

## **Multimodal assessment and like for like feedback: What's the point?**

Danielle Tran, Greenwich University, [d.f.tran@gre.ac.uk](mailto:d.f.tran@gre.ac.uk)

### **Abstract:**

At the University of Greenwich, United Kingdom, the Postgraduate Research Teaching and Learning and Assessment course (PGRTLA) sees a coming together of post-graduate research students (PGRs) from a variety of disciplines. The latter means that students have often developed distinct approaches to studying and assessment rooted in the subject area in which they specialise. The PGRTLA is a six-week course consisting of one three-hour interactive seminar each week. This case study evaluates a trial to submit a reflective assignment in a format of their choice. Students were also informed that the feedback given by the course leader would be 'like for like', meaning that the tutor would employ the same mode and format used by the student when constructing the feedback. Five of the 42 participants chose to submit a multimodal assessment. In spite of the low number of multimodal submissions, positive feedback was received via the course completion survey. Experiments with assessment and feedback show students that their different learning styles are respected; it offers students greater choice and control over the format and mode of their work. However, support for new technology-enhanced learning tools needs to be offered in advance for those interested in trying out something new. Training may also need to be offered to staff involved in marking multimodal assessments. Resource and time have shown to be challenging factors but such experimentation by student and teacher can lead to both parties developing their professional practice. Existing skills of familiar tools can be improved upon, and new skills can be learnt as new tools are tried out.

### **Introduction**

In many UK Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), PGRs are expected to carry out some teaching duties. To support them, courses are often provided. Whilst these courses may differ in style and length, they generally have a focus upon introducing researchers to key debates within the sector as well as the relevant theories, technology enhanced learning tools, and approaches to help shape and innovate learning and teaching at university level. These courses help to equip postgraduate researchers with the basic skills and knowledge to support them in delivering tutorials and/or lab demonstrations, which they may be able to take up as paid employment opportunities alongside their doctoral research.

### **The context behind this case study**

At the University of Greenwich, United Kingdom, the postgraduate research teaching and learning and assessment course (PGR TLA) is strand two of five of the postgraduate researcher development program. The University has three campuses based at Greenwich, Avery Hill, and Medway. Based in

London, the student body is made up of home and international students, creating an engaging multicultural learning environment. All enrolled postgraduate researchers must complete the TLA course unless they successfully claim exemption. PGRs on the TLA come from a wide range of subject areas including science, engineering, music, law, mathematics, and sports science. This coming together of PGRs from a variety of disciplines leads to fruitful discussions of different ways of teaching and learning. The latter also means that students have often developed distinct approaches to studying and assessment rooted in the subject area they are specialising in.

The PGR TLA is a six-week course consisting of one three-hour interactive seminar per week.<sup>1</sup> Each session introduces students to a key topic relating to learning and teaching in Higher Education such as assessment and feedback, learning theories, technology enhanced learning, and the flipped classroom method. One of the six sessions is carried out online via Adobe Connect whilst the others are delivered face-to-face. There are two cohorts, one group is based at the Greenwich Maritime campus of the University, and the other is based at the Medway campus. For the 2017-18 autumn term, there were a total of 42 PGRs registered: 23 at Greenwich and 19 at Medway.

In order to complete the PGR TLA, enrolled PGR's must attend all six sessions and complete all assessments. During week four of the PGR TLA course, all PGR's must deliver a 10 minute micro-teach session on a topic of their choosing, as long as the topic does not directly relate to their PhD work. This is to help test their ability to communicate and engage an audience of mock students on a subject which they are interested in but may not necessarily be very familiar or experienced in teaching. The students are notified of this task at the start of the course. Session content ahead of the micro-teach supports them with the planning and design of their micro-teach. The PGRs then have a couple of weeks to prepare for this micro-teach. They have the option of submitting a lesson plan for feedback from the course leader ahead of the micro-teach and are expected to include an activity within their micro teach as well as some form of assessment. The activity and assessment must relate and be constructively aligned with the learning outcomes, which they also are responsible for designing.

After their micro-teach, they receive feedback from their peers as well as from a tutor who is there to coordinate their particular group. The feedback from their peers is communicated to them both verbally and through a written observation form, which can then be used to help them critically reflect upon their micro-teach. During the 2017-18 autumn term of this course, there were two summative assessments. The first was a multiple-choice quiz, where questions were based upon the different topics that they had been introduced to throughout the course. The second was a 500 word critical reflection upon their micro-teach activity. Guidance regarding the critical reflection is given to students both on Moodle and in their course handbook. Time to discuss the summative assessment was also allocated at relevant points during the face-to-face sessions and online webinar.

---

<sup>1</sup> Information correct during the academic year 2017-18.

All submissions were uploaded to Turnitin via Moodle. An end of course survey was sent round to all students after the results of the summative reflection were released. Within this survey, students were asked about their opinions and experience of the reflective assignment. Anonymised quotations from the student survey have been included during the results and discussion section below by way of evaluating the assessment and feedback process as a whole.

### **Multimodality and like for like feedback**

A multimodal assignment incorporates 'the use of several different elements to convey information [such as...] text, images, videos, and sound to create a singular assignment. This mode of information processing allows students to demonstrate their understanding of course materials in ways that fit their learning style or preferred method of communication while still meeting literacy standards' (Blake, 2015). Since the PGR TLA course began in 2011, the second summative assessment has always called for the submission of a purely written critical reflection. There has always been a healthy pass rate and students have not communicated or raised any dissatisfaction with the written mode. However, as is emphasised during the course of the PGR TLA, students learn in different ways and may prefer to be assessed in different ways. For this reason, it was decided that an experiment would be carried out and that the option of a multimodal submission for the second summative assignment would be trialled with the autumn term cohort.

In an effort to design a more inclusive assessment and allow room for greater levels of creativity among the PGR's when reflecting upon their micro-teach, it was made clear to all PGR's that as long as their submission appropriately met the assessment criteria [see Appendix C] they had the choice to submit their critical reflection in whatever mode they thought most suitable. Examples such as a mind map, song, poem, video, rap, cartoon, or comic book strip were put forth as some suggestions. If a student wished to submit in a different mode other than the ones listed above, they would have to liaise with the course leader before submission. Ragupathi (2012) summarises that 'While approaches to literacy have become increasingly "multimodal", student outputs have remained largely "unimodal", with the written word being privileged for its ability to convey a level of complexity supposedly outside the purview of other communication forms. Research indicates that students who incorporate multimodal forms and approaches to their learning are better engaged with the content than those who employ traditional approaches, thereby enhancing their thinking and learning process.

Going even further in an effort to develop a more inclusive assessment, students were informed that the feedback given by the course leader would be 'like for like'. This meant that if a student submitted a written critical reflection, then the feedback would be written too. If a student chose to submit a mind map then their feedback would also take the form of a mind map. Needless to say that this was a fairly brave decision to take, as it is unusual for an academic tutor to be faced with the possibility of having to rap, draw,

sing, and/or write feedback for a range of submissions. Campbell and Feldmann note that, 'Giving feedback that is both visual and auditory can help make students feel connected to the teacher and the content' (2017, 4). They go on to say, 'Multimodal feedback allows a teacher to convey care and interest in student progress and growth through the tone of his or her voice. This can aid in disarming a student who may traditionally become defensive when receiving feedback in writing' (Campbell and Feldmann, 2017, 5).

It was hoped that students on the course would feel empowered by the option of this multimodal assessment and feel that their creativity and decision making was respected and trusted. It was also hoped that students would find the task to be more enjoyable as they had more control over the format of their submission and that they may also feel excited by the prospect of their 'like for like' feedback. If a student looks forward to receiving their feedback then they may pay more attention to it and engage with it on a deeper level. The latter points to a wider issue of endeavouring to encourage students to deeply engage with and reflect upon the feedback that they have received from tutors.

Commenting on what feedback means, Brookhart (2017, 1) notes that, 'Feedback says to a student, "Somebody cared enough about my work to read it and think about it!"'. This statement underlines the value and appreciation which students feel when they receive individual, constructive, and thoughtful feedback. Students want to know that time has been taken to read through their work and then feedback thoughtfully written. By giving students like-for-like feedback, they are made aware that this time and focus will be taken by the tutor. The feedback they receive would be tailored to their submission, acknowledging the style and format of the work. When asked to comment on the feedback they received, the PGR TLA students from this case study noted the following: 'Very excited because it showed that the lecturers were read[y] to accommodate everyone by giving 'like for like' feedback', 'The feedback was clear and not as "empty" as I would have expected', 'Very interesting to read the feedback, shows the lecturer has read everything you wrote and has understood the style you used'.

As students on the PGR TLA come from a range of disciplines and a variety of departments across the University, they are specialists in specific areas of work, which may focus on greatly different skills such as writing, music, art, and/or technology, to name a few examples. By giving students the option to submit a multimodal assessment, students could choose to employ the expert skills in which they are trained and are rooted in that particular subject discipline. The initial response from students on hearing about this multimodal option was a mixture of amusement and surprise, which increased on hearing about the promise of like for like feedback.

## **Results and discussion**

In week 6, the Greenwich group were asked if anyone was thinking of submitting a piece in a non-written format; no one indicated that they would.

They said they would find it easier to simply *write* the reflection. Out of 34 submissions, 5 went against the traditional structure of a written assessment.

- 1 animated presentation
- 2 Mind maps
- 1 Formal letter
- 1 Video

The limited number of multimodal submissions may be because the skill of writing for assessments among PGRs has become a skill honed over time and one they feel familiar and comfortable with over other forms of submission. This point is reinforced by one of the surveyed students who responded, 'I like the idea in principal as having more options is almost always a good thin[g], and it fits in with the course content encouraging students to explore new avenues of learning, but I imagine that most people at this stage in their education would be most comfortable writing up a small reflection than finding another format, if only for the expe[r]ience of completing the course content quickly. So I expect you will only ever get a small minority actually elect to use this option'. Taking this into consideration, it would be worth running a similar experiment with a group of year 1 undergraduates to see whether such a cohort would be more open to testing out new forms of multimodal submission. The challenge of course would be resource, as the number of multimodal submissions may take longer to mark depending on the availability and experience of markers.

The end of course evaluation survey included questions concerning the option for multimodal submission and the promise of like for like feedback. PGRs were informed that the survey was 'an anonymous survey and feedback will be used to help develop the PGR TLA programme for future students and help to inform ongoing research within the Educational Development Unit regarding assessment and feedback'. Results from the survey regarding the specific questions on multimodal assessment and feedback can be found in full in Appendix A and B.

The Powtoon submission was an animated video full of colour and movement. Any text included had to be relevant and concise in order to fit in with the style and format of the Powtoon video. When asked via a survey whether or not the PGR appreciated having the opportunity to submit work in a different mode, the student responded, 'Yes - I used it as an opportunity to use Powtoons (which I had not used before)'. The latter is supported by most of the other PGRs who commented that it was 'something different', 'creative', that it offered 'variety', 'flexibility' and 'allowed students to express themselves in the best way'. These descriptions connect the option of multimodal submission with choice and stresses an acknowledgement of the personal and individual.

Two mindmaps were submitted, each using a different software tool to produce them. The final versions of these mind maps were detailed and visually engaging. The structure was simplistic at the core, as most mindmaps are, but the format worked well as each strand of the mind map was connected to a particular area of the activity which was being reflected upon

by the student. The student survey expressed positive opinions regarding the multimodal assessment such as: 'it opens the gate of learning varieties of skills such as (writing for blogs, communication behaviour for recording videos and brainstorming for the flowchart)', and 'it exposes one to methods they probably have never tried before'. The triggering of experimentation among some of the PGRs, which came as a result of the choice to submit in a multimodal format, is encouraging to consider. It is this 'open[ing] of the gate of learning' which is what teaching staff at university endeavour to achieve among their students. They are not empty vessels to be filled with information, but academics in their own right who should feel confident, inspired, and supported to try out new modes of approaching set tasks.

One student chose to submit their assignment in the structure of a letter. Although this can be counted as a clearly written assignment, it was not formatted or structured in the same way as a typical critical reflection. The style, approach, and tone was that of a formal written letter. The tone was more specific as it was evident that the student was making an effort to write to an individual person rather than a generic marker. As like for like feedback was given, the student also received feedback that mirrored the style and structure of the submission. The visual aesthetic of the letter stood out as being different to the other written assignments. The reason(s) behind the student's choice to submit their work in this way remains unclear, was their intention to simply write formally or to produce an assignment that diverges from the standard conventions of academic structure for the purposes of this task? What is known is that the style pointed to the different ways in which the written form can be played with when there is opportunity for creativity and flexibility in an assessment.

The course leader also received one video submission, which was a recorded talking head video made available to the tutor via a weblink to a Youtube video. During the recording, the student made use of the audio and visual benefits of video, showing props and communicating directly with the audience. In terms of feedback given, the tool Screencastify was used to record a video. This was chosen as it enables the user to record their laptop screen as well as embed an image of their talking head into the video. As a result, while like for like feedback was given through the medium of direct video, it also extended the value and effectiveness of the content of feedback as notes that were written on a Word document were shared on the screen and talked through. The latter meant that it would be easier for the student to follow the points being made and they could reference both the written and audio feedback for clarification of a particular point. McCormack and Taylor (2006) 'presented the advantages and disadvantages, reported by final year graphic design students and their teacher, of oral assessment feedback recorded and delivered electronically. The use of technology, combined with the immediacy, privacy, convenience and accessibility of the feedback and the opportunity to listen multiple times, was reported by students as helping them learn' (527). 'A further advantage is that, like audio, video files provide a permanent record, which can be stored and replayed at the students' convenience' (Crook et al, 387).

However, while the positives of offering a multimodal assessment and like for like feedback have been outlined, and the value which it can bring to students has been discussed, in order to offer a rounded and fair evaluation of this case study, it is also important to consider the limitations of such a task. Although it has been lamented that only a small number of the cohort submitted a multimodal submission, for the lecturer responsible for marking the submissions, the small number of submissions received in this way made the task of offering like for like feedback manageable. The time consuming nature of completing like for like feedback means that it can longer to complete a piece of feedback via video or Powtoon than it is to construct written feedback. This is because the lecturer is not employing a single tool for all the marking. As a result, if like for like feedback is chosen to be part of the feedback and assessment process for a larger course, the issue of staff resourcing would need to be considered due to the amount of time needed to produce feedback using certain technology enhanced learning tools. But multimodality need not be reliant on technology as Oldakowski (2014) emphasises. He states that 'A large misconception [...] in multimodal assessment is that the work requires the use of digital tools or technology [...] A collage made up of pictures cut out of magazines, for instance, constitutes the visual mode without the use of technology or digital tools'.

What is surprising is the contrast between the positive language used to respond to the option of submitting a multimodal submission and the low number of PGRs who actually took up the option for the summative assessment. One of the reasons why the students may have felt discouraged from submitting a multimodal piece of work is pointed out in this response, 'I liked the idea of the other methods but I found it difficult to understand where the marks would be distributed if I organised it in an alternative method'. This constructive feedback is valid and while guidance was given in the handbook about the expectations and requirements of the assessment as a whole, more detail could have been added to explain how the feedback and final mark would be decided upon if the submission was a multimodal assessment. A similar finding was noted in a study by Weaver (2006), where 'A multi-method approach of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis was used to survey 44 students in the faculties of Business and Art & Design' (379). In the study, it was noted that 'A number of students [...] perceived unhelpful feedback as that which did not relate to assessment criteria, or to the mark received' (390).

Some lecturers may find that using technology enhanced learning (TEL) tools is actually a quicker way of recording and communicating feedback and this may be down to the experience, technical skill and confidence of the individual. What can be a time consuming task to provide like for like feedback leads on to the issue of staff training. Not all members of a teaching team may have the same level of ability, familiarity, and/or confidence of employing TEL tools. So as not to risk making assumptions of an individual's capability on a teaching team of using a variety of tools and their confidence of learning how to employ a new tool, it is important to consider what type and how much staff training (whether informal or formal) can be offered to staff to help prepare and support the markers through the process. It can be argued that the

investment of resource for such a small proportion of students opting to submit in one of the multimodal formats would be unnecessarily costly. However, the dissemination of individual experiences of employing TEL tools and how they were used within staff meetings and internal conferences can be used as free training and professional development opportunities.

The lack of confidence regarding the use of ICT has also affected students on the PGR TLA course from submitting a multimodal assessment. One student noted, 'I really wish I had the skills to submit something so i could have fun feedback. I am a bore'. Another PGR commented, '[The option to submit a non-written assignment] was a nice option. I am so rubbish with IT stuff that I didn't attempt anything unusual though'. These responses point to the need for more support and practical guidance regarding the use of TEL tools ahead of the summative assignment. It may be that for multimodal assessments and like for like feedback, a select choice of tools is offered to students. The selection of these tools could be chosen based on which tools the teaching team are already familiar with, which would help with the ease of marking. However, doing so would mean limiting the options available for students to pick their own tool and prevent an opportunity for lecturers to develop their own skills by trying out new software. Thus, as noted by Poulos and Mahony, 'Feedback is clearly a complex multi-dimensional rather than a simple, straightforward phenomenon' (2008, 145).

## **Conclusion**

Some critics may question the value, or as the title of this case study has casually stated, 'the point' of giving like for like feedback. Offering students the option of submitting in a multimodal form already opens up a range of possible challenges which would need to be dealt with as part of the assessment and submission process, so why further complicate matters by promising like for like feedback? Particularly when as this small scale case study has shown, the majority of the PGRs involved did not even choose to engage with the multimodal option. The high levels of interest and curiosity which the teacher was expecting did not materialise. It seems that this particular PGR cohort preferred the familiarity and ease of submitting a written assessment. They have over time become trained in writing for an academic purpose. This skill, which takes time and effort to carve, meant that they found it *safer* to submit in written form rather than trying out a new tool and risk receiving negative feedback. On reflection, more questions could have been asked of the small number of PGRs that did submit in a multimodal form to find out in more depth how they found the experience, and what they felt they learnt from doing so?

Some of the responses have touched upon these latter questions with one student noting, '[the option to submit in a multimodal form] was a nice touch, a bit of a novelty but one that encouraged a feeling of equality'. The perception of the choice of multimodal submission being one that was seen as a novelty raises questions in terms of how the choice of submission format could have been better communicated to the PGRs. However, the feeling of equality which the PGR comments on relates to one of the core reasons why



the choice was initially offered. The choice gives all students an opportunity to have creative control over the mode of submission. The teacher is able to show students another level of respect, trust, and an openness to experimenting with assessment methods. Other students stated that 'it gave me the opportunity to learn a different format', 'it helps to improve creativity, which in higher education diminishes in science and maths based subjects. Creativity increases engagement and thus improves teaching', 'I love this innovation'.

Crook et al (2012) comments, 'An appropriate technological application has the potential to encourage staff to reflect on their current feedback practices so that they can provide more detailed, comprehensible and engaging feedback. Technologies may also provide the innovative edge that can help students engage more effectively with their feedback' (387). Offering students the option to submit work in a multimodal form does not mean that the teacher has to follow this up with like for like feedback. But doing so does show an extra effort by the teacher to take the time to respond more individually to each assignment. However, if all the students in this PGR cohort had submitted a multimodal assignment then the task of producing like for like feedback for every submission would have been difficult.

This case study has underlined the positives and limitations of experimenting with assessment modes and feedback methods. It can show students that their different learning styles are respected, it offers greater choice and control to the student over the format and mode of their work. However, support for new TEL tools needs to be offered in advance for those interested in trying out something new. Training may also need to be offered to staff who may be involved in marking multimodal assessments. Resource and time have been shown to be challenging factors but such experimentation by student and teacher can lead to both parties developing their professional practice. Existing skills of familiar tools can be improved upon, and new skills can be learnt as new tools are tried out.

## Reference list

Blake, Caitrin (2015) Creating Memorable, Productive Assignments With Multimodal Composition, *Professional Resources*, Concordia University, <https://online.cune.edu/multimodal-composition/> [accessed: 19 April 2018].

Brookhart, Susan M. (2017) *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*, Second Edition (Alexandria VA, USA: ASCD).

Campbell, Breanne, and Ann Feldmann (2017) The Power of Multimodal Feedback, *Journal of Curriculum, Teaching, Learning and Leadership in Education*, Vol. 2, Issue. 2 , Article 1, pp. 1-6. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/ctlle/vol2/iss2/1>

Crook, Anne, and Alice Mauchline, Stephen Maw, Clare Lawson, Robyn Drinkwater, Karsten Lundqvist, Paul Orsmond, Stephen Gomez, Julian Park (2012) 'The use of video technology for providing feedback to students: Can it enhance the feedback experience for staff and students?', *Computers & Education*, 58: 1, pp. 386-396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.08.025>

McCormack, Coralie, and Mary-Jane Taylor (2006) 'Electronic delivery of oral feedback on graphic design projects', Proceedings of the 23rd annual ascilite conference: Who's learning? Whose technology? ascilite, The University of Sydney [accessed: 19 April 2018] (Available at: [http://www.ascilite.org/conferences/sydney06/proceeding/pdf\\_papers/p72.pdf](http://www.ascilite.org/conferences/sydney06/proceeding/pdf_papers/p72.pdf))

Oldakowski, Tim (2014) 'A Multimodal Assignment That Enriches Literacy Learning The Problem', *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, Vol 9, pp. 70-77. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1035852.pdf> [accessed: 19 April 2018].

Poulos, Ann, and Mary Jane Mahony (2008) 'Effectiveness of feedback: the students' perspective', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33:2, pp. 143-154  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02602930601127869>

Ragupathi, Kiruthika (2012) Using multimodal communications for critical thinking assessments, *Technology in Pedagogy*, No. 10, August 2012. Available at: <https://blog.nus.edu.sg/cdtkdr/tag/multimodal-essays/> [accessed: April 19 2018].

ScreenCastify (2018) <https://www.screencastify.com/> [accessed: 19 April 2018].

Weaver, Melanie R. (2006) Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31:3, 379-394, DOI: 10.1080/02602930500353061



## Appendix A: feedback comments

Whether or not you chose to do so, did you like having the option of submitting a multi-modal reflection? (i.e. a reflection in a different format to that of a purely written essay structure). Please give a reason for your answer.

yes, because it is nice to be able to choose to do something different or creative for once.

As I have never written a reflection before I thought it was quite interesting/challenging writing one. I liked the idea of the other methods but I found it difficult to understand where the marks would be distributed if I organised it in an alternative method.

indifferent

Yes, variety is always good.

I like the idea in principal as having more options is almost always a good things, and it fits in with the course content encouraging students to explore new avenues of learning, but I imagine that most people at this stage in their education would be most comfortable writing up a small reflection than finding another format, if only for the expedience of completing the course content quickly. So I expect you will only ever get a small minority actually elect to use this option.

Yes, this gives the students room to be creative and express themselves in the best way. Not everyone can be good at writing a written essay structure, hence the flexibility is a good thing.

Although I only wrote an essay style reflection, I am very glad that the option was given because some others have definitely benefited from having this choice.

Yes, it gave me the opportunity to learn a different format

Yes, it helps to improve creativity, which in higher education diminishes in science and maths based subjects. Creativity increases engagement and thus improves teaching.

I love this innovation.

---

personally I didn't affect me but i suppose it must have been a nice change of pace for the teachers not to just mark essays.

---

Yes - I used it as an opportunity to use Powtoons (which I had not used before)

---

yes

---

yes

---

Yes, it was a nice option. I am so rubbish with IT stuff that I didn't attempt anything unusual though

---

Yes, it opens the gate of learning varieties of skills such as (writing for blogs, communication behaviour for recording videos and brainstorming for the flowchart).

---

Yes, it exposes one to methods they probably have never tried before.

---

## Appendix B

You were told that you would receive 'like for like' feedback for your summative reflection. What were your thoughts on this?

I do not have an opinion on this.

I think written feedback is often the clearest.

This has not happened.

Very helpful.

An interesting idea, which should certainly help motivate people to try the alternate submission methods for the reflection.

Very excited because it showed that the lecturers were read to accommodate everyone by giving 'like for like' feedback.

The feedback was clear and not as "empty" as I would have expected.

I had a bit of anxiety because I wasn't comfortable teaching my peers.

Very interesting to read the feedback, shows the lecturer has read everything you wrote and has understood the style you used.

it is a good comparison.

The feedback was very detailed and gave me a list of the areas I can improve on.

Yes - I received feedback also made using the Powtoons web software.

it was a nice touch, a bit of a novelty but one that encouraged a feeling of equality.

I thought that was a great idea.

---

I really wish I had the skills to submit something so i could have fun feedback. I am a bore

---

It shows the bright side of the reflection feedback and engagement for improving in reflection thoughts. Therefore, a better exploring of thoughts.

---

I agree with the feedback i got

---

## Appendix C

Assessment Criteria for critical reflection  You will be expected to:	Fail	Marginal pass	Pass
<i>Criterion A Address the agreed topic of the assignment and have a clear focus and structure so that there is logical development of your argument</i>	May be overly descriptive and/or fails to provide a reflective account of your micro teaching experiences. Might Lack a coherent structure and focus	Offers some reflections on the experiences of micro teaching. Reflections are not pulled together through a coherent argument.	Provides a clear overview of your teaching experience, highlighting what worked well and what did not.
<i>Criterion B Be situated in the context of relevant educational knowledge and debate and be accurately referenced</i>	Makes passing reference to higher education literature. Cited literature may be irrelevant and not integrated. References, where used, may not be presented in Harvard style.	Draws on <b>some literature</b> and good practice related to learning and teaching in higher education. Literature is not always well integrated, resulting in awkward, citation--heavy writing. Some inconsistencies in Harvard referencing style.	Draws on relevant literature and good practice examples related to learning and teaching in higher education. Sources are well integrated and consistently presented in Harvard style.



<p><i>Criterion D</i>  <i>Make sound connections between theory and practice</i></p>	<p>No attempt to connect what happened in the microteach and course materials and educational literature in higher education. The result may be overly abstract (too focused on theory) or overly individualised (unsubstantiated).</p>	<p>Some attempts made to link the experiences of microteach with relevant educational theory, debate and course materials. Some connections are superficial, tangential or convoluted.</p>	<p>Clear links are made between the educational theory and debate cited and microteach experience or any other teaching experience.</p>
<p><i>Criterion E</i>  <i>Show independence of thought, originality, and where appropriate, the ability to formulate innovative proposals</i></p>	<p>Written in a detached and impersonal style. Suggestions and future development are missing.</p>	<p>Awkwardly written (clumsy and ungrammatical, with little individual style or overly academic). Areas of development identified but are only loosely linked to the reflection.</p>	<p>Written in the first person in a clear, thoughtful and questioning style. Areas of development are clear and flow from the evidence (from literature and practice) cited</p>

## Appendix D

### Assessment guidance

Summative assessment 2 – Critical reflection on your micro teaching  
(500 words+/- 10%)

This assessment requires a reflection on your experience of micro teach during week 4 of the course. The aim of this assessment is for you to reflect critically on your experience of microteaching in order to improve your own teaching skills for your future teaching responsibilities. You should identify what worked well and what worked less well and reflect on what this suggests or illustrates about teaching and learning. You should end your assignment with recommendations and future development that will enhance your teaching. You should draw on higher education literature and materials covered in the course to support your reflection. You need to be analytical rather than descriptive; your assignment is not to give account of what happened - you have only 500 words and should only include the minimum of descriptive materials which is necessary to support your reflection.

You have the option of submitting this assignment in a variety of modes. Please select from one of the following:

- \* A blog post - write your critical reflection as if it were a blog post commenting on your experience and submit this to Turnitin
- \* An annotated mind map - draw/create a mind map focusing on key aspects of your microteach and write notes around these branches coming of the mind map which shows your critical reflection upon these different aspects. Submit this to Turnitin.
- \* Video - An audio recording where you talk through a set of slides in which you critically reflect upon your microteach. Or you may wish to record yourself discussing your microteach (talking head video). For recorded submissions, please upload your video to youtube and copy/paste the link into a document which you should then upload/submit to Turnitin.
- \* Animation - Create an animated video that discusses critically your microteach experience (e.g. using a tool like Powtoon). Please paste the web link into a word document which you should then submit through Turnitin.

If there is another mode of submission you are interested in, please liaise with [the programme leader] before submitting. Thank you.

Questions to help guide your reflection:

- Do you think you planned the session well? Did you use a lesson plan? Was it useful?
- What went well and what didn't go well? (include your own thoughts as well as feedback received) Why? What did you learn from the session about teaching? What did you learn about yourself *as a teacher*?

- How did you assess? i.e. How did you judge whether the 'students' had learned anything?
- How far does your experience match what the educational scholarship or theoretical ideas you have encountered on the course say about teaching and learning?
- And how would you implement/transfer these suggestions in your future teaching?
- What do you feel require further development and how you would go about addressing this?

**Appendix E**  
**Revised assessment criteria**

Criteria	PASS	FAIL
A: Structure and focus	There is a clear focus on the individual's microteach activity throughout the submission. There is a clear flow from start to finish, ending with a summary of learning gained and action points for future improvement.	There is no clear focus on the microteach activity. The reflection focuses on the task in general rather than on the individual reflection.
B: Evaluation	The reflection engages with what worked well in the microteach activity and what could be improved in future. The writing is critically evaluative, questioning the approach taken, the topic chosen, the assessment, and feedback received.	The reflection is descriptive, focusing only on what happened and not on how? Or why? Brief overview of the feedback received without detailed consideration of how teaching can be improved going forward.
C: Engagement with scholarship covered in the course	The reflection makes reference to and engages with scholarship covered on the course.	The reflection makes no reference to suitable literature.
D: Referencing	The submission appropriately cites scholarship referred to both in in-text form and in the bibliography in a suitable and consistent format.	Unclear and inconsistent referencing. Or no referencing at all.