efforts to solve one aspect of the problem may reveal or create new problems (Martin and Murray 2011). As such, sustainability education and literacy underpin deeper learning and can exercise students’ intellectual agility and capacity to make connections within and between topics, including those not necessarily sustainability-related. Sustainability education then, is beyond transmitting sustainability knowledge in the form of content to students. In this context, the presenters argued that sustainability education and literacy can contribute a great deal towards the development of the broader skills, knowledge and competencies needed for students to thrive in a world of ‘supercomplexity’ (Barnett 2000).

Richard Howarth explained how sustainability literacy is fostered in the School of Social Sciences through a focus on applied and reflective learning in a work-related context and through the use of blended learning. Because of the nature of his work, and the specific examples used, Richard identified that there was clear alignment with the NTU attributes and wider needs related to sustainability and the assessments used. However, it was further identified that the requirements of the assessments, and the approach to feedback, was supportive of, and facilitated, sustainability literacy. Noted as important here were the recognition and embracing of connections and complexity, tools to support understanding, the need for critique and reflection (i.e. of current practices and thinking) and the (re)visioning of solutions in current and future contexts.
In Nottingham Business School as explained by Petra Molthan-Hill, students develop a greenhouse gas emission inventory, devise ideas for companies to go carbon neutral and also take part in a three-day sustainable organisation simulation game. The game combines experiential learning with learning new tools for example in sustainable accounting, sustainable marketing, sustainable strategy and new skills such as systems thinking, inter- and trans-disciplinary teamwork. The game provides a good opportunity for students to draw connections between the various core modules in their course.

Though it may be neither desirable nor possible for an entire curriculum to be based on sustainability-related topics, incorporating sustainability within formal and informal assessments can facilitate meaningful and for many students transformative learning outcomes. The speakers all supported the use of assessment and feedback to promote students’ capacity to understand change as well as economical, societal and environmental needs and the associated management of these dimensions of sustainability now and in the future. More information about sustainability including definitions, resources and a curriculum framework can be found on the CADQ web pages.
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Grade-based marking
Roger Eccleston

Context and Objectives
In Autumn 2011 a Marking Scheme Task Group (MSTG) was formed to consider changes to the assessment and marking process which would ensure that they recognise the achievements of our students in a fair and transparent manner.

After extensive evaluation and consultation, in February 2012, Academic Board approved the introduction of a Grade-based Marking System (GMS) for implementation in academic year 2012/13, applying to all years of undergraduate and postgraduate study.

The current status of the work of the MSTG (March 2012) was presented for comment and discussion. GMS has been introduced in NLS and examples from their implementation was presented.

Rationale
Grade-based Marking Systems reduce subjectivity and ensure assessment is outcome rather than task-focused; an approach to curriculum design that NTU has been using for many years. Further, such schemes encourage the use of the full marking range and better reward intellectual merit and achievement ensuring excellence is recognised and poor performance is penalised. In combination with descriptors and marking matrices, they clarify the expectations of students, may facilitate prompt and effective feedback and increase confidence in marking.

Marking Processes
A student’s work is assessed in terms of 17 grade bands, (listed below on the basis of general marking descriptors, and it is this grade band that is communicated to the student. Each of the grade bands have a numerical equivalent. Where a module comprises more than one unit of assessment, a weighted average of the numerical equivalents is used to provide a module mark expressed as a percentage which can then be translated into the
module grade. The 17 grade bands are: excellent 1st; high 1st; mid 1st; low 1st; high 2.1; mid 2.1; low 2.1; high 2.2; mid 2.2; low 2.2; high 3rd; mid 3rd; low 3rd; marginal fail; mid fail; low fail; zero.

The MSTG are engaged in on-going work to evaluate methodologies for aggregating module grades to provide the final degree classification and support exam boards.

**General Marking Descriptors and Marking Matrices**

Generic level descriptors represent a set of common characteristics expected of work at each of the different grade bands, at each undergraduate level. Bandings cover the full range of marks (0-100%), align with the GMS and are consistent with pedagogic content (constructive alignment and SOLO taxonomy).

Schools and Academic Teams should refine the descriptors to suit specific discipline areas.

Marking matrices, schemes or grids, in a variety of forms, are currently used by a number of Schools and provide a number of benefits:

- feedback aligns with specific assessment criteria;
- they are shared with students to clearly articulate expectations;
- they support consistency in marking and moderation; and
- relevant comments are highlighted and additional comments are only exceptionally added thereby potentially making marking more efficient.

Where matrices are used, student response is positive, because a clear justification can be seen for the mark. External examiners have also commended use of marking grids that are tailored to specific assessments because feedback is contextualised.
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