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EAT Framework Overview

Enhancing assessment feedback practice in higher education: The EAT Framework

“
To maximise the potential of pedagogical innovations, assessment is the lynchpin as it must keep pace with what disciplinary knowledge is seen as valuable and relevant within HE and wider contexts and needs to accurately measure meaningful learning. Pedagogies aimed at developing deeper approaches to learning are most successful when assessment practice is aligned to capture and reward a shared understanding of what constitutes ‘deep’ within a discipline. (Evans et al., 2015, p. 64).
”

Evans et al., 2015, p. 64
Underpinning Principles of the EAT Framework

Equity – Agency – Transparency

There is a substantial body of research on developing assessment feedback practice in higher education (Evans, 2013). See Appendices A1: Guidance on Assessment Feedback Design, and A2: Effective Assessment Feedback Principles.

A key issue is how we can effectively use this information to enhance assessment feedback practice at all levels within an institution mindful of the need for high quality research-informed pedagogy, and the importance of sustainability and manageability agendas from student and staff perspectives.

EAT (Evans, 2016) can help to achieve this. EAT demonstrates a research-informed, integrated, and holistic approach to assessment. It has evolved from extensive research on assessment feedback (Evans, 2013) and use in practice within higher education institutions (HEIs) (e.g., the Researching Assessment Practices group at the University of Southampton).

In sum, EAT has synthesized research from over 40,000 studies, and evidence-based institutional practices.

EAT (Evans, 2016) is underpinned by a Personal Learning Styles Pedagogy approach (PLSP) (Waring & Evans, 2015). At the heart of EAT is the importance of the following:

(a) Attending to student and lecturer beliefs about assessment including feedback;

(b) Ensuring the use of appropriate research informed tools and a holistic approach to assessment;

(c) Sensitivity to learner context – the importance of learner agency;

(d) The importance of adaptive learning environments that support all learners to become more self-regulatory in their approaches to learning;

(e) Supporting learner autonomy and informed choices in learning.

EAT is also informed by the RADAR dimensions model (Education Quality Enhancement team, University of Exeter); the Viewpoints project, (Ulster, 2008–2012); Quality Assurance Frameworks (e.g., QAA Code, UK; and the Advance HE framework for transforming assessment in higher education).

Theoretically, EAT integrates cognitivist, socio-critical, and socio-cultural perspectives and draws on systematic analyses of the research literature involving the interrogation of over 56,000 sources, and 5000 articles in detail.

Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education

full download free from: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3102/0034654312474350
The Personal Learning Styles Pedagogy

A. Exploration of student and teacher beliefs/modelling and support (importance of learners’ previous knowledge, beliefs, learning histories, identity)

B. Careful selection and application of styles (emphasis on learning how to learn – development of metacognitive and self-regulatory skills and knowledge)

C. Optimising conditions for learning (sensitivity to context – situational demands; promoting access; developing learner flexibility)

D. Design of learning environments (using multiple representations of concepts and information; aligned and authentic assessment; explicit designs; network facilitation)

E. Supporting learner autonomy (emphasis on developing student voice, negotiation and sharing of meanings; issues of power addressed)

Figure 1: Theoretical underpinnings of EAT (Waring & Evans, p. 55)
Overview

EAT (Evans, 2016) includes three core dimensions of practice:

- Assessment Literacy
- Assessment Feedback
- Assessment Design

EAT by drawing on the PLSP (Waring & Evans, 2015), stresses the importance of agency, collaboration, and sensitivity to the needs of the context (discipline; programme etc.) to support the development of strong student-lecturer partnerships in order to build student self-regulatory capacity in assessment feedback. A key consideration as part of this agenda is ownership:

---

How students come to co-own their programmes with lecturers and see themselves as active contributors to the assessment feedback process rather than seeing assessment as something that is done to them.

---

While EAT was not designed as a psychometric tool, the factor structure of it suggests loading on three key factors to include engagement, self-regulation, and assessment literacy. Individual differences are implicated in the ways in which individuals manage their learning using similar and different combinations of strategies and approaches to manage assessment. The EAT Framework highlights the importance of seeing how all elements of curriculum design work together to impact the efficacy of feedback. From a semiotics perspective (Peirce, n.d) EAT is a symbol or a ‘SIGN’ of integrated assessment (the OBJECT); of fundamental importance is how colleagues and students make sense of it (we are the INTERPRETANTS).
Figure 2: Key constructs underpinning EAT

Assessment Design Key Considerations

- Individual Learning Differences
- Self-regulation
- Design
- Agentic Engagement

Note: PLSP and assessment link Evans, 2015: https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/personal-learning-styles-pedagogy
**Figure 3: EAT Reflecting Integrated Assessment from a Semiotics Perspective**

**Interpretant/Signified**
The sense made of the sign
What the sign means to the individual

**Representamen/Signifier/SIGN**
The symbol – the form of the sign

**Referent/Object**
What the sign stands for or represents

**Importance of considering assessment literacy, feedback and design as part of an integrated whole – and from an inclusive and self-regulatory perspective**
Why the need for EAT?
The literature is rich in studies proclaiming a new paradigm of student engagement with assessment, and this has been in motion for at least thirty years. Translation of core ideas around engagement, self-regulation and student partnership in practice have been much slower to take hold in practice given the constraints of assessment cultures at all levels of inquiry, and the lack of integration of cognitive and educational psychology, neuroscientific perspectives and disciplinary requirements. The framework critically synthesises a very broad-based literature base, and attendant theories and explores pragmatic ways of addressing assessment in practice.

To enhance assessment feedback practice it is important to look at the interconnected nature of all three core dimensions of practice (i.e., assessment literacy, assessment feedback, and assessment design). It is, however, also possible to focus on any specific areas of assessment feedback that you have identified as relative weaknesses/priorities for development, acknowledging the fact that activity and development in one area will impact on other areas of EAT.

Scale of Inquiry
EAT can be used to explore assessment feedback practice at a variety of levels in order to identify assessment priorities (individual; discipline; faculty; university) (See EAT Diagrams Appendices B (educator) lecturer/teacher and C (student versions). EAT acknowledges the nested nature of pedagogy in that assessment practice is influenced by policy operating at various levels within and beyond higher education institutions (HEIs), and that individuals can also influence higher education and national policy using research-informed approaches through an evidence-informed approach.
EAT (Evans, 2016) is fundamentally about promoting self-regulatory practice in assessment, and asks the key question: ‘What does student engagement in assessment and feedback look like?’ To address this question, there is a student and lecturer version of EAT framed from each of their perspectives. The student version explores how students can be active co-owners of the assessment feedback process drawing on Evans (2015a) identification of ‘savvy feedback seekers’ who shared the following characteristics:

(a) focus on meaning making;
(b) self-management skills;
(c) perspective;
(d) noticing;
(e) resilience;
(f) managing personal response to feedback;
(g) pro-active feedback-seeking behaviour;
(h) adaptability, and
(i) forward thinking.

Appendix C enables students to self-assess how they are attending to each of the areas highlighted in EAT as part of trying to understand and develop their own role(s) in assessment feedback practice.

Central to the EAT Framework is consideration of beliefs and values underpinning assessment practices and how shared understanding of these is developed. The EAT Framework looks at Principles at three levels:

- Overarching Principles Underpinning Practice (see Appendix G2)
- Principles applied to Quality Assurance of Assessment and Feedback (Appendix G3)
- Implementation of Assessment Feedback Principles on the ground (Appendix A)

A concern with how we evaluate the quality of what we doing in a dynamic way. What evidence can we draw on at the micro level to explore the process and not just the outcomes of assessment feedback practices? Is the time we are spending on a specific assessment activity justified?

**Principles Underpinning Practice: Integrated Approach**

- Shared beliefs and values
- Student-staff partnership
- Inclusive
- Sensitive to context
- Holistic
- Integrative
- Agentic
- Engagement in meaningful learning experiences – relevant
- Sustainable

**Research-informed**

**Figure 4: Underpinning EAT Principles**
It means tacking the Biesta (2010) question head on – measuring what we value rather than valuing what is easy to measure. It means resisting gaming metrics to instead focus on meaningful learning. The Moore et al. (2015) framework for managing complex interventions provides a useful steer in considering:

- Fidelity of assessment approaches – how true they are to intended plans,
- Dose (how much is needed) to effect positive change,
- Significance (the scale of the difference made and for whom,
- Its reach – has it been successful with the target population.
- In considering scaleability, we also need to consider how embedded ideas have become within institutional structures and processes, their sustainability and transferability within and across contexts.

**Inclusivity**

We need to constantly explore whether any learner is being excluded from assessment (a critical pedagogy) and ensure that all learners have access to learning environments drawing on a universal design perspective. Ensuring that our practice provides all students and staff with equal access to learning in respecting diversity, enabling participation, working with students and staff to remove barriers, cognisant of individual learning differences.

**Self-regulatory**

How are we supporting learners to manage their own learning, and what does self-regulation mean? The Eldorado of assessment is for learners to be able to accurately measure the quality of their work for themselves; this requires attending to cognitive, metacognitive and emotional dimensions of learning. It also requires understanding of how individuals can be supported to maximise the affordances from an environment and to understand that self-regulation does not mean self-reliance.

**Student-staff partnership**

How do students and staff perceive their roles in assessment feedback? What tensions may exist? Are goals openly discussed and role boundaries agreed and made explicit?

**Shared beliefs and values**

Can you articulate clear principles underpinning your practice? Is there open discussion, and development of principles that all stakeholders can buy into?

**Promoting student and staff agency**

This is about ownership and supporting this from individual and organisational perspectives. How can we ensure that assessment policies do not straitjacket assessment practices?
Sensitive to context
This includes factors pertaining to the individual and how the assessment environment operates. How do we ensure sensitivity to how learners experience assessment and support individuals to manage themselves in context (to notice cues to support learning; engage in networks to support learning; the inferences and meanings of disciplinary cultures). This also requires acknowledgement understanding that of the fact that individuals’ perceptions of an assessment environment are varied, they are context related, and subject to change.

Engagement in meaningful learning experiences
How are we supporting students to engage deeply in their learning through careful consideration of the key learning attributes we are supporting students in developing.

How are such attributes best tested to enable students to be able to show their depth of understanding? Are the assessment tasks we set relevant and authentic. (See section: on Meaningful Practice Considerations).

Holistic
Involves consideration of the whole experience of the learner within a programme and beyond the discipline. To achieve this we need to be sensitive to individual and contextual variables impacting learning.

Sustainable
From a pedagogical perspective this is about supporting learners through their development of self-regulation capacity to manage their learning throughout their lives; accurate self-assessment is central to this. It is also about manageability and best use of resource. From a personal perspective, it is also about deliberate practice; being discriminatory in when and where to invest efforts.

Critical approach
Is about considering the impact of assessment and feedback practices on students and colleagues, and our ability to engage in ongoing development and critical evaluation of our own practice and that of others.

Integrative
Integrated assessment means consideration of the relationship of all elements of assessment. It also highlights the importance of an approach where the aim is to support students in being ‘able to make connections across learning experiences and achieve learning at the highest cognitive level’ (Durrant & Hartman, 2014, p.1).
Dimensions of Practice: Key considerations

Each of EAT’s three core dimensions of practice have four sub-dimensions; making 12 sub-dimensions in practice. Each of these twelve sub-dimensions have been presented in the form of a decision-making card which identifies overarching questions to be considered when developing assessment feedback practice as part of EAT.

The questions/suggestions are by no means exhaustive but they provide a guide as to some of the key aspects that need to be considered when implementing developments in assessment and feedback practices (See Appendix E: Decision-Making Cards for each of the 12 sub-dimensions of EAT).
Assessment Literacy (AL)

In order for learners to be able to fully engage in their learning in higher education, they need to have a good understanding of the requirements of assessment. These requirements need to be clear to both students and lecturers. Such understanding is helped if there are clear principles underpinning assessment practice that are shared and owned by all. Some have argued that such an emphasis on assessment literacy can lead to ‘criteria compliance’, Torrance, 2007, 2012), however, without access to the language and rules of assessment much time is wasted by students and lecturers on lower level concerns rather than on what really matters in learning. Engaging students with assessment criteria by involving them in: assessing each other’s work, refining criteria to align with requirements of a specific assessment task, and supporting programme level development of assessment criteria are all helpful activities in enabling students to get a deeper understanding of the requirements of assessment.

Key questions include:

- How are learners encouraged to articulate their beliefs, understandings, opinions, and motives in assessment feedback? (see Clark, 2012)
- How are we providing learners with opportunities to be able to calibrate standards for themselves?

AL 1 Clarify what constitutes good

Building on the work of Ramaprasad (1989) and Sadler (1989) about the role of feedback in bridging the gap between a student’s current and ideal level of performance, an individual needs to have a clear understanding of what good is, and the different ways of achieving good.

Key questions include:

- Do module/programme teams have a shared understanding of what constitutes ‘good’ and how you achieve this shared understanding?
- How do we bridge student and lecturer learning goals?

AL 2 Clarify how assessment elements fit together

It is important that students are able to self-manage the requirements of assessment and part of this is being clear about how the overall assessment design fits together. It is essential for students to map what they think the assessment design is, and to agree, confirm, and revisit how all elements of assessment fit together with the support of lecturers at regular intervals. It is highly probable that individuals (students and lecturers) will perceive assessment and feedback guidance and design in different ways.
A key question is how is a shared understanding of how all aspects of assessment fit together achieved? Time devoted to this at the start of a programme is invaluable.

An agreed blueprint of key assessment tasks, progression points, and feedback mechanisms needs to be shared and owned by student and lecturer teams.

We also need to consider the programme as a whole and what the entirety of the learning journey looks like, and also consider the extent to which the pattern of assessment supports and also may constrain learning and teaching.

**AL 3  Clarify student and staff entitlement**

In supporting students to self-manage their assessment journeys it is important to make it clear what support is available and when. What are the boundaries regarding support and what is the student role in this process? Feedback should be seen as a highly valuable and rationed resource, and students should be supported to make best use of the opportunities available to them; this requires careful preparation and management of timelines and professional protocols in order to get the best out of feedback.

The student role in supporting the learning process as active feedback givers as well as receivers of feedback should be stressed. Module and programme leads need to agree and clarify with students from the outset what student engagement in assessment involves and what the protocols are.

**AL 4  Clarify the requirements of the discipline**

To support student retention and successful learning outcomes, students need to be able to identify with, and meet the requirements of their specific disciplines (Bluic et al., 2011); they need to feel part of the disciplinary community. It is important for teams to agree and clarify with students what the core concepts and threshold concepts (those that may prove difficult) within a discipline are, and what are the most appropriate strategies to support their understanding of these difficult concepts, and to also assess them. The need to define what constitutes a ‘deep approach’ within the discipline is of paramount importance along with approaches to induct students into the discipline, and to clarify with students what the signature pedagogy of the discipline is.
Assessment Feedback (AF)

Assessment feedback comprises ‘all feedback exchanges generated within assessment design, occurring within and beyond the immediate learning context, being overt or covert (actively and/or passively sought and/or received) and, importantly, drawing from a range of sources’ (Evans, 2013, p. 71).

The emphasis of feedback should be on supporting learners to drive feedback for themselves. To address ‘the feedback gap’ it is important to get students to clarify their understandings of feedback and for them to ascertain where the problem lies (e.g., lack of knowledge; lack of preparation; misunderstanding of the process and/or requirements) (See Sadler, 2010).

When we receive feedback we often interpret it at the personal level rather than at the task level (see Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). In considering the emotions of feedback, allowing sufficient time between students receiving results and feedback on work, and follow up discussions regarding the next steps in developing work is very important in order to enable students to fully process the feedback given, and to be ready to take advice on how to proceed.

Engaging students to lead on feedback should be a priority; this requires students to do the necessary preparatory work so that they can make the most of feedback opportunities (e.g., encouraging students to pitch a proposal for an assignment; to ask specific questions as part of their formative work; to take the lead in tutorials and seminars regarding what they would like feedback on). In order for students to develop and maintain motivation they need to believe that their efforts will lead to success. A key question is how are learning environments supporting students’ perceptions of self-efficacy? This is an important ingredient in the development of students’ self-management skills.

In addressing the four assessment feedback sub-dimensions of EAT, the role of individual differences is important. Students’ understanding of feedback and their capacity to act on it depends on their beliefs, motives, and established schema; feedback needs to tackle these areas early on to ensure students’ psychological development is synchronised with other aspects of their self-regulatory development, and so that appropriate addition and removal of scaffolding can be applied.

Feedback needs to have a dual function in meeting students’ immediate assessment needs and in gesturing to the knowledge skills and dispositions they require beyond the module/ programme as part of lifelong learning (see Boud, 2000; Hounsell, 2007).
Assessment Feedback (AF) continued

The Feedback Conundrum
Feedback cannot be discussed in isolation from assessment design as it is assessment design that is key to managing the efficacy of feedback in context. A central question is: How do we maximise feedback exchanges for staff and students acknowledging that lecturer feedback is but one element of the feedback process? Mapping of the assessment design is needed to make clear what assessment feedback opportunities there are, and who is leading on them student and/or lecturer.

In facilitating feedback exchange emphasis must be on how assessment is designed to maximise opportunities for students to come to understand requirements for themselves without being dependent on external feedback in order to be able to accurately judge the quality of their own learning (Boud & Molloy, 2013).

“…The focus needs to shift away from the narrow issue of how feedback can be improved and communicated, and towards the wider issue of how assessment (rather than feedback) can enhance student learning... any assumption that feedback must remain the primary assessment related tool inhibits opening up the agenda.

Sadler, 2013, p. 56

Student Assessment Sat Navs: As architects of assessment, how do lecturers create learning environments that give students maximum access, but importantly, support students to manage their own learning?

This definition places emphasis on how assessment is designed to maximise opportunities for learning. Consideration of how students can be co-opted into supporting the development of such opportunities, so as to maximise their learning still requires a substantial shift in thinking.
Assessment Feedback (AF) continued

AF 1 Provide accessible feedback
Keeping assessment focused with an emphasis on how to improve is important (e.g., What was good? What let you down? How can you improve?). Agreeing key principles underpinning assessment feedback and consistency in the giving of feedback are essential (Evans, 2013 – see Appendix A2). Of key importance is considering what the best method is to give feedback in relation to the nature of the task. More adapted forms of feedback are made possible through use of artificial intelligence to provide feedback and resources matched to the learner level and to provide invaluable information on the learning process.

AF 2 Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback
In order to support students to help themselves, early assessment of needs is important. Emphasis should be on providing early opportunities for students to receive feedback on key areas of practice while there is sufficient time for them to use such feedback to enhance their work; assessment design must take account of this. Furthermore, formative feedback must directly link into the requirements of summative assessment as part of an aligned approach. Repeated testing has been shown to have significant impact on student learning outcomes (Heeneman et al., 2017; McCann, 2017; Sennhenn-Kirchner, et al., 2017).

AF 3 Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement
Peer engagement activities are important in promoting student self-regulatory skills. The term ‘peer engagement’ focuses on student collaboration, confidence, and autonomy (Cowan & Creme, 2005) and predominantly comprises formative support as opposed to summative peer assessment.

Clarifying student responsibility within peer engagement models is important; this requires clarity regarding student expectations with peer engagement designs, and student access to resources to ensure full preparation for meaningful rather than meaningless dialogue. A key question is how are you mobilising students to effectively contribute to the design and delivery of programmes as genuine partners?

AF 4 Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills to include self-monitoring/self-assessment and critical reflection skills.
For feedback to be sustainable, students need to be supported in their self-monitoring (in the moment) and self-assessment (aggregation of information from multiple past events of their work), independently of the lecturer/teacher (cf. Carless et al., 2011). (For clarification on self-monitoring and self-assessment see Eva and Regehr (2011)).
Assessment Feedback (AF) continued

Curriculum design is important in ‘creating opportunities for students to develop the capabilities to operate as judges of their own learning’ (Boud & Molloy, 2013, p. 698). A key question is how are we engaging students in co-judging their work with lecturers?

The importance of developing students’ self-monitoring skills cuts across all 12 sub-dimensions of EAT. Self-assessment is fundamental to the self-regulation of learning (see Archer, 2010). Opportunities for students to assess their own work and that of others are important in enabling students to develop self-assessment capacity. Supporting students to find their own resources and networks to support their understanding, the use of modelling of approaches, and use of tools to explicitly demonstrate different ways of thinking are all important in supporting students in this endeavour. In order for students to critically reflect on their learning it is important to consider how their reflexivity can be developed through support structures (e.g., student support groups; direction to new sources of information; ensuring sufficient challenge so that students have to re/consider their approaches to learning).

“[It is possible to identify key elements of effective peer feedback designs... These elements include the importance of setting an appropriate climate for the development of peer feedback practice, acknowledging the role of the student in the process, ensuring authentic use of peer feedback, the need for explicit guidance on what constitutes effective feedback practice, encouraging students to critically reflect on their own giving and receiving of feedback, and addressing ongoing student and lecturer training needs. A key question for educators is how to maximise the affordances of peer feedback designs while at the same time minimise potential constraints for learners](Evans, 2015b, pp.121–122).
Assessment Feedback (AF) continued


In considering feedback dynamics and building on the Feedback Landscape (Evans, 2013), there are many variables impacting how students make sense of feedback, and we need to have a better understanding of those key variables if we are to maximise the effectiveness of assessment feedback (Evans & Waring, 2019).

These include:
In Figure 4, the factors implicated in impacting students’ engagement with assessment feedback and student learning outcomes are highlighted integrating individual and contextual variables. The importance of beliefs and values in impacting assessment feedback behaviours is central to the EAT Framework as part of examining the cognitive, metacognitive and emotional factors and predispositions impacting how a learner engages with a learning environment.

Goals play a central part in impacting behaviours, and supporting students in developing appropriate goals and monitoring activities to check activities are aligned with goals is essential.

On the environmental side of the equation, it is known that self-regulation strategies of learners can be enhanced through appropriate training and support which also includes removal of scaffolding, and that development of such skills can negate the influence of individual difference factors on achievement. One of the biggest threats to self-regulation is the over-scaffolding of learning which HE environments need to be mindful of when planning transitional learning support activities for students. Ensuring that curriculum design fully supports the development of self-regulatory capacity requires time for teams to create programme blueprints of the core knowledge and skills’ development that are required by students, and the best ways to support them in developing the metacognitive competencies required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Constructs</th>
<th>Individual differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Social class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for cognition/metacognition</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Abilities and Dispositions</td>
<td>social, cultural and political capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working memory capacity/cognitive load</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristics – schema</td>
<td>Cognitive styles &amp; meta-style flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Abilities</td>
<td>Metacognitive/cognitive/affective abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agentic engagement: mobilisation and use of environmental resources – co-shared regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about Ability</td>
<td>General/academic self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belief that human attributes are malleable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about Learning</td>
<td>Belief that knowledge can be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belief that assessment feedback can support improvements in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Valuing a task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future time perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of future selves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum grade goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning and performance goal orientations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive outcome expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptions of learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning dispositions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5:** Evans, C. & Waring, M. (forthcoming). “Enhancing Students’ Assessment Feedback Skills within Higher Education.” Educational Psychology. New York: Oxford University Press.
Assessment Design (AD)

A holistic approach to assessment design is needed in order to address central issues such as: (i) the relevance of assessment; (ii) volume of assessment; (iii) inclusive nature of assessment; and (iv) collaborative design of assessment to ensure shared understandings, sustainability, and manageability. A fundamental question is how can technology support the operationalisation of EAT and the development of each of the 12 sub-dimensions?

A programme level assessment approach is useful to fully consider the learning journey of the student and to critically review what we need to assess and how. In implementing innovative assessment design we need to consider the evidence-base for using specific approaches especially if we are expecting colleagues and students to 'buy in' to an approach; what is the evidence base to support such change? A critical pedagogies approach is essential in ensuring inclusive practices through exploring who may be advantaged and disadvantaged by changes to assessment and feedback. A key question is how does curriculum design support the development of self-efficacious self-regulatory learners?

‘Bang for buck’ is important for pedagogical and viability reasons. It is useful to consider what changes in assessment practice make the biggest difference in relation to the impact on student learning outcomes in the immediate and longer terms, and the level of investment required to effect such changes.

It is possible to develop positive assessment habits by looking for small improvements in each of the 12 sub-dimensions of EAT building on Brailsford’s notion of marginal gains used so effectively by the UK Cycling team – Team GB in the 2012 Olympics. Put simply by Brailsford it is about the: ‘aggregation of marginal gains... The one percent margin for improvement in everything that you do.’ The argument is that the sum of small incremental improvements can lead to significant improvements when they are all added together. In Evans’ et al. (2015) it was also noted that some relatively small changes in assessment practice had the potential for significant changes to both students’ perceptions of the learning environment and to learning outcomes.
Assessment Design (AD) continued

AD1 Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures; QA literacy
To innovate with confidence we need a good understanding of quality assurance, hence the emphasis in the framework on developing lecturer QA literacy. QA literacy gives us the freedom to implement new approaches to assessment in an informed and responsible way and to cut through prevailing misconceptions and hurdles regarding what we can and cannot do. Within modules and programmes an understanding of QA literacy is not the preserve of one person; it is the responsibility of the whole team in developing collaborative assessment designs. As part of this: to what extent is training provided for lecturer teams to support calibration of standards (Sadler, 2017)? Furthermore, to what extent are students and lecturers clear about marking and moderation processes?

“We need to... bridge the classroom with life outside of it. The connection between integrative thinking, or experiential learning, and the social network, or participatory culture, is no longer peripheral to our enterprise but is the nexus that should guide and reshape our curricula in the current disruptive moment in higher education learning.”

Das, 2012, p. 32
Assessment Design (AD) continued

AD 2  Promote meaningful and focused assessment

The importance of engaging students in 'real assessment' working on real problems that are relevant to their future careers and in real contexts is important (Bedard et al., 2012; Crowl et al., 2013; Erekson, 2011; Patterson et al., 2011). Paraphrasing Friedlander et al. (2011, pp. 416–417) in their discussion of medical students priorities, it is important for us to carefully consider the rationale underpinning what we asking students to do, and its relevance to their current and future needs:

Manageability of assessment for lecturers and students is also a key concern and one that can be addressed through a programme level approach to the review and rationalisation of learning outcomes and patterns of assessment to ensure the assessment design works as a coherent whole and that colleagues understand where their modules fit within the programme. Bass (2012) highlights the importance of team-based design of learning environments to ensure shared understandings, collaboration, and integration of ideas across modules.

[students] are relational agents, with tremendous demands on their time and attention, and must make choices about where to focus their energies and attention most efficiently... at both conscious and unconscious levels, their brains are engaging in a continuous process of triaging for the allocation of finite neural resources.
Assessment Design (AD) continued

AD 3  Ensure access and equal opportunities
A key aim of assessment design is to ensure that no learner is disadvantaged by the nature and pattern of assessment. A totally unlimited choice available to students within assessment design may penalise those whose self-regulatory abilities are not as well developed. EAT emphasises the importance of negotiated and managed choice with students working with lecturers to agree options.

Ensuring early and full provision of resources is one way to promote access to learning. Supporting students to develop strong resource networks (e.g., appropriate sources of information; relevant research/discipline groups; peer groups etc.) are additional ways to address the impoverished networks that some students have which limit their access to learning.

The concept of universal design is applicable to the design of assessment and feedback in promoting adaptive assessment designs that enable access for all learners rather than focusing on adapted designs to suit the needs of specific groups (Evans et al., 2015; Waring & Evans, 2015). Computer technologies and AI already offer considerable opportunities to support adapted designs but require strong pedagogy underpinning them and data analysis skills to pull out the complex relationships between variables.
Assessment Design (AD) continued

AD 4 Ensure ongoing evaluation to support the development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice

Feedback needs to be organic to feed into enhancements in learning and teaching. Students and lecturers need to work in partnership to inform teaching on an iterative basis. Feedback mechanisms need to be an integral part of curriculum design. Feedback should be part of the ongoing dialogue within taught sessions on what can and cannot be changed to enhance practice and why. It is about clear communication about why learning and teaching is designed and delivered in a particular way; this is definitely not about solely complying with student requests; it is about justifying the underpinning rationale for why the teaching design is as it is, and what is reasonable and not reasonable to change and why.

Feedback should not be overcomplicated; a ‘what was good’ and ‘what could be improved’ serves an important purpose in gaining immediate feedback. Students need guidance regarding ‘feedback capture’. More detailed feedback questionnaires also need to be aligned to what the assessment feedback priorities are in order to catch relevant and focused information where necessary.

A key issue is how feedback is shared among lecturers to promote the exchange of good practice for the benefit of the whole programme during the teaching cycle as well as after it as part of annual programme review.

In summary, EAT is an example of an integrative assessment framework that can support small-scale and large-scale assessment and feedback change. Key emphases include self-regulatory development; student and lecturer ownership and co-ownership of programmes; collaborative endeavour; all underpinned by an inclusive pedagogical approach (PLSP) with a critical pedagogic stance.
Using EAT in Practice

The Framework can be used with individuals (students and lecturers) and with teams.

- **As a diagnostic tool** to evaluate strengths and weaknesses at individual and team/organisational levels.
- **As a design tool** to hone in on the development of one area of practice e.g., feedback and consider what needs to happen in all 12 areas of practice.
- **As a predictive tool** to explore relationships between student engagement and outcomes.
- **As an evaluative tool** to evaluate the relative effectiveness of assessment feedback practices.
- **As a training tool** to support student and lecturer skills’ development.

For each of the 3 dimensions and 12 sub-dimensions of the EAT framework in total, it is possible to ask students to score their own contribution (1 = do very little to 5 = do as much as possible). It is then possible to identify each students’ own EAT footprint. The key question here is to why students choose to engage or not in assessment and feedback practices which includes a consideration of the extent to which a programme/module enables them to engage fully. A discussion of facilitators and barriers to engagement in assessment and feedback from institutional and personal perspectives is important in moving practice forward. Using the lecturer/student version it is also possible for lecturers to overlay their profiles within and between modules to account for areas of difference and to look at strengths and areas to develop. Students can also overlay their interpretation of the teaching within a module/programme with that of the lecturer’s to identify points of agreement and difference.
**Assessment Design**

**AD1**: Do I have a good understanding of HE assessment processes /and regulations

**AD2**: Meaningful work
Do I using the knowledge acquired across modules to inform my overall development? Am I adopting a deep approach in my work?

**AD3**: Making the best use of resources
Do I know how to access and make best use of resources? Am I developing networks to support my learning now and into employment?

**AD4**: Supporting the development of the course
Am I giving useful feedback on how to enhance assessment feedback practice? How am I owning the course?

**Assessment Literacy**

**AL1**: What constitutes good?
What am I aiming for? Do I know what good looks like? Do I know what to do to meet the assessment criteria and learning outcomes.

**AL2**: How assessment elements fit together
Have I mapped how the assessment works in/across modules, and how I am going to manage them all?

**AL3**: Student and staff entitlement
Do I know what: feedback looks like; support I am entitled to; my role in feedback is?

**AL4**: Am I clear about the requirements of the discipline?
Am I aware of the key concepts I need to know and the main ways of working and thinking in my discipline? Do I feel part of the discipline?

**Assessment Feedback**

**AF1**: Ensuring I know how to improve
Do I know how to improve my work from the feedback? If it is not clear, what am I doing about it?

**AF2**: Using formative feedback opportunities
Am I actively seeking out feedback opportunities and making full use of them?

**AF3**: Have I done the necessary preparation to participate fully in peer dialogue?
How do I support others in giving and receiving feedback?

**AF4**: Self-evaluation
Do I know how I am doing? Do I know what to do when I do not know? Am I managing my learning effectively?

---

*Figure 6: Using EAT Student Profiles*
Figure 7: Using EAT Lecturer Profiles

Assessment Design

AD1: Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures
QA literacy.

AD2: Promote meaningful and focused assessment
Fit for Purpose; Relevant Programme Level
Assessment; Collaborative Design; Manageable.

AD3: Ensure access and equal opportunities
Provision of Resources; Guidance; Network
Development; Choice.

AD4: Ensure ongoing evaluation to support the
development of sustainable assessment and
feedback practice

Assessment Feedback

AF1: Provide accessible feedback
Specific, and focused on how to improve.
Encourage students to clarify their interpretation
of the feedback.

AF2: Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback
The pattern and timing of assessment, and alignment of formative to summative assessment.

AF3: Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement

AF4: Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills
Self-monitoring, self-assessment and critical reflection.

Assessment Literacy

AL1: Clarify what constitutes good
Standard of work; recognition and application of good academic practice; student and lecturer beliefs.

AL2: Clarify how assessment elements fit together

AL3: Clarify student and staff entitlement
Student/Lecturer roles and principles underpinning the ‘What’, ‘When’, and ‘How’ of feedback.

AL4: Clarify the requirements of the discipline
Core and threshold concepts; deep approach.
Meaningful Assessment Practices

Key considerations in developing meaningful assessment practices are highlighted in EAT

- Agreeing Assessment Feedback
  Principles: (See Appendix A2)
  See Effective Assessment Design (see Appendices A1)
- Inclusive Assessment
- Self-regulation
- Student Partnership Approaches:
  How we design assessment feedback to encourage engagement (see Appendix F)
- Supporting Student Reflection on Practice

Characteristics of meaningful assessment practices
In emphasising meaningful assessment feedback practices the importance of students’ abilities to be able to use, apply, adapt and create new knowledge are accented. As noted by Sadler (2013), students need to be proficient in three key areas and have to be able to: have a good understanding of quality and identify it when they see it; judge the quality of their own work, their strengths and weaknesses; know what strategies to use to improve the quality of their work (Sadler, 1989).

Meaningful learning is much more than students being better users of lecturer feedback. It requires a holistic, co-ordinated and integrated approach that frames genuine paradigmatical shift. It is about students’ noticing and valuing the range of opportunities available both internal and external to themselves:

Generating feedback for themselves, understanding the role of inner feedback processes as part of monitoring and evaluation components of self-regulation (Nicol, Thomson, & Breslin, 2014; Sadler 2013), constructing meaning for themselves (which should reduce the need for external feedback); co-constructing knowledge involving genuine dialogue and not a one-way conversation.

It is, therefore, also about power and the conflicting roles of lecturers as facilitators and assessors. Sustainability, in emphasising the role of the student in the assessment process and the changing role for the lecturer in facilitating student agency in managing their own feedback are important. Ensuring best use of resource, and questioning what the learner and lecturer should be attending to most are also critical as part of an integrated approach. (See Appendix F for approaches to engaging students in assessment)
Vehicles to support students’ in constructing meanings for themselves include:

- Personalising and creating their own criteria for each piece of work (Taras, 2015).
- Being trained in using, triangulating and making sense of feedback to include the emotional dimension of feedback (Evans, 2013; Forsythe & Johnson, 2017).
- Reviewing work of varying quality to support student understanding of quality, and seeing quality can be achieved in different ways (Sadler, 2010, 2013).
- Acting as reviewers of others (Nicol, Thomson, & Breslin, 2014).
- Self-assessing and feeding back to others as part of summative assessment and evaluative processes (Boud, 2000; Boud et al. 2013; Carless, 2012; Deeley, 2014).
- Working with assessment to do the noticing, the thinking about repair and modification, and the generation of ways to improve' as defined by Sadler (2013, p. 57) as ‘knowing to’.
- Co-constructing habitus in working with lectures as part of signature pedagogies in generating dispositions to act and perceive in the discipline (Gray, 2013; Yu & Hu, 2017).
- Genuine collaborative partnership and discussion between student and lecturer and emphasis on students leading discussions (Feedback Landscape, Evans, 2013; Dialogic – Carless et al., 2011).
- Working as co-producers with the wider community in boundary-crossing, integrative, and socially networked experiences, as part of the pedagogy of the real (Garcia, 2014) that bridge HE experiences with life outside of it (Bass, 2012; Evans, 2013).
- Designing assessment with lecturers (Riley, 2017; Riley, McCabe, & Pirie, 2017).
- Teaching and researching with peers and lecturers (Scott, Moxham, & Rutherford, 2013; Evans et. al., 2017).
Realisation of Meaningful Assessment Approaches in Practice

At present much assessment aimed at being transformational falls short because of entrenched personal and collective beliefs which encourage adherence to an existing organisational paradigm (Harrison et al., 2017; Taras, 2015) despite claims of paradigm shift. If we want to transform assessment by promoting student ownership of it, we need to start by addressing student and lecturer beliefs and values which impact individual and organisational behaviours.

To facilitate effective learning communities, organisational and individual beliefs need to be aligned. Beliefs and conceptions about the nature of knowledge frame how learning experiences are designed and how they are interpreted leading to entrenchment on both sides. To support sustainable assessment practices, that build students’ self-regulatory capacity and particularly their self-evaluative judgement, much more attention needs to be focused on the development of shared principles underpinning assessment design (Evans, EAT, 2016). Seeking congruence in student and lecturer beliefs and values has to be a priority if students and lecturers are to work in partnership in developing valuable and manageable assessment opportunities.

In investing in change we have to be able to do more than hope that colleagues and students will be receptive; the rationale underpinning the assessment design needs to be transparent to all, and alternative approaches and ways of being modelled and supported. In engaging students actively in assessment, we need to be very careful that we do not fall into the trap of engaging students and lecturers in ‘waste of time’ activities. We need a clear understanding of what facilitates students’ and lecturers ‘knowing to’, and what is a distraction from this core purpose.

Central to this debate is an awareness of individual differences, and an understanding that learners will use strategies in different ways. Individual and situational constructs need to be factored into assessment design as solutions need to be found at the local level and supported by institutional clarity and openness to explore and evaluate assessment at all levels within an organisation as to what is working well and for whom.

Table 1 identifies examples of strategies that have been successful in reducing student differential learning outcomes through a focus on supporting students’ self-regulatory capacity through assessment design (Evans et al., 2019).
## Table 1 Effectiveness Factors in using EAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAT Principles</th>
<th>EAT areas</th>
<th>Elements evident in successful case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. shared beliefs and values between academics and students | Literacy AL1 | ■ Involvement of students in the development of assessment criteria  
■ Explanation of the rationale underpinning the assessment criteria and facilitating students to work with these to refine and develop at the level of the task  
■ Lecturers going beyond looking at transparency to questioning the relevance and validity of the criteria and tasks themselves (AD2) |
| b. student-academic partnership | Literacy AL2 | ■ Making clear how all elements of a programme fitted together and how the assessments were linked for staff and students  
■ Getting students to walk through the programme and to map their own journeys and potential crunch points  
■ Team development of programmes (AD2) to critically examine the placement and nature of different assessments and how these map to learning outcomes |
| c. inclusivity from universal design perspectives | Literacy AL3 | ■ Being explicit about what partnership means and what entitlement is – how much support and when. In navigating the rules of engagement, what is black and white and what is grey  
■ Clarifying with students at point of entry what is expected from them in terms of their contribution to programme development, attendance, supporting other students etc |
| d. sensitivity to context | Literacy AL4 | ■ Clarifying what the core and threshold concepts are and agreeing these as a team  
■ Identifying any specific skills gaps in the transition from school to HEI at the discipline level  
■ Undertaking a skills and knowledge audit/base line testing at point of entry for students  
■ Agreeing a ‘common language’ for the discipline and making this accessible to students  
■ Focusing on relational dimensions in building a discipline-specific community with students |
| e. holistic – experience of the student learning journey in its entirety | | |
| f. integrative – interconnected | | |
| g. agentic in promoting student and academic ownership of assessment | | |
| h. meaningful learning experiences | | |
| i. sustainable | | |
| j. evidence-based | | |

*Table 1: Effectiveness Factors in using EAT (Evans et al., 2019. Maximising Student Success OfS project, p. 83–85)*
Table 1 Effectiveness Factors in using EAT continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAT Principles</th>
<th>EAT areas</th>
<th>Elements evident in successful case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. shared beliefs and values between academics and students</td>
<td>Feedback AF1</td>
<td>▪ Focusing feedback on what was good, what let you down and how to improve – rationalising feedback to focus on the most important points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. student-academic partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Staff and students working together to clarify what feedback is, how to seek, give and use it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. inclusivity from universal design perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Situating feedback where it can have most impact (AD2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. sensitivity to context</td>
<td>Agreement clear baselines for the quality of feedback, ensuring quality and moderating quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. holistic – experience of the student learning journey in its entirety</td>
<td>Feedback AF2</td>
<td>▪ Making sure students have many opportunities to test their understanding from point of entry into university – with students also leading on providing such opportunities (AD2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. integrative – interconnected</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ensuring that the formative feedback directly supported summative outputs (AD2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. agentic in promoting student and academic ownership of assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Supporting student reflection on feedback but with an emphasis on goal setting – on how feedback is used to move forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. meaningful learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. sustainable</td>
<td>Feedback AF3</td>
<td>▪ Providing training for students in how to give, use and seek feedback with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. evidence-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Making requirements for peer support explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ensuring team activities are authentic and support students to use the individual strengths of team members to maximise outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Reward based on getting all team members over the line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Making the tensions involved in team work explicit from the outset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Providing the mechanisms to support the building of team networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Flexibility in team membership and individual ownership of team efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Students engaged in identifying ‘crunch points’ for future cohorts and providing timely training for peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback AF4</td>
<td>▪ Student self-assessment built into all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Students engaged in summative marking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 continued: Effectiveness Factors in using EAT (Evans et al., 2019. Maximising Student Success OfS project, p. 83–85)
Table 1 Effectiveness Factors in using EAT continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAT Principles</th>
<th>EAT areas</th>
<th>Elements evident in successful case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. shared beliefs and values between academics and students</td>
<td>Design AD1</td>
<td>Training staff and students in assessment regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. student-academic partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td>Making marking and moderation procedures explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. inclusivity from universal design perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocating time in workload models to ensure teams are able to come together to discuss assessment processes and to calibrate judgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. sensitivity to context</td>
<td>Design AD2</td>
<td>Designing assessments that require students to engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. holistic – experience of the student learning journey in its entirety</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on inquiry based, project/product based learning requiring depth of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. integrative – interconnected</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on students as producers working in partnership with lecturers on real problems with a community focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. agentic in promoting student and academic ownership of assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students as mentors to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. meaningful learning experiences</td>
<td>Design AD3</td>
<td>Making how to access and use resources explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. sustainable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarifying what good resources look like and how to access them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. evidence-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting students to build their own networks of support beyond their current network base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engaging students in resource development and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of data to interrogate whether any students are disadvantaged by assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring the mode of assessment is the most appropriate to test understanding required by the learning outcome and being explicit on the range of ways in which meeting the requirements of the learning outcome can be achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusive Assessment Practices

Ensuring that our practice:

- Provides all students and staff with equal access to learning in respecting diversity, enabling participation, working with students and staff to remove barriers and is cognizant of individual learning needs; attends to reasonable adjustments (Equality Act, 2010).
- Clarifies the role of the student in the process from the outset and addresses the issue of relevance and ownership.
- Establishes with students their starting points and maps their journey through the progressive development of knowledge, skills, and understanding to meet the programme level outcomes.
- Ensures individual learning needs are met through a Universal Design stance – ensuring that the curriculum allows students to navigate the curriculum in different ways through attending to specifics of good design; it is not about designing assessment with a particular type of student in mind.
- Alerts us to whether any student is being inadvertently excluded through our on-going analysis of the impact of what we do. We need to constantly explore whether any learner is being excluded from assessment.
  - Are students’ starting points taken into consideration?
  - Are we aware of the needs of the different tribes making up our intake?
  - Nature of assessment – do all have equal access to content?
  - Is there sufficient variation in tasks across a programme to meet the requirements of different PLOs?
  - Is information clear, accessible, and explicit?
  - Is it clear to the student what good looks like?
  - Are alternative ways of ‘good’ demonstrated?
  - Does assessment allow a learner to demonstrate what they can do?
  - Is feedback given in sufficient time to allow a learner to use it?
Inclusive Assessment Practices continued

- Are students supported in how to use feedback?
- Are students guided in how to improve?
- Is scaffolded support put in place to support the learner journey and removed accordingly to promote student independence and not dependence in learning?
- Is the student given frequent opportunities to self-test their knowledge, understanding and skills?
- Where there is free choice, how are learners supported to make informed choices?
- Does the timing of assessment unfairly impact certain learners?
- Is information provided in good time to allow students to navigate the curriculum as they choose?
- What does reasonable adjustments mean in practice?
The link between students’ abilities to self-regulate their learning and successful learning outcomes is well-known (Bembenutty, While, & Vélez, 2015; Dent & Koenka, 2016; Panadero, 2017).

Self-regulation is used widely within the literature to mean the same and, or different things. It can be seen as a process whereby students set goals, devise strategies to achieve those goals, attend to learning through the use of cognitive, metacognitive and emotional management of learning which includes maintaining motivation, choosing appropriate strategies to master a task, ongoing reviewing and evaluation of performance to enhance achievement of goals.

“Students' strategies for learning and exam preparation, for effort regulation, and goal-setting demonstrate stronger relationships with achievement than their personalities or personal backgrounds.”

Schneider and Preckel, 2017, p. 595

Metacognition denotes an ability to understand one’s own learning processes, cognition an ability to utilise cognitive strategies to master a task, and emotional regulation, the ability to manage one’s emotions at all stages in completion of a learning task.

Assessment design should enable students to develop their self-regulatory abilities as an integral part of curriculum design

As highlighted in Table 2, there are high-level self-regulatory processes that are known to impact learning outcomes as highlighted by Dinsmore, 2017. Over-scaffolding of learning can work against the development of self-regulatory capacity. In projects used to support development of students’ self-regulatory abilities, too much scaffolding led to negative self-regulatory strategies such as minimum effort regulation, where for example, students become increasingly reliant on teacher input, and subsequently regulated their learning by realising that they need to do less to achieve goals (Evans et al., 2019). Dinsmore (2017), like Schneider and Preckel (2017) highlights the importance of students’ discriminatory use of strategies in terms of appropriate use of strategies and the quality of strategy use.
Self-Regulatory Assessment Practices continued

Key considerations to support self-regulatory capacity

■ Identifying and mapping high level skills required throughout a programme of study.
■ Awareness of potential skills gaps between school level learning and HE within the discipline.
■ Signposting at point of entry the key knowledge, understanding and skills students will need to be successful in their field of inquiry.
■ Modelling approaches to developing key skills.
■ Repeated practice and application of such skills in real life/approximations of practice conditions.
■ Training for staff and students in the development of self-regulatory skills.
Table 2 Self-regulatory skills implicated in assessment feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-regulatory behaviours in managing assessment and feedback</th>
<th>Specifics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Metacognitive strategy use:** knowing how, when, and where to deploy a strategy | - Quality: how well a strategy is executed  
- Conditional use: how appropriately a strategy is used |
| **Cognitive control** |  |
| **Task analysis:** accurate assessment of task and what you know and do not know | - Meta-memory: memory of what you know  
- Accuracy for recognising or knowing a task and predicting one’s knowledge |
| **Planning regulation of a task:** organisational and motivational skills in setting goals, understanding the necessary steps in the assessment process and developing an action plan to achieve these goals. | - Goal setting: grade goal (minimum level one wants to achieve); learning-oriented goals versus performance goals  
- Ability to set specific, manageable, and challenging mastery goals |
| **Contextual regulation:** ability to influence the environment to support learning | - Selective use: knowing when, why, and from whom to seek support – cue seeking; help-seeking  
- Quality of, and selective use of networks of support  
- Flexibility: boundary crossing – adaptability – ability to transfer and adapt ideas across contexts |
| **Situation awareness** |  |
| **Personal-interpersonal competence** |  |
| **Metacognitive monitoring** of cognitive, volitional (motivational and affective) states to support effort regulation and attention-focusing in pursuit of goals. | - Adaptive control: flexible use of self-regulation strategies  
- Absolute accuracy in relation to expected and actual performance  
- Relative accuracy: being able to discriminate between the differential learning for some materials versus others  
- Availability and accurate use of predictive cues to measure progress  
- Best use of time: choosing deliberately when and where to invest time and mental resources |
| Ability to rely on own internal processes to make progress against goals and adapt one’s plan as necessary. |  |
| To self-monitor in the moment, and to monitor overall plan of activity. |  |
| **Self-reflection:** ability to critically reflect on one’s own performance and also to be reflexive – to be able to see the situation from different perspectives – an ‘outward in glance’ – objective assessment of the situation. | - Self-evaluative capacity: ability to accurately estimate one’s performance bringing together information from a range of sources;  
- Accuracy in attributing the causes of success and/or failure |
Scaling up Assessment Feedback Practices

Using the EAT framework from programme lead/faculty/university perspectives highlights scaling-up considerations:

‘We must find ways to stimulate and scale change across institutions—as well as to sustain those changes—if we are to create models that serve the expanding needs of our learners...’

This leads to the core question of ‘...Where should we put strategic and sustainable efforts to improve uneven performance and variable outcomes.’ (Ward, 2013)

Integrating Assessment: Key Considerations Part 1

Clarity/Clear communication
Entitlement for staff and students
Coherence/Alignment
Consistency
Equity
Relevance
Sustainability
Measuring What We Value
Technology supporting assessment design
Shared understandings of standards

Transparency
Agency
Fit
Creativity
Universal Design
Agility
Manageability
Ownership
Symbiosis
Calibrated
Integrating Assessment: Key Considerations Part 1 continued

In supporting higher education assessment communities of practice, the importance of developing shared understandings of good practice based on research and practice evidence, and ensuring alignment of systems and processes to support such endeavours are essential at the institutional level. Drawing on European University Association Guidance (Evans (2019) in Bunesco & Evans, 2019, p. 7) an integrated approach at the institutional level requires:

- Conceptual awareness: An understanding of assessment as an integral part of dynamic curriculum design where all elements of assessment are interlinked. Good feedback requires consideration of assessment design and promotion of assessment literacy.

- Contextual awareness in relation to promoting graduate attributes that are attuned to fourth industrial age needs.

- Organisational awareness in supporting the development of effective aligned systems and processes that promote team ownership and development of assessment. Teams to include all stakeholders (students, teachers, technology support, information services, employers etc.)

- Individual differences awareness in being able to critically evaluate the impact of assessment on all learners throughout their learning journeys.

Table 3 can be used by those responsible for assessment at the institutional level to consider how well prepared a university is to support effective assessment feedback on the ground. A suggested scoring is provided:

1 = Has not been considered at all to
5 = Has been considered fully and operationalised.
Institutional Support for Assessment

Table 3 can be used by those responsible for assessment at the institutional level to consider how well prepared a university is to support effective assessment feedback on the ground.

A suggested scoring is provided:
1 = Has not been considered at all
5 = Has been considered fully and operationalised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Priorities</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreed purposes/principles/ethics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Assessment and feedback principles are agreed at institutional level and act as a baseline for all assessment feedback endeavours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 There is clear university-level guidance on assessment criteria, and this is translated to programme and module/course levels by discipline teams involving staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Student partnership in co-production of assessment is promoted (policy/teaching/marketing/feedback/moderation/research/leadership/enterprise).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment of systems and processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 University structures support an integrated university approach to assessment. There are designated assessment leads in each discipline and clear priorities established for enhancing assessment practices sensitive to context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 There is strong alignment between institutional assessment strategic priorities and enactment of assessment strategy at the local level but flexibility to allow fine-tuning to local contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Time is allocated within workload models for team planning of assessment design, marking and moderation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Transparency is promoted in all assessment processes (rationale behind assessment design and how marks are allocated and moderated, appeals managed etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Personal academic tutoring assessment support is aligned with course demands and identified cohort needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Transitions management ensures mapping of key crunch points in assessment for students and academics to ensure appropriate monitoring and support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Electronic management of assessment fully supports the assessment process in providing seamless registration, submission of work, and online support via virtual learning systems aligned to personal networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Institutional Support for Assessment: Key Priorities (EUA: Evans & Bunescu, 2020).
### Institutional Support for Assessment continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Priorities</th>
<th>Rating 1–5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agility and quality of systems to support assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Best use is made of technology to support assessment processes (e.g., mode and timing of feedback; virtual learning; personalised support using AI; predictive analytics).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Assessment resources have a dedicated website with links to key materials to support an institutional assessment network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 QA structures and processes are agile to support ongoing enhancement in assessment design to ensure relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Processes for checking the integrity of awarded grades, to fully address issues around grade inflation, are robust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 There is commitment to inclusive assessment principles, such as Universal Design, to enable all students to have equitable access to, and chances of success within, assessment and feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Data analysis is used to ensure assessment is not disadvantaging any specific groups of students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research-informed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 There is a commitment to the development of research-informed assessment and feedback processes and evaluation of effectiveness using fine-grained measures of student learning gains at the discipline level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Staff and students receive comprehensive induction into assessment feedback processes in an iterative and developmental way (quality assurance processes; peer and self-assessment, mentoring etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Interdisciplinary assessment communities of practice are supported and leadership training provided to sustain and develop them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional Support for Assessment continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Priorities</th>
<th>Rating 1–5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>There is <strong>reward and recognition for effectiveness in assessment and feedback</strong> for staff and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Course evaluations are aligned to high-level focused learning outcomes</strong> that place emphasis on students’ development of high-level skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>Assessment load and distribution of assessment is regularly reviewed to ensure manageability for staff and students.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>Emphasis is on a programme level approach</strong> to assessment where assessment is <strong>co-constructed with teams and links between modules are clear.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>Emphasis is on best use of resource</strong>; and in promoting student engagement and self-regulation of assessment so that students are guided in how to evaluate the quality of their own work for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><strong>There is a team approach to assessment engaging with wider stakeholders within and beyond the university to support authentic assessment practices</strong> (eg., IT teams, library, careers, employers, professional bodies, alumni).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Institutional Support for Assessment: Key Priorities (EUA: Evans & Bavensco, 2020).*  

To consider elements of good assessment feedback design in more detail see G3 and G4
Key Considerations Part 2
(read in conjunction with EAT cards) Appendix E

1. **Rationale and goals.** Is the key driver/rationale underpinning change to assessment and feedback practices clear to all? Are short and long-term goals transparent? Using the EAT framework it is possible to identify measured steps and ‘quick gains’ that can be achieved that are aligned to longer term goals. A key question is how priorities are being identified and communicated?

2. **Being clear about the essential elements of a scaling-up initiative** is critical (Gabriel, 2014). The EAT Framework’s essential elements are:
   (i) inclusivity with an emphasis on developing autonomy and agency for staff and students in the promotion of self-regulatory learning behaviours as part of a universal design approach; (ii) the integrated holistic framework considering all dimensions of assessment practice; (iii) theoretical underpinnings (cognitive constructivist and social constructivist/social-critical theoretical perspectives (PLSP, Waring & Evans)).

3. **Developing shared understandings from staff and student perspectives about ‘what constitutes good and how this can be developed.’** A key tenet of the EAT framework is the importance of exploring stakeholder beliefs and values about assessment practices to ensure buy-in and ownership of ideas. (The EAT framework has identified principles of effective assessment and feedback practice based on extensive reviews of the literature and practice-based evidence (see Evans, 2016, p.15; Evans, 2013; Evans, et al., 2015).

4. **Alignment with institutional priorities and structures.** The EAT framework supports the development of manageable and sustainable assessment feedback practices. Aligning the framework with institutional/faculty/programme priorities with top-down and bottom-up support involving the engagement of senior leaders, students, and staff is important along with integrating the framework into existing structures to ensure its inclusion in the ‘institutional HE fabric’ and to avoid duplication of effort (Hounsell & Rigby, 2013).
Key Considerations Part 2
(read in conjunction with EAT cards) Appendix E
continued

5. **Building a community of practice and shared ownership of the initiative.** In developing a holistic approach to assessment, bringing teams together to explore at programme level how assessment can work most effectively is imperative (Bass, 2012). A key element of this work is on-going focused training and support using research-informed evidence nuanced to the requirements of the context/discipline (Evans et al., 2015). Identification of advocates, clarifying the mechanisms for how networks are to be created, maintained, and developed are all fundamental to the longer-term sustainability of the initiative.

6. **Reward.** Individual (staff and student) recognition and reward for engagement in the development of assessment practices should be an integral part of HEI reward structures. Ensuring manageability and efficiency are key concerns within the EAT framework mindful of the competing pressures on colleagues' time from research, leadership, and enterprise activities in addition to teaching commitments. An effective ‘one-stop shop’ website to pool resources, encourage collaboration, promote shared understandings, and to provide links to key areas of activity is essential.

7. **Measuring what is meaningful.** Relevant learning gain measures should be an integral part of holistic assessment designs and they should be subject to on-going evaluation and review by staff and students. The effectiveness of the overarching assessment feedback strategy in meeting immediate and longer term goals requires iterative analysis to enable fine-tuning and attention to the requirements of the disciplines. A critical pedagogy perspective, that considers who is advantaged and disadvantaged by assessment practices, is required in order to address differential learning outcomes (Mountford Zimdars et al., 2015; Waring & Evans, 2015).
Evaluating Assessment Practices

The EAT Framework places much emphasis on training and development of academics’ and student understanding and engagement with assessment (Use Appendices B–D to consider specific elements of staff and student engagement in assessment, and Appendix G to consider overall institutional approach to assessment feedback ). Key considerations include how we evaluate the effectiveness of what we do, in an iterative development way with all stakeholders.

Specifically, we need to consider both the process and products of learning. By monitoring student learning trajectories, we can investigate whether assessment practices have differential impacts on students' from different backgrounds (Evans et al., 2019).

Types of Impact:
Impacts on attitudes; behaviours; process and products; wider benefits; embeddedness; sustainability; transferability; scaleability.
Specifically, impact on engagement at a number of levels:
(i) Impact on beliefs and values as articulated in practice
(ii) Impact on curriculum design and delivery
(iii) Impact on professional development of staff and students
(iv) Impact on student learning, attitudes, behaviours, satisfaction, longer term learning retention
(v) Impact on learning and teaching beyond HE with partners in industry, business, medical, school contexts etc.
(vi) Impact on policy at various levels

Impact Perspectives
Significance = What is/are the best outcome(s) we could reasonably expect from a specific ‘group’.

Reach = What percentage of the relevant audience are you engaging with, and within your specific field?
## Table 4: Evaluating Impact of Assessment Interventions

| **Sustainability:** Students taking more responsibility for assessment – becoming more self-regulatory. | How to build student responsibility and ownership of assessment?  
- Is it manageable?  
- Is it cost-effective – bang for buck? Does the degree of impact (effect size) justify the effort?  
Efficient use of resource. |
| --- | --- |
| **Embeddedness:** Built into curriculum design ‘part of the fabric of things’. | Is the approach embedded within curriculum design?  
- Is the approach endorsed by the institution and embedded within institutional processes?  
- Is it embedded within CPD provision?  
- Is it aligned to institutional strategy(ies) and part of institutional policy? |
| **Scaleability:** depth and breadth  
**Transferability:** across contexts | Is it scaleable to programme, discipline, faculty, university levels?  
- Can the approaches be used in a variety of contexts?  
- How easy is it to adapt it to suit different contexts and local needs? |
| **Impact on reducing differential student learning outcomes** | Have any identified gaps in achievement been reduced?  
- Are we able to identify any specific assessment design practices that have made a significant impact generally and for specific groups? |
Reward and Recognition

EAT and Advance HE Fellowships
(Appendix H)

It is essential that efforts to enhance assessment feedback practices are acknowledged and rewarded. EAT has been used to support both internal university awards, National Teaching Fellowships (NTF), and Collaborative and Spotlight awards for teaching excellence at the institutional level (CATE) and professional development HEA fellowship awards with Advance HE. In working towards national qualification frameworks such as the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF, 2011), the ability to reflect and evaluate on practice is critical and EAT gives you many tools to be able to do this.

The UKPSF (2011) supports the development of professional practice of those engaged in teaching and supporting learning within higher education. It was developed as a standards framework for the HE sector that sets out the knowledge, skills and behaviours demonstrated by those teaching and/or supporting higher education learning. There are two elements to the UKPSF; the Dimensions of the Framework (Figure 3.1) and four Descriptor/Category statements. (pp. 3–6, UKPSF, 2011).

The four categories of HEA Fellowship are awarded on the basis of evidence of personal professional practice which meets the requirements of one of the four Descriptors of the UKPSF. The different categories of HEA Fellowship reflect the wide range of professional practice carried out by individuals who teach and/or support learning in higher education; from those who have a partial role in teaching/supporting learning through to senior professionals with strategic impact on teaching and learning in an organisational, national and/or international setting. In deciding which category of Fellowship to apply for at this stage in your career, you will need to determine which of the four Descriptors of the UKPSF is most appropriate to your practice and professional experience.
UKPSF Dimensions of Practice

The UKPSF has 15 dimensions of practice, grouped into three overarching themes: Professional Values, Core Knowledge and Areas of Activity.

The EAT Framework uses an understanding of assessment to inform curriculum design and delivery through focusing on assessment design. The principles underpinning EAT are aligned to the UKPSF values (V1–V4).

Links to the framework and associated information include:

- www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf
- www.heacademy.ac.uk/recognition-accreditation/fellowships/recognition-resources
UKPSF Dimensions of Professional Practice

Professional Values

V1  Respect individual learners and diverse learning communities
V2  Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners
V3  Use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development
V4  Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates recognising the implications for professional practice

Areas of Activity

A1  Design and plan learning activities and/or programmes of study
A2  Teach and/or support learning
A3  Assess and give feedback to learners
A4  Develop effective learning environments and approaches to student support and guidance
A5  Engage in continuing professional development in subjects/disciplines and their pedagogy, incorporating research, scholarship and the evaluation of professional practices

Core Knowledge

K1  The subject material
K2  Appropriate methods for teaching, learning, and assessing in the subject area and at the category of the academic programme
K3  How students learn, both generally and within their subject/disciplinary area(s)
K4  The use and value of appropriate learning technologies
K5  Methods for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching
K6  The implications of quality assurance and quality enhancement for academic and professional practice with a particular focus on teaching

Figure 8: UKPSF Dimensions of Practice
# EAT Principles and the UKPSF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAT Principles</th>
<th>UKPSF Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Shared beliefs and values</td>
<td>V1 Respect individual learners and diverse learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Student-staff partnership</td>
<td>V2 Promote participation in higher education and equality of opportunity for learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Research-informed/practice informed</td>
<td>V3 Use evidence-informed approaches and the outcomes from research, scholarship and continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Inclusive approach</td>
<td>V4 Acknowledge the wider context in which higher education operates recognising the implications for professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Holistic – considering the whole experience of staff/students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Integrative – considering all dimensions of assessment design and how they interact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Promotion of student/staff agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Supporting individuals to self-manage their own learning as part of a self-regulatory approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Ensuring emphasis is on meaningful assessment practices (relevance and authenticity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Sensitive to context: taking account of individual and contextual variables and the specific requirements of disciplines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: EAT Principles and UKPSF**

UKPSF Areas of Activity and Core Knowledge Dimensions can be aligned with the EAT Framework; the emphasis on evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and implications of quality assurance and enhancement for academic and professional practice are fundamental to the EAT framework.
Appendix H contains details for meeting fellowship at associate, fellow, senior fellow and principal fellow dependent on role and key areas of focus.

In the following appendices the EAT Framework diagrams are located including BLANK COPIES to enable you to personalise items to ensure relevance to local contexts.
Appendix A
- A1 Guidance on Assessment Feedback Design
- A2 Effective Assessment Feedback Principles
Appendix A1: Guidance on Assessment Feedback Design

Formative feedback includes all those resources that enable a student to make progress in their learning, both in the immediate and longer term. This definition of feedback places considerable emphasis on feed-forward (how feedback can be applied by the learner and teacher to support learning within the context of a programme, and in future learning gains into employment – feed-up). Feedback is not the sole responsibility of the lecturer; the student should be an active seeker, user, and contributor to the feedback process.

Assessment design should, therefore, be aimed at supporting students to self-monitor/self-regulate their own learning. Access to suitable resources, and supporting students in developing their assessment literacy skills are fundamental elements of effective assessment feedback provision within higher education (Evans, 2013).

Assessment should be fit for purpose; with the purposes of assessment that is clear to all parties and promoted through an active ongoing dialogue as part of curriculum design and development. Assessment practices support learning and provide a measure of the extent to which an individual has met the required learning outcomes. Understanding the assessment process is fundamental in enabling effective use of assessment feedback. Students need to co-own the assessment feedback process if they are to gain maximum benefit from it as genuine partners in the process.

The importance of engaging students in meaningful assessment practices throughout their higher education experience is highlighted along with the importance of acknowledging and supporting student transitions. The assessment feedback process is seen holistically in terms of how all assessment components fit together and are aligned to support the student journey. A critical pedagogic stance is integral in ensuring ongoing evaluation of assessment feedback processes and the provision of appropriate training to support staff and students in assessment feedback practices.
Appendix A1: Guidance on Assessment Feedback Design continued

Effective assessment feedback practices should support students to:

- Participate fully in assessment feedback processes;
- Understand the assessment feedback requirements of the discipline/profession they are working in;
- Embrace the aims and expectations of their chosen programme of study;
- Demonstrate understanding of, and an ability to reflect on their development of knowledge and skills as part of self-evaluation;
- Recognise and value existing knowledge and skills and build upon them in order to apply learning to new contexts;

- Make effective and responsible use of feedback that is provided;
- Offer feedback and support to others as part of collaborative learning opportunities;
- Understand sound academic practice and behave with integrity;
- Use resources, including own time effectively;
- Contribute effectively to teaching sessions including peer support;
- Contribute to the development of the design and delivery of assessment feedback practices
Appendix A2: Effective Assessment Feedback Principles continued

The key aim of assessment feedback should be to support students to become more self-regulatory in managing their own learning as part of sustainable assessment practice; a focus on three core areas is recommended: Assessment Literacy; Facilitating Improvements in Learning; Holistic Assessment Design.

To support assessment literacy we should:
1. Clarify what the assessment is and how it is organised. Explain the principles underpinning the design of assessment so that students can understand the relevance and value of it.
2. Provide explicit guidance to students on the requirements of each assessment (e.g., clarification of assessment criteria; learning outcomes; good academic practice).
3. Clarify with students the different forms, sources, and timings of feedback available including e-learning opportunities.
4. Clarify the role of the student in the feedback process as an active participant (seeking, using, and giving feedback to self and peers; developing networks of support), and not just as a receiver of feedback.
5. Provide opportunities for students to work with assessment criteria and to work with examples of work at different grade levels in order to understand ‘what constitutes good.’

To facilitate improvements in learning we should:
6. Ensure that the curriculum design enables sufficient time for students to apply the lessons learnt from formative feedback in their summative assessments.
7. Give clear and focused feedback on how students can improve their work including signposting the most important areas to address (what was good; what could be improved; and most importantly, how to improve).
8. Ensure that formative feedback precedes summative assessment; that the links between formative feedback and the requirements of summative assessment are clear.
9. Ensure that there are opportunities and support for students to develop self-assessment/self-monitoring skills, and training in peer feedback to support self-understanding of assessment and feedback.
10. Ensure training opportunities on assessment feedback for all those engaged in curriculum delivery to enhance shared understanding of assessment requirements.
To promote holistic assessment design we should:

11. Ensure that opportunities for formative assessment are integral to curriculum design at module and programme levels.

12. Ensure that all core* resources are available to students electronically through the virtual learning environment (e.g., Blackboard) and other relevant sources from the start of the semester to enable students to take responsibility for organising their own learning.

13. Provide an appropriate range and choice of assessment opportunities throughout a programme of study.

14. Ensure that there are opportunities for students to feedback on learning and teaching, both individually, and via the Students’ Union’s Academic Representatives, during a taught module as well as at the end of it, to enable reasonable amendments to be made during the teaching of the module subject to the discretion of the module leader.

*Core = handbook; assessment guidelines; formative and summative tasks and deadlines; resources for each session

(Based on: Evans, 2013 and developed with Researching Assessment Practices Group, University of Southampton, UK 2015–2019)
Appendix B
Lecturer/Educator Versions
The Three Core Dimensions of EAT

- Assessment Design
- Assessment Literacy
- Assessment Feedback
**Assessment Literacy**

**AL1:** Clarify what constitutes good Standard of work; recognition and application of good academic practice; student and lecturer beliefs.

**AL2:** Clarify how assessment elements fit together

**AL3:** Clarify student and staff entitlement
Student/Lecturer roles and principles underpinning the ‘What’, ‘When’, and ‘How’ of feedback.

**AL4:** Clarify the requirements of the discipline
Core and threshold concepts; deep approach.

---

**Assessment Design**

**AD1:** Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures
QA literacy.

**AD2:** Promote meaningful and focused assessment
Fit for Purpose; Relevant Programme Level Assessment; Collaborative Design; Manageable.

**AD3:** Ensure access and equal opportunities
Provision of Resources; Guidance; Network Development; Choice.

**AD4:** Ensure ongoing evaluation to support the development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice

---

**Assessment Feedback**

**AF1:** Provide accessible feedback
Specific, and focused on how to improve. Encourage students to clarify their interpretation of the feedback.

**AF2:** Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback
The pattern and timing of assessment, and alignment of formative to summative assessment.

**AF3:** Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement
Encourage students to clarify their interpretation of the feedback.

**AF4:** Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills
Self-monitoring, self-assessment, and critical reflection.
### Assessment Design

**AD1: Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures**
- QA literacy.

**AD2: Promote meaningful and focused assessment**
- Fit for Purpose; Relevant Programme Level Assessment; Collaborative Design; Manageable.

**AD3: Ensure access and equal opportunities**
- Provision of Resources; Guidance; Network Development; Choice.

**AD4: Ensure ongoing evaluation to support the development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice**

### Assessment Literacy

**AL1: Clarify what constitutes good Standard of work; recognition and application of good academic practice; student and lecturer beliefs.**

**AL2: Clarify how assessment elements fit together**

**AL3: Clarify student and staff entitlement Student/Lecturer roles and principles underpinning the ‘What’, ‘When’, and ‘How’ of feedback.**

**AL4: Clarify the requirements of the discipline Core and threshold concepts; deep approach.**

### Assessment Feedback

**AF1: Provide accessible feedback**
- Specific, and focused on how to improve. Encourage students to clarify their interpretation of the feedback.

**AF2: Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback**
- The pattern and timing of assessment, and alignment of formative to summative assessment.

**AF3: Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement**

**AF4: Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills**
- Self-monitoring, self-assessment, and critical reflection.
Assessment Design

**AD1:** Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures
QA literacy.

**AD2:** Promote meaningful and focused assessment
Fit for Purpose; Relevant Programme Level Assessment; Collaborative Design; Manageable.

**AD3:** Ensure access and equal opportunities
Provision of Resources; Guidance; Network Development; Choice.

**AD4:** Ensure ongoing evaluation to support the development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice

Assessment Literacy

**AL1:** Clarify what constitutes good Standard of work; recognition and application of good academic practice; student and lecturer beliefs.

**AL2:** Clarify how assessment elements fit together

**AL3:** Clarify student and staff entitlement
Student/Lecturer roles and principles underpinning the ‘What’, ‘When’, and ‘How’ of feedback.

**AL4:** Clarify the requirements of the discipline
Core and threshold concepts; deep approach.

Assessment Feedback

**AF1:** Provide accessible feedback
Specific, and focused on how to improve. Encourage students to clarify their interpretation of the feedback.

**AF2:** Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback
The pattern and timing of assessment, and alignment of formative to summative assessment.

**AF3:** Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement

**AF4:** Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills
Self-monitoring, self-assessment, and critical reflection.
Appendix B2 bv: lecturer blank version

Assessment Design

**AD1:** QA literacy

**AD2:** Promote meaningful and focused assessment

**AD3:** Ensure access and equal opportunities

**AD4:** Ensure ongoing evaluation

Assessment Feedback

**AF1:** Provide accessible feedback

**AF2:** Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback

**AF3:** Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement

**AF4:** Promote development of students' self-evaluation skills

Assessment Literacy

**AL1:** Clarify what constitutes good

**AL2:** Clarify how assessment elements fit together

**AL3:** Clarify student and staff entitlement

**AL4:** Clarify the requirements of the discipline
Appendix C
Student Versions
**Assessment Design**

**AD1: Do I have a good understanding of assessment processes/requirements**

**AD2: Meaningful work**
Am I using the knowledge acquired across modules to inform my overall development? Am I adopting a deep approach in my work?

**AD3: Making the best use of resources**
Do I know how to access and make best use of resources? Am I developing networks to support my learning now and into employment?

**AD4: Supporting the development of the course**
Am I giving useful feedback on how to enhance assessment feedback practice? How am I owning the course?

**Assessment Literacy**

**AL1: What constitutes good?**
What am I aiming for? Do I know what good looks like? Do I know what to do to meet the assessment criteria and learning outcomes.

**AL2: How assessment elements fit together**
Have I mapped how the assessment works in/across modules and how I am going to manage this?

**AL3: Student and staff entitlement**
Do I know what feedback looks like; support I am entitled to; my role in feedback is?

**AL4: Am I clear about the requirements of the discipline?**
Am I aware of the key concepts I need to know and the main ways of working and thinking in my discipline? Do I feel part of the discipline?

**Assessment Feedback**

**AF1: Ensuring I know how to improve**
Do I know how to improve my work from the feedback? If it is not clear, what am I doing about it?

**AF2: Using formative feedback opportunities**
Am I making full use of opportunities to get feedback on my work? Do I actively seek out feedback opportunities?

**AF3: Have I done the necessary preparation to participate fully in peer dialogue?**
How do I support others in giving and receiving feedback?

**AF4: Self-evaluation**
Do I know how I am doing? Do I know what to do when I do not know? How am I managing myself?
**Assessment Design**

AD1: Do I have a good understanding of HE assessment processes /and regulations

AD2: Meaningful work
Do I know how to access and make best use of resources? Am I developing networks to support my learning now and into employment?

AD3: Making the best use of resources
Am I using the knowledge acquired across modules to inform my overall development? Am I adopting a deep approach in my work?

AD4: Supporting the development of the course
Am I giving useful feedback on how to enhance assessment feedback practice? How am I owning the course?

**Assessment Feedback**

AF1: Ensuring I know how to improve
Do I know how to improve my work from the feedback? If it is not clear, what am I doing about it?

AF2: Using formative feedback opportunities
Am I actively seeking out feedback opportunities and making full use of them?

AF3: Have I done the necessary preparation to participate fully in peer dialogue?
How do I support others in giving and receiving feedback?

AF4: Self-evaluation
Do I know how I am doing? Do I know what to do when I do not know? Am I managing my learning effectively?

**Assessment Literacy**

AL1: What constitutes good?
What am I aiming for? Do I know what good looks like? Do I know what to do to meet the assessment criteria and learning outcomes.

AL2: How assessment elements fit together
Have I mapped how the assessment works in/ across modules, and how I am going to manage them all?

AL3: Student and staff entitlement
Do I know what: feedback looks like; support I am entitled to; my role in feedback is?

AL4: Am I clear about the requirements of the discipline?
Am I aware of the key concepts I need to know and the main ways of working and thinking in my discipline? Do I feel part of the discipline?
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Assessment Design

**AD4:** Supporting the development of the course
Am I giving useful feedback on how to enhance assessment feedback practice? How am I owning the course?

**AD3:** Making the best use of resources
Do I know how to access and make best use of resources? Am I developing networks to support my learning now and into employment?

**AD2:** Meaningful work
Am I using the knowledge acquired across modules to inform my overall development? Am I adopting a deep approach in my work?

**AD1:** Do I have a good understanding of assessment processes/requirements

Assessment Feedback

**AF4:** Self-evaluation
Do I know how I am doing? Do I know what to do when I do not know? How am I managing myself?

**AF3:** Have I done the necessary preparation to participate fully in peer dialogue?
How do I support others in giving and receiving feedback?

**AF2:** Using formative feedback opportunities
Am I making full use of opportunities to get feedback on my work? Do I actively seek out feedback opportunities?

**AF1:** Ensuring I know how to improve
Do I know how to improve my work from the feedback? If it is not clear, what am I doing about it?

Assessment Literacy

**AL4:** Am I clear about the requirements of the discipline?
Am I aware of the key concepts I need to know and the main ways of working and thinking in my discipline? Do I feel part of the discipline?

**AL3:** Student and staff entitlement
Do I know what feedback looks like; support I am entitled to; my role in feedback is?

**AL2:** How assessment elements fit together
Have I mapped how the assessment works in/across modules and how I am going to manage this?

**AL1:** What constitutes good?
What am I aiming for? Do I know what good looks like? Do I know what to do to meet the assessment criteria and learning outcomes?
**Assessment Design**

- **AD4**: Am I contributing to teaching, research, enterprise to enhance my learning and that of others?
- **AD3**: Do I know where and how to access resources and network well?
- **AD2**: Am I doing my best to really understand the subject?
- **AD1**: Do I understand regulations?

**Assessment Literacy**

- **AL1**: I am clear about what good looks like?
- **AL2**: How does all the assessment fit together?
- **AL3**: Am I clear about what being and expert in this subject/profession requires?
- **AL4**: Am I clear about the requirements of the discipline?

**Assessment Feedback**

- **AF4**: How accurate is my own assessment of how I am doing?
- **AF3**: Have I prepared sufficiently to make the most of learning opportunities? Do I actively support others?
- **AF2**: Do I make the most of all opportunities to test my understanding?
- **AF1**: Am I able to use feedback from others effectively?
PhD Versions
**Assessment Design**

**AD1:** Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures: QA literacy
How are students being made aware of regulations? Do supervisors have shared understandings?

**AD2:** Promote meaningful and focused assessment
How is the PhD programme supporting student progression in an integrated way and as integral members of the research community?

**AD3:** Ensure access and equal opportunities
Have students been alerted to key resources, sources of support? Have students’ individual differences been addressed?

**AD4:** How are you reviewing in an ongoing way how your student is doing and how your working relationship is evolving?

**Assessment Literacy**

**AL1:** Clarify what constitutes good?
Do you and your PhD student have a shared understanding of what quality at PhD looks like especially in relation to their focus and design?

**AL2:** Clarify how assessment elements fit together
Is it clear to the student how the different element of their PhD programme fit together and the requirements of them?

**AL3:** Clarify student and staff entitlement
Have supervisory expectations been agreed and made clear from the outset?

**AL4:** Clarify the requirements of PhD study
(e.g., in relation to research questions, research design, substantive content, analysis), and in addressing issues of originality, contribution to research.

**Assessment Feedback**

**AF1:** Provide accessible feedback
Is the feedback you give supporting students to take responsibility for themselves? How do you know your feedback is accessible?

**AF2:** Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback
How is supervision supporting student progression?

**AF3:** Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement
How are you encouraging students to take responsibility for sessions/developing networks etc./contributing to the work of the department as members of the team?

**AF4:** Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills
How are you engaging students in reviewing their own and others’ work? (e.g., tools/frameworks) my learning effectively?
Assessment Design

AD1: Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures: QA literacy
AD2: Promote meaningful and focused assessment
AD3: Ensure access and equal opportunities
AD4: How are you reviewing in an ongoing way how your student is doing and how your working relationship is evolving?

Assessment Feedback

AF1: Provide accessible feedback
AF2: Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback
AF3: Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement
AF4: Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills

Assessment Literacy

AL1: Clarify what constitutes good?
AL2: Clarify how assessment elements fit together
AL3: Clarify student and staff entitlement
AL4: Clarify the requirements of PhD study

AD4: How are you reviewing in an ongoing way how your student is doing and how your working relationship is evolving?
**Assessment Design**

**AD1:** Do I have a good understanding of PhD regulations and where to access information on this?

**AD2:** Meaningful work
Am I adopting a deep approach in my work? Do I have a clear warrant (Why is my research important? What is original about it? What lessons have I learnt from it?). Am I able to demonstrate criticality/synthesis in my work? What is my role as an integral member of the research community?

**AD3:** Making best use of resources
Do I know how to access and make best use of resources? Am I developing networks to support my learning? Am I aware of key researchers in my field?

**AD4:** Supporting the development of the programme
How am I contributing to the PhD community? What can I offer to enhance the development of the programme; what activities can I initiate/contribute to.

**Assessment Feedback**

**AF1:** Ensuring I know how to improve
Do I know how to improve my work from the feedback? If it is not clear, what am I doing about it? (e.g., accessing training).

**AF2:** Using formative feedback opportunities
Am I making full use of opportunities to get feedback on my work? Do I actively seek out feedback opportunities?

**AF3:** Have I done the necessary preparation to participate fully in peer dialogue?
How am I working with others to support my understanding (e.g., discussion papers / leading sessions)?

**AF4:** Self-evaluation
Do I know how I am doing? Do I know what to do when I do not know? Am I managing my learning effectively?

**Assessment Literacy**

**AL1:** What constitutes good?
What am I aiming for? Do I know what good looks like? Do I know how to meet PhD assessment requirements? What am I unclear about?

**AL2:** How assessment elements fit together
Have I mapped how the different elements of my PhD programme fit together and how I will manage these?

**AL3:** Student and staff entitlement
Am I clear about my role and responsibilities and those of my supervisors in the process?

**AL4:** Am I clear about the requirements of the discipline?
Am I aware of the key concepts I need to know and the main ways of working and thinking in my discipline at PhD level?
AL1: What constitutes good?

AL2: How assessment elements fit together

AL3: Student and staff entitlement

AL4: Am I clear about the requirements of the discipline?

AD1: Do I have a good understanding of PhD regulations and where to access information on this?

AD2: Meaningful work

AD3: Making best use of resources

AD4: Supporting the development of the programme

AF1: Ensuring I know how to improve

AF2: Using formative feedback opportunities

AF3: Have I done the necessary preparation to participate fully in peer dialogue?

AF4: Self-evaluation

AD1: Supporting the development of the programme

AD2: Meaningful work

AD3: Making best use of resources

AD4: Supporting the development of the programme

AF1: Ensuring I know how to improve

AF2: Using formative feedback opportunities

AF3: Have I done the necessary preparation to participate fully in peer dialogue?

AF4: Self-evaluation

AD1: Do I have a good understanding of PhD regulations and where to access information on this?

AD2: Meaningful work

AD3: Making best use of resources

AD4: Supporting the development of the programme

AL1: What constitutes good?

AL2: How assessment elements fit together

AL3: Student and staff entitlement

AL4: Am I clear about the requirements of the discipline?
Appendix E
Decision-making cards
Assessment Literacy

AL 1 Clarify what constitutes good

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

- LT1 Provide explicit guidance from the outset on the requirements of the assessment tasks.
- LT2 Check students’ understanding of requirements through small-focused tasks and opportunities for discussion and reflection about the assessment criteria (e.g., demystifying critical reflection; writing styles; referencing etc.).
- LT3 Model examples of good practice in taught sessions.
- LT4 Provide students with examples of good practice and identify why they are good using explicit assessment marking criteria.
- LT5 Select snippets of good practice to discuss in sessions on a regular basis.
- LT6 Set formative tasks asking students to focus on key concepts.
- LT7 Provide model answers to questions and FAQs that are also available online.
- LT8 Develop rubrics so that students are directed to the requirements of the assessment task.

Student Focused (S)

- S1 Get students to produce model answers individually and in groups to share with their peers.
- S2 Ask students to mark work using the assessment criteria.
- S3 Get students to personalise the assessment criteria in relation to the requirements of a specific task (i.e., write it in their own words).
- S4 Get students to set the marking criteria for specific pieces of work using the guidelines for assessment ratified for your module/programme.
- S5 Get students to advise on developing the assessment criteria guidance for following cohorts of students; get students to map learning outcomes across modules.
- S6 Get students to develop and personalise rubrics to support their own learning within and beyond the module of study.
- S7 Get students to self-assess their own performance as part of the summative assessment (e.g., using the assessment criteria grid to annotate where they think they are according to the different criteria and justify why).
- S8 Give students an article to assess and then get students to moderate their decisions in groups and to summarise and justify conclusions to the group.
AL 1 Clarify what constitutes good continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

| PD1 | Do teams have a shared understanding of what constitutes good? |
| PD2 | How is what constitutes good academic practice shared within and across disciplines? |
| PD3 | How are you ensuring that the assessment criteria are fit for purpose? |
| PD4 | How are new colleagues inducted into the requirements of good academic practice? |
AL 2 Clarify how assessment elements fit together

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

LT1  Provide a route map/diagram showing how all assessment elements (formative and summative) fit together for students and lecturers.
LT2  To ensure buy in — clarify with students why the assessment design is relevant and valuable in supporting students to meet learning objectives within and beyond the module.
LT3  Signpost key tasks and timelines.
LT4  Demonstrate how assessment tasks and assessment guidance are organised on the virtual learning environment.
LT5  If completing formative assignments is a condition for submitting summative assignments make this explicit from the start.
LT6  Revisit the assessment route map with students at regular intervals throughout the module/programme.

Student Focused (S)

S1  Get students to produce their own picture of the assessment pattern and get them to outline their role(s) in the process. (Gantt charts can be useful for students to demonstrate how they are going to organise and manage the requirements of assessment).
S2  Get the students to rewrite the learning outcomes in their own language. Map with them how you are intending to cover these within the module.
S3  Get students to complete a self-assessment on what aspects of assessment they are clear about and what areas they need more guidance on. Produce a summary of key points for all students based on student feedback queries.
S4  Involve students in contributing resources to the module/programme.
S5  How can students in years 1, 2 and 3 and at PG level contribute towards supporting understanding of how the module/programme fits together; what resources can they share?
S6  Ask students to review guidance in the handbook and to work with you to make information more explicit where and if necessary.
AL 2 Clarify how assessment elements fit together continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

| PD1 | Is the rationale underpinning how the assessment elements fit together clear to lecturers and students? |
| PD2 | Is information in module/programme handbooks clear and consistent throughout about how the different elements of assessment fit together? |
| PD3 | How effective is the pattern of assessment within and across modules (timing; variety; fitness for purpose; organisation of formative and summative)? Who is overseeing this? |
| PD4 | How are students feeding into the development of modules/programmes to support their understanding of how elements of assessment fit together? |
AL 3 Clarify student entitlement

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

LT1 Clarify expectations regarding the hours of study required; the amount of preparation required for each session.

LT2 Be explicit and precise about the hours of support available for feedback and make sure this is consistent in handbooks and all other sources.

LT3 Be clear about what constitutes feedback and where and when this feedback will take place.

LT4 Be clear about what you want the students to do with the feedback and set specific tasks related to this (e.g., developing an action plan; reflecting on the feedback about what is understood and what is not; how they are going to advance their work ...)

LT5 In giving written feedback ensure consistency in the timing of feedback across the feedback team within a modules all students receive the feedback at approximately the same time.

LT6 Use individual and group feedback judiciously – when is group feedback most appropriate?

LT7 Tackle the emotional dimension of feedback directly with students. (e.g., enable time between the receiving of feedback and asking students to act on feedback).

Student Focused (S)

S1 Clarify the role(s) of the student in the feedback process and formalise this (e.g., contract regarding expectations as part of the feedback process).

S2 Get students to produce a summary of what they understand from the feedback they have received.

S3 Support students to establish peer feedback mentoring roles.

S4 Encourage students to audit where their own strengths and areas for development lie and where they can best support peers.

S5 Ask students to take responsibility for auditing in-session feedback to feed into future delivery working with the lecturer.
**AL 3 Clarify student entitlement continued**

**Programme/Director Questions (PD)**

| PD1 | How are lecturer and student roles and expectations in assessment made clear to all? |
| PD2 | What does student engagement in assessment look like? |
| PD3 | What baseline of expectations regarding assessment practice has been agreed with teams? |
| PD4 | How have you established where consistency is essential and in what areas? |
| PD5 | What is being done to develop a shared understanding of assessment feedback approaches? |
| PD6 | How are students being supported to give and act on feedback as part of their role? |
| PD7 | Are hours of required study by students and hours of lecturer support made explicit? |
| PD8 | How are students being supported to recognise and make best use of the support offered? |
### AL 4 Clarify the requirements of the discipline

#### Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

| LT1 | Clarify what constitutes good within the discipline and/or dimensions of it. |
| LT2 | Model what constitutes a deep approach within your discipline. |
| LT3 | Be clear about who are the leading researchers/sources within your discipline that students should be consulting. |
| LT4 | Less is more – highlight key concepts and focus attention on these in your teaching. |
| LT5 | Identify threshold concepts – those that are likely to present difficulties to students and provide resources on these. |
| LT6 | Provide links to where further information can be sought on difficult concepts. |
| LT7 | Do an academic needs analysis with students to identify gaps in knowledge; use this information to pair students to support one another and/or to set up mixed groups for peer support. |
| LT8 | Ensure a programme level approach to the covering of core concepts to agree where replication is warranted and to avoid unnecessary duplication. |
| LT9 | Consider progression of ideas at programme level and how modules are working together to support student learning, and specifically how the flow of ideas/concepts/knowledge, and skills from one module feed into another. |
| LT10 | Consider how resources are best shared across modules. |

#### Student Focused (S)

| S1  | Be clear about what information students can source and cover for themselves, and provide links to useful resources/sites. |
| S2  | Provide self-assessment tools so that students can test their understanding of key ideas. |
| S3  | Get students to write mini tests for each other to use for whole groups; peer groups etc. |
| S4  | Get students to produce key summaries of problematic concepts in an accessible language for their peers. |
| S5  | Encourage students to produce and offer resources for other cohorts. |
AL 4 Clarify the requirements of the discipline continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

PD1 Is What constitutes a ‘deep approach’ within the discipline? Is your signature pedagogy articulated clearly?
PD2 How are you inducting students to become members of your academic discipline?
PD3 What networks beyond the disciplines should colleagues and students be tapping into to support understanding within the disciplines?
PD4 How is the course content linking to the latest research within and beyond the Faculty and University?
PD5 How are we promoting innovation within the disciplines, and as part of interdisciplinary research?
PD6 How are students contributing to the knowledge base of the discipline?
Assessment Feedback

AF 1 Provide accessible feedback

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

LT1 Explain the principles underpinning how you give feedback and why your approach is good.
LT2 Agree the most appropriate form(s) for feedback for specific tasks.
LT3 Ensure there is time for feedback in each taught session and identify it as feedback.
LT4 Ensure feedback is specific and focused on how to improve.
LT5 Ensure feedback contains reference to what the student has done well prior to elaborating on what needs improvement (address ‘is anything I did okay?’).
LT6 Ensure feedback relates directly to the assessment criteria but also gestures to beyond the module.
LT7 Ensure feedback focuses on the most important areas to address and not the minutiae.
LT8 Ensure feedback is realistic in expectations (student has sufficient knowledge to be able to use feedback effectively).
LT9 Provide links to where further information can be found to support development of ideas.
LT10 Give detailed feedback on key sections of text so that students can learn to address this throughout their work without you doing the whole thing for them.
LT11 Do not give feedback on full drafts and use comment boxes judiciously.
LT12 If a student has failed an assignment summarise succinctly what the key things are that they must address in order to achieve a pass.

Student Focused (S)

S1 Get students to ask three focused feedback questions when submitting formative work and address these specifically.
S2 Ask students to commit to what they want feedback on with Masters and PhD work.
S3 Get students to do something with the feedback to check their understanding of it, and their ability to use it within and beyond a module.
S4 Get students to diagnose where their problem lies (e.g., lack of knowledge; lack of understanding of feedback; effort; lack of awareness of resources; misunderstanding of requirements etc.).
AF 1 Provide accessible feedback continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

| PD1 | Do you have agreed principles of effective feedback underpinning all programmes? |
| PD2 | How are you ensuring consistency in approaches to the giving of feedback? |
| PD3 | Is your strategy for implementing University strategy at the Faculty level clear to all? |
| PD4 | How are you evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of feedback mechanisms? |
| PD5 | Is time built into workload models for training to ensure shared understandings of what the base line of quality is for giving feedback and for agreeing what constitutes good? |
AF 2 Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

LT1 Ensure that there is sufficient time for formative feedback to feed into summative.
LT2 Ensure formative tasks lead directly into summative and that students can see the link.
LT3 Be selective with assessment tasks.
LT4 Aim to reduce the emphasis on summative assessment; distribute tasks across a module.
LT5 Use formative assessment but make tasks compulsory to ensure engagement.
LT6 Use pre- and post-session tasks to ensure students make the most of the opportunities presented.

Student Focused (S)

S1 Get students to do 1–3 minute videos on key points covered in a lecture/seminar.
S2 Use a series of assignment tasks of different types that can be brought together. Allow students to select which ones will comprise their final submission and also ask them to justify their reasons for the inclusion of the specific final submission.
S3 Integrate self and peer engagement opportunities into the module/programme so that students learn to self-assess as they progress through the module. Aim to include an aspect of self-assessment in each taught session.
S4 Use online self-checking tests that students can use to test their knowledge.
S4 Use technology to support learning (e.g., lecture capture; audio on powerpoints) so students can go back and check understanding.
S5 Get students to do one or two page outlines of what they intend to cover early on to ensure they are on the right lines.
S6 Get students to map how they can best support each other as part of peer engagement agendas within and beyond the taught programme.
AF 2 Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

PD1  Do you have a clear policy on the nature and timing of formative feedback that students can expect to receive?
PD2  How are you ensuring early assessment of students' needs through the design of assessment?
PD3  What is the balance between formative and summative assessment?
PD4  What marking can students do for themselves and how can technology support this?
PD5  How are you ensuring that deadline dates enable students to use the whole content of the module (should allow students to use information covered in the last session)?
PD6  How are you managing deadline dates across the whole programme so as to not have negative knock on effects (e.g., can use formative assessment to spread load; can use same dates for final submissions if given interim formative feedback)?
PD7  How can you make summative feedback formative in supporting students to move forward in their next module(s)?
### AF 3 Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

| LT1 | Make expectations regarding student participation clear from the outset. |
| LT2 | Justify if and why collaborative learning is important in relation to learning outcomes/preparation for professions etc. |
| LT3 | In setting up peer groups ensure opportunities for students to work with both the same and different groups; support lone working and collaborative activity. |
| LT4 | Be clear about the remit of groups (contribution to teaching sessions; peer feedback; summative assessment; study group; roles within groups). |
| LT5 | Ensure that group activities (wiki; blog; etc) are purposeful and relevant to learning outcomes and beyond. |
| LT6 | Be clear about exactly what type of feedback you want students to give to each other. |
| LT7 | Provide students with training in how to give and use feedback. |
| LT8 | Ensure assessment encourages cooperation rather than competition (e.g., individual students’ marks and group activity comprise the collective score for all in the group to ensure each student supports others in the group or a nominated person in the group). |
| LT9 | Use pre-tasks to ensure students have prepared in order to be ready to have meaningful discussions with peers. |
| LT10 | Build collaborative requirements into formative assessment (e.g., each student needs to give feedback to three peers). |
| LT11 | If using peer assessment: be very specific about what criteria is being assessed and keep this very narrow; ensure multiple markers; ensure training in the allocation of marks; and that the mark allocated by peers is a small component of the student’s overall mark. |
AF 3 Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement continued

Student Focused (S)

S1  Encourage student groups to set up their own informal meetings/ways of working.
S2  Encourage student groups to manage session feedback to feed into following lectures.
S3  Ask students to prepare resources and questions for each other.
S4  Get students to use materials pre-lecture to develop reciprocal questioning on key themes.
S5  Ask students to generate assessment criteria for group projects.

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

PD1  How are you defining peer engagement (formative peer support vs summative peer judgements)?
PD2  How are you mobilising students to effectively contribute to the design and delivery of programmes as genuine partners?
PD3  How are you ensuring students are prepared for dialogue (e.g., design of curriculum; pre-tasks)?
PD4  How are you ensuring that peer engagement activities are authentic and relevant?
PD5  What are the most effective peer engagement activities within disciplines?
PD6  How is technology supporting interaction and dialogue?
AF 4 Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

LT1  Ensure students have full access to resources and course information so that they can self-regulate their own learning.

LT2  Provide a range of resources so that students can check their own understanding.

LT3  Use ipsative approaches to get students to gauge where they currently are, and to help them to develop strategies to enhance their performance, and to measure self-development rather than development in relation to others.

LT4  Unpack key concepts like critical reflection through modelling and the provision of a range of tools to assist with this process.

Student Focused (S)

S1  Support students to identify useful networks of support (e.g., individuals; resources; memberships of organisations etc.) that can support their own learning journeys.

S2  Support learners to self-regulate their own learning through an understanding of how they learn, what their current strengths and limitations are, and what strategies would be most useful to support their development.

S3  Support learners to see connections across modules to support their learning.

S4  Ask students to specify specific areas they would like feedback on.

S5  Get students to reflect on their responses to feedback. Train students in how to seek out and act on feedback.

S6  Create opportunities for students to assess their peer’s work.

S7  As part of summative assessment, ask students to reflect on their giving of feedback to others; and their own seeking and acting on feedback abilities.

S8  Get students to grade their own mark and to defend the grades allocated.

S9  Ask students to reflect on how they can apply learning acquired beyond the module of study.
AF 4 Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

PD1 How are students being supported to self-regulate their own learning and to help themselves?
PD2 How are programmes supporting students’ development of self-assessment skills?
PD3 How are programmes helping students to understand what critical reflection is, and how to achieve this?
PD4 How can technology support students to develop their self-assessment skills?
PD5 In getting students up to speed with the requirements of assessment feedback and as part of self-regulatory development – how is this being addressed as part of induction into higher education?
PD6 How are you engaging students in assessing their own work?
Assessment Design

AD 1 Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures: QA literacy

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

| LT1 | Make the marking and moderation processes explicit to students and staff to ensure confidence in the process. |
| LT2 | Ensure ‘guest lecturers’ are aware of the nature of the specific assessment demands on the students. |
| LT3 | Keep marking teams small where possible to make it easier to ensure consistency. |
| LT4 | Ensure programme meetings have a training element to allow time to consider marking and moderation and review best practice. |
| LT5 | Ensure assessment timelines enable students to demonstrate lessons learnt from formative assessment and to allow students to use material covered in the whole module. |
| LT6 | Ensure that you clarify with students how marks have been awarded at the individual task level and how marks are combined at the module/programme levels. |

Student Focused (S)

| S1 | Involve students directly in quality assurance and enrichment processes. |
| S2 | Consult and work with students in the development of University QA assessment and feedback documentation. |
| S3 | Ensure documentation is written in an accessible style for all stakeholders. |
AD 1 Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures: QA literacy continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

| PD1 | What procedures and processes are in place to ensure that colleagues have a good and current understanding of quality assurance and how this relates to the development of assessment practice? |
| PD2 | Do you have an easily accessible summary on key assessment regulations within Faculty and University that is available to all colleagues and students with clear and active links to relevant and updated information sets? |
| PD3 | Is there agreement on how, when, and where key information on processes and procedures is disseminated to students (e.g., one overarching virtual learning location; one key person or individual module leads; programme handbook)? |
| PD4 | How do Faculty Curriculum and Quality Teams support innovative developments in assessment practice; is colleagues' expertise being used fully? |
| PD5 | How are you ensuring additional support for lecturers new to a module? |
| PD6 | How are you ensuring that assessment policies, regulations, and processes are explicit, transparent, and accessible to all stakeholders? |
| PD7 | How are you ensuring student performance is equitably judged? |
| PD8 | How are you evaluating the effectiveness of marking and moderation processes/procedures? |
**AD 2 Promote Meaningful and Focused Assessment**

**Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)**

| LT1 | Ensure the nature of assessment is appropriate to meaningfully assess key learning outcomes (constructive alignment). |
| LT2 | Ensure the nature of assessment enables students to be engaged in the production of meaningful products (e.g., engaging in research; developing resources for the community; addressing key concerns within the wider world; have direct applications to professional practice; community input involved in assessment of products). |
| LT3 | Share principles underpinning the assessment design with students so that they can understand the rationale informing the nature of assessment. |
| LT4 | Ensure assessment tasks require students to engage deeply with the content. |
| LT5 | Produce a one page plan for all teams to show how modules fit within a programme. |

**Student Focused (S)**

| S1 | Work with students to develop aspects of assessment (timing of formative; selection of products for assessment, engaging with each other and the wider community etc.). |
| S2 | Encourage students to demonstrate how can they apply their learning both within and beyond the module (e.g., working in the community; real world issues; new designs; research). |
| S3 | Manage choice in assessment by negotiating with students exactly where the choices are and the limits of such choices (e.g., being clear on what students can lead on). |
| S4 | Involve students in developing and mapping learning outcomes within modules, and across the programme. |
| S5 | Work with students to demonstrate the linkages and progression from one module to the next so they are able to gain a holistic sense of how the programme fits together, and so they can understand the assessment requirements at each level. |
| S6 | Work with students to ensure ‘buy in’ to the assessment (creative engagement). |
AD 2 Promote Meaningful and Focused Assessment continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

PD1 How are you engaging students in meaningful assessment?
PD2 How are you streamlining assessment to ensure that you do not over-assess (e.g., focus on programme level assessment – key considerations include: ensuring coherence of modules; reducing the number of modules; rationalising learning outcomes; rethinking the types and patterns of assessment across the programme as a whole to ensure an integrated and developmental experience for the learner; rethinking the balance of formative and summative assessment)?
PD3 How are you encouraging collaborative design (e.g., involving colleagues beyond the module (programme team; QA team; Library Services etc.)?
PD4 How are you ensuring mechanisms for the development of programmes are appropriate to enable assessment practice to be responsive to needs?
PD5 How are you providing opportunities for teams to consider assessment holistically across modules to ensure progression; managed choice; rationalisation of learning outcomes?
PD6 How are you ensuring that all lecturers have a clear understanding of how their module(s) fit within the overall programme structure? Do you have a one page outline summarising this?
AD 3 Ensure access and equal opportunities

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

LT1 Ensure assessment is appropriate and manageable in relation to student level.

LT2 Support student transitions by providing an in-depth session or series of sessions that explore the students’ previous experiences of assessment and feedback and initial concerns that can be targeted in subsequent teaching sessions.

LT3 Ensure provision of all resources prior to students starting the module/programme (e.g., handbooks; virtual learning environment; assessment guidelines, and submission deadlines).

LT4 Ensure resources are clearly organised to promote access (provide a routemap/explanation of how resources are organised) and that students receive training in how to access and use resources.

LT5 Introduce early assessment opportunities to enable appropriate support to be put in place.

LT6 Ensure learning environments are adaptive rather than adapted and enable flexibility (opportunities for learner to proceed at appropriate pace; alternative pathways; opportunities to specialise and/or generalise etc.).

LT7 Ensure sufficient variety in the nature and forms of assessment matched to the learning outcome requirementsto enable all students to fully demonstrate their understanding.

LT8 Ensure choices in assessment and support learners to make informed choices (e.g., opportunities for individual and group working; self-selection of focus for assessment with guidance; choice over formative deadlines; modes of feedback; nature of groups and ways of working within and beyond sessions; ensure sufficient time to enable choices to be realised over a programme of study).
AD 3 Ensure access and equal opportunities continued

Student Focused (S)

S1 Encourage students to take responsibility to address their specific learning needs as to what they can do and what we can reasonably do in partnership to support each other.

S2 Ensure that assessment design including feedback is accessible to all students.

S3 Undertake early assessment to ascertain student needs and to engage students in undertaking their own audits of their needs.

S4 Provide students with managed choices as to how they navigate their learning environments and encourage students to take responsibility for their assessment choices.

S5 Support students’ development of networks of support so to ensure their integration into communities of practice to support their work at the University.

S6 Ensure students are aware of support mechanisms available to them across the University.

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

PD1 How are you ensuring an adaptive design (one that enables all students to access the curriculum)?

PD2 What is the agreed baseline expectation regarding resource provision including online provision?

PD3 How are all students’ needs being addressed as an integral part of design?

PD4 Is assessment design inclusive? How are you monitoring and evaluating inclusive assessment practice within and across modules and programmes?

PD5 Using a critical pedagogical stance- who is advantaged and disadvantaged by your assessment?

PD6 How is formative assessment supporting students to successfully manage their own learning?
AD 4 Ensure ongoing evaluation to support development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice

Lecturer/Teacher Focused (LT)

LT1 In developing sustainable assessment practice the key is in supporting students to manage the learning environment for themselves; evaluate how effectively your assessment design is enabling this.

LT2 Elicit short, sharp feedback from students on your teaching within taught sessions (e.g., through use of clickers; post-its; what went well; what could be better questions).

LT3 Demonstrate how student feedback is being taken on board (where appropriate) within teaching sessions.

LT4 Provide opportunities for frequent low stakes assessment tasks to support student engagement and to enable you to measure progress and/or stumbling blocks.

LT5 Set pre-tasks where students need to prepare focused questions for discussion in the taught session; enable student groups to take turns in producing model answers.

LT6 Demonstrate to students how mid-semester feedback is being used to inform learning and teaching and gain feedback from the students about the enhancements you have made.

LT7 Clarify with students where it is not appropriate to make requested changes and why.

Student Focused (S)

S1 Get students to write a 5 minute essay and share with peers for feedback and further discussion.

S2 Use the three minute elevator pitch idea (time it takes to get into and out of lift!) to get students to summarise key ideas and to gain feedback from peers.

S3 Collate student snapshots of feedback during and at end of programme to feed into developments.

S4 Get students to write guidance for students on key lessons that they learnt that would be useful to have known at the start.

S5 Get students to evaluate their own feedback seeking, giving, and using performance.
AD 4 Ensure ongoing evaluation to support development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice continued

Programme/Director Questions (PD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>How are you using and sharing feedback from students and staff to inform the development of your programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD2</td>
<td>How are you evaluating with teams what assessment enhancements have had the most impact and are also the most manageable within a short time frame?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD3</td>
<td>What are the mechanisms to ensure timely processing and sharing of feedback to inform programme development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD4</td>
<td>What are your assessment feedback priorities? How do these align with the University plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD5</td>
<td>How are you implementing ideas consistently across modules as part of your strategic plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD6</td>
<td>How are you ensuring regular programme meetings to agree principles underpinning assessment practice to ensure development of modules is in line with potential larger scale programme changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD7</td>
<td>What opportunities are there for staff to evaluate and further develop their assessment practice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F
Student Engagement in Assessment Feedback
Developing Student Engagement in Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Identify Your Position</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Literacy</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Explaining/discussing requirements with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling – one directional guidance on assessment criteria – lecturer to student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher driven rubrics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student generated rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of exemplars</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student development of exemplars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of assessment criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student reworking/creating assessment criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of glossaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student generated glossaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given assessment regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students contributing to development of regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Feedback</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on the teacher for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliance on range of sources – emphasis on developing student self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective feedback – one directional from teacher to student – work corrected</td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of how to correct with the responsibility on the student to apply the approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of guidance on how to improve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student responsibility for developing action plan based on feedback on how to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks students to reflect on their feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides frameworks to support students in reflection involving dialogic practices and focused application to demonstrate understanding rather than reflection alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive – solutions provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges the student to find solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the immediate requirements of the module task</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on application of learning within and beyond the course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing Student Engagement in Assessment
continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Identify Your Position</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Design</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Assessment tasks designed with and by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tasks designed for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher summative assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student and teacher summative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher ownership of assessment tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student ownership of assessment tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks designed exclusively to meet specific learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks designed to meet learning outcomes and to go beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly scaffolded learning tasks – students regulated and told what to do</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students taught to self-regulate as part of course design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources to support learning provided but relationship between them not made explicit</td>
<td></td>
<td>All key resources available from the outset to enable student control of learning and signposted in relation to tasks and key crunch points – clear links to resources provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance mainly provided by teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students supported to build networks and to identify guidance from range of sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources provided for students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students/teachers generate resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for self-assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing aligned opportunities for self-assessment from start to finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities to explore assessment holistically and to explore potential issues – teacher directs solution-finding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Key threshold concepts identified from the outset. Students encouraged to provide resources to support understanding in areas seen as difficult, and to find own solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix G
Tools to Evaluate Practice

- G1: Planning Change
- G2: Overarching Assessment Principles Checklists
- G3: Quality Assuring Assessment Practices
- G4: Evidencing Practice
Tools to evaluate your practice at individual, team, and institutional levels

G1: Planning Change

1. What is currently the strongest aspect of your assessment and feedback at individual/module/programme-suite of programmes? How do you know this is the case?

2. Which aspect of assessment and feedback is most in need of improvement? How do you know?

3. How could you strengthen the sense of shared purpose regarding assessment and feedback within your team(s)? What key principles underpin your practice? How are these shared?

4. How could you engage students in improving or refining the approach to assessment and feedback?

5. How well aligned are your assessment tasks with your intended learning outcomes? How could this be improved?

6. What is the most authentic example of assessment on your module/ programme(s)? What changes could be made to other assessments to make them more authentic?

7. What formative tasks do you currently use to support summative assessment? How could these be strengthened to enable students to self-assess their performance?

8. As a team do you have a shared understanding of what the core content is and what constitutes good? How could you develop this for colleagues and students?

9. What aspect of assessment and feedback are your students most bothered about? How can you address this?

10. If students are not using feedback, do you know why not? What can you do to address this?


G2 Assessment Design Principles Checklist

1. Arrange these principles in order of importance to you and your team.

2. What do these terms mean to you? Do you have shared understandings of them?

3. Is anything core missing – please add in any additional items.

4. Explain how you have interpreted these in your own practice.
## G2: Overarching Assessment Principles Checklists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-informed – practice informed</th>
<th>How are you meeting these in your design?</th>
<th>What challenges/compromises?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared beliefs and values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-staff partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it promoting student and staff agency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it supporting individuals to self-manage their own learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in meaningful learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Underpinned by theoretical and conceptual frameworks

**Holistic**
How does your design of assessment consider the student learning journey as a whole?

How are assessments promoting the synthesis of work from across the programme?

**Self-regulatory**
How are you supporting students to manage their learning for themselves?

How are learner cognitive/metacognitive/affective dispositions being developed?

Does assessment require a deep approach?

**Student-Staff Partnership**
How are you building this?

What different models are you supporting?

**Sensitive to Context**
Are you aware of the differential needs of your student population, and what facilitators and barriers impact their assessment journeys?

How fine-tuned are assessments to ensure they are the most suitable means of assessing knowledge, understanding and skills within the discipline?

**Inclusive**
How are you ensuring that assessment design is not disadvantaging any groups of students?

How are you using principles such as Universal Design, for example, to ensure all students have access to the curriculum?
Underpinned by theoretical and conceptual frameworks continued

**Sustainable**
Pedagogical & Best use of Resource Perspectives

**Integrative**
How are you using assessment to develop and integrate the curriculum?

How do all elements fit together within and across modules?

How coherent is your assessment design within your module?

**Shared Beliefs and Values**
What are your beliefs and values about assessment and learning?

How are you developing and sharing understanding of assessment principles with students & colleagues?

**Promoting Student and Staff Agency**
How are you promoting student/lecturer ownership of learning and assessment?

**Engagement in Meaningful Learning Experiences**
How are you ensuring the assessment learning outcomes, tasks, and practices are relevant?

How does your design encourage students to develop a deep approach?
# Key Considerations in Implementing Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Considerations</th>
<th>Things to think about</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Beliefs and values</td>
<td>How are you ensuring staff and students are on the same page?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Choice</td>
<td>How are you defining choice and where too much choice is detrimental?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Clarity/clear communication</td>
<td>How are you ensuring transparency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Coherence/alignment</td>
<td>How are you ensuring it all fits together?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Consistency</td>
<td>How are you defining consistency? Where is it essential/not essential? (Be careful about limiting creativity and straitjacketing).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Entitlement for staff and students</td>
<td>How are you ensuring agency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Equity</td>
<td>How are you defining inclusivity? What practices are unintentionally exclusive? Think about universal design principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Measuring what we value</td>
<td>What are the best ways to measure effectiveness from pedagogical perspectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Relevance</td>
<td>Think about currency of curriculum and agility of systems to respond to change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sustainability</td>
<td>Consider from self-regulation and manageability perspectives where efforts are best placed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL 1: Clarify what constitutes good</td>
<td>Students should receive explicit guidance on the requirements of assessment tasks from the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL1.1</td>
<td>Criteria for assessment should be as clear as possible to tutors, examiners, and students to ensure equity, validity, and reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL1.2</td>
<td>What constitutes good academic practice should be made clear to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL1.3</td>
<td>All those involved in the teaching, learning and assessment on a programme (staff and students) should be trained in assessment feedback practices including the requirements of good academic practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL 2: Clarify how assessment elements fit together</td>
<td>How all the different elements of assessment fit together across a programme should be made clear to students from the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL2.1</td>
<td>The pattern of assessment should be considered at the programme level to ensure coherence and progression in the development of knowledge, skills, and understanding in relation to learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL2.2</td>
<td>How formative and summative assessment operates across a whole programme should be made clear to students and staff from the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL 3: Clarify student and staff entitlement</td>
<td>Every student should be provided with clear and current information that specifies the learning opportunities and support available to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL3.1</td>
<td>The role and expectations of students in assessment and feedback practices should be clarified with all students from the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL3.2</td>
<td>Information regarding student entitlement should be clear and consistent in module and programme handbooks and online provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL3.3</td>
<td>Principles underpinning the assessment and feedback design should be made clear to students to enable them to engage fully in assessment and feedback practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL 4: Clarify the requirements of the discipline</td>
<td>All students should be inducted into the requirements of the discipline and what is to be a member of such a community from the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL4.1</td>
<td>Core and threshold concepts should be identified at module and programme levels in order to support student progression throughout a programme of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL4.2</td>
<td>Assessments should be relevant to the requirements of the discipline and related professional, statutory and regulatory bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL4.3</td>
<td>Assessments should be designed to encourage a deep approach to learning within the discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**G3: Quality Assuring Assessment Practice: Assessment Literacy**
# G3: Quality Assuring Assessment Practice: Assessment Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF1: Provide accessible feedback</strong></td>
<td>Feedback should be focused on supporting students’ learning in ‘how to improve.’ Feedback should directly relate to the assessment criteria and the learning outcomes being assessed and all students should receive parity of treatment. The feedback method used should be appropriate for the assessment task. The rationale for the awarded mark should be clear. The effectiveness and efficiency of feedback mechanisms should be evaluated on an ongoing and iterative basis with students and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF2: Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback</strong></td>
<td>There should be early opportunities to assess students’ competence in key areas of knowledge, skills, and understanding to enable students’ to benchmark where they are at, and where they need to get to. Feedback should be given in sufficient time to enable a student to use the feedback prior to summative assessment. Formative feedback tasks should directly relate to summative tasks and the links between them should be made clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF3: Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement</strong></td>
<td>There should be regular opportunities for students and staff to engage in dialogue to enhance understandings of assessment and feedback and relevant standards in order to understand what is required from, and entailed in, the assessment process. Peer engagement activities should be authentic and relevant. Where students are involved in peer teaching and feedback activities expectations regarding student participation should be made clear from the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF4: Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills</strong></td>
<td>Assessment and feedback practices should support students to successfully manage their own learning. Learning opportunities should be made available to students to support them in reflecting on their own learning and enable them to develop the skills to self-monitor and self-evaluate their performance. Students should be made aware of existing networks of support that are available to them (discipline and University) and supported in developing their own networks of support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## G3: Quality Assuring Assessment Practice: Assessment Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Design</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD1: Ensure robust and transparent processes and procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD1.1 Assessment policies should be created in partnership with students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD1.2 Assessment policies, regulations, and processes must ensure that the academic standard for each award of credit/qualification is rigorous and maintained at the appropriate standard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD1.3 Assessment should be fit for purpose. Assessment tasks should be designed to effectively measure the intended module/programme learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD1.4 Student performance should be equitably judged against the standards set.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD2: Promote meaningful and focused assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2.1 Assessment and feedback practices should be informed by best practice underpinned by research, discipline-specific and educational scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2.2 Assessment design should be underpinned by effective assessment and feedback principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2.3 Assessment practices should be holistic in taking into account assessment literacy, assessment feedback, and assessment design. Learning and assessment should be integrated and fully aligned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2.4 Assessment should be relevant and enable students to be engaged in the production of meaningful products.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2.5 Assessment tasks should be sufficiently challenging to enable all students to demonstrate the best level of attainment of which they are capable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2.6 Technology should be used appropriately to support the sustainability and enhancement of assessment practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD2.7 Assessment practices should be sustainable and manageable for students and staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD3: Ensure access and equal opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD3.1 Assessment and feedback practices should be inclusive. They should provide every student with an equal and effective opportunity to access learning and teaching opportunities and to achieve the intended learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD4: Ensure ongoing evaluation to support development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD4.1 Students should be given a range of opportunities to effectively contribute to the design, delivery, and evaluation of assessment and feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD4.2 Feedback from a range of sources (staff and student feedback; external examiner reports; learning gain measures/analytics) should be analysed appropriately to ensure the continued effectiveness of the assessment feedback strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD4.3 How student feedback has been used to inform programme/module development should be clearly communicated to students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD4.4 Assessment practices should be regularly evaluated and developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD4.5 Assessment practice should be aligned to University Plans and Strategies. It should be cognizant of the wider HE context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## G4: Evidencing Practice  Assessment G4A:

A student evaluation questionnaire (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested student question?</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example AL 1</strong></td>
<td>Clarify what constitutes good.</td>
<td>Do the students at your institution know what the marking criteria is? Do they understand what they need to do to meet the assessment criteria and learning outcomes?</td>
<td>It is sometimes available and sometimes it is not. There is no consistent approach</td>
<td>Not when it is not available</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL 1</strong></td>
<td>Clarify what constitutes good.</td>
<td>Are you clear about what you need to do to meet the assessment requirements? (assessment criteria and learning outcomes required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL 2</strong></td>
<td>Clarify how assessment elements fit together.</td>
<td>Do you understand how the programme fits together and what will be required of you at each stage of the process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL 3</strong></td>
<td>Student and staff entitlement.</td>
<td>Are you clear about your roles in assessment and feedback and how you are expected to engage? Do you have a clear understanding of how your assessment fits into your learning and how it will be marked?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL 4</strong></td>
<td>Clarify the requirements of the discipline.</td>
<td>Do you have a good understanding of the core concepts within your discipline that you will need to master? Is information and guidance to support mastery of difficult concepts made clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment G4A:

A student evaluation questionnaire (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested student question?</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF1</strong> Provide accessible feedback. Specific and focused on how to improve. Encourage students to clarify the feedback.</td>
<td>Do the staff at your institution provide feedback that makes it clear how you could improve, any areas that were not good and why? Does the feedback you receive enable you to enhance the quality of your work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF2</strong> Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback. The pattern and timing of assessment, and alignment of formative to summative assessment.</td>
<td>Does your institution provide early opportunities for you to assess how you are doing so you can take appropriate actions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF3</strong> Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement.</td>
<td>Have you received any training in how to work with peers? Are expectations made clear about what you need to have prepared for teaching sessions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF 4</strong> Promote development of students' self-evaluation skills. Self monitoring, self assessment.</td>
<td>Does your institution support you in developing your self-assessment skills through for example, engaging in marking your own and that of others; discussing different approaches to studying etc)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment G4A:

**A student evaluation questionnaire (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019) continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested student question?</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 1</strong> Do I have a good understanding of HE assessment processes and regulations?</td>
<td>Do you have a good understanding of the assessment regulations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you feel that the processes for how work is marked and moderated are clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have confidence in the assessment procedures?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 2</strong> Promote meaningful and focused assessment.</td>
<td>Do you feel that the assessments encourage you to learn the materials in depth so you can apply what has been learnt beyond the programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you think you are challenged enough in your studying?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 3</strong> Ensure access and equal opportunities.</td>
<td>Do you feel assessments are designed to bring out the best in you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you know how to access and use available learning resources within your institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment G4A:

A student evaluation questionnaire (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested student question?</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 4</strong> Ensure ongoing evaluation to support the development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice.</td>
<td>Do you contribute to ongoing review and evaluation of your courses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you know how your feedback on the course has been used to inform development of it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 4</strong> Supporting the development of the programme. Am I giving useful feedback on how to enhance assessment feedback practice? How am I owning the programme?</td>
<td>Does your institution provide you with opportunities to develop and contribute to the programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## G4: Evidencing Practice Assessment G4B:

An assessment questionnaire for Institutions (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested Institution question</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example AL 1</strong></td>
<td>Clarify what constitutes good.</td>
<td>Do the staff at your institution know what a good assessment looks like?</td>
<td>There is an online resource available for staff to access that explains how to set a good assessment.</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>All new staff are required to complete the course within the first week of starting. But, there is no follow up support for them when creating assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL 1</strong></td>
<td>Clarify what constitutes good.</td>
<td>Are disciplinary teams at your institution able to articulate what a good assessment is, and what suitable assessment types looks like?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are there mechanisms in place for staff to consider different modes of assessment and to assess what are the best assessment types for a specific task?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does your institution provide clear guidance on how assessments and learning outcomes fit together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL 2</strong></td>
<td>Clarify how assessment elements fit together.</td>
<td>Do the staff at your institution understand how assessment works and its purposes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do all teaching staff understand how their module/course fits within whole program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would the staff be able to articulate the whole student assessment journey?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment G4B:

#### An assessment questionnaire for Institutions (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested Institution question</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;Student and staff entitlement.</td>
<td>Is the responsibility among both parties clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the boundaries of the roles of different parties clearly articulated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does your institution encourage student feedback development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there clear mechanisms for providing feedback?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do I know what: feedback looks like, support I am entitled to, my role in feedback is?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AL 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;Clarify the requirements of the discipline. Am I aware of the key concepts and main ways of working?</td>
<td>Is there a clear process for mapping the requirements of the programme – ‘a discipline course blueprint’?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the process for sharing this blueprint with students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the process for inducting students into ways of thinking within a discipline?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are baseline tests undertaken at student point of entry to support learning and to assess needs and starting points in curriculum delivery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Assessment G4B:**

An assessment questionnaire for Institutions (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested Institution question</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF1</strong> Provide accessible feedback. Specific and focused on how to improve. Encourage students to clarify the feedback.</td>
<td>What are the baselines for meaningful feedback? How are these supported and developed within teams?  Have the staff agreed upon evidence-based best feedback type for the discipline? Is there consistency in the quality of feedback provided?  How is feedback built into systems and monitored? Is feedback best placed to have maximum impact?  Does your institution provide training for staff on providing meaningful feedback?  Does your institution review assessment feedback to ensure it is clear and fair?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF2</strong> Provide early opportunities for students to act on feedback. The pattern and timing of assessment, and alignment of formative to summative assessment.</td>
<td>Are there early opportunities provided within a course for students to check their understanding (quizzes, three minute articles, pre-tests etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment G4B:

**An assessment questionnaire for Institutions (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019)** continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested Institution question</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF3</strong> Prepare students for meaningful dialogue/peer engagement.</td>
<td>Do you provide support and advice on engaging students in programme design, or facilitation of peer engagement models?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are students trained to work as members of teams? Is there training in marking and moderation? Are expectations made clear about how students are supposed to work together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AF 4</strong> Promote development of students’ self-evaluation skills. Self monitoring, self assessment.</td>
<td>Are opportunities provided for training in curriculum design and techniques to support students in developing self-assessment skills? How is supporting students in accurately judging the quality of their own work, to understand, design and manage own learning being promoted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Assessment G4B:**

**An assessment questionnaire for Institutions (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019) continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested Institution question</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do I have a good understanding of HE assessment processes and regulations?&lt;br&gt;How are teams ensuring that assessment is up to date and compliant with national, institutional, disciplinary, professional regulations?&lt;br&gt;Is there a code of practice for quality assurance?&lt;br&gt;Are mechanisms in place to ensure that all team members are aware of assessment requirements and standards?&lt;br&gt;Are colleagues provided with the opportunity to develop skills in quality assurance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Promote meaningful and focused assessment.</td>
<td>How are teams ensuring that the assessments are appropriately challenging and require students to engage deeply to understand the material (relevant, authentic, current)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Assessment G4B:

**An assessment questionnaire for Institutions (EUA, Roberts & Evans et al., 2019) continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original statement</th>
<th>Suggested Institution question</th>
<th>What is currently happening?</th>
<th>Is it effective?</th>
<th>How do we know?</th>
<th>What could be done to improve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ensure access and equal opportunities.</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms to check whether any students are being disadvantaged by the nature of assessments&lt;br&gt;Is training provided to help staff understand how assessment design impacts on different types of student?&lt;br&gt;Do teams map where key assessment resources and support mechanisms can be located for students?&lt;br&gt;Are resources available at point of entry for all students and have they been assessed to ensure accessibility for all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ensure ongoing evaluation to support the development of sustainable assessment and feedback practice.</td>
<td>Are there mechanisms in place for ongoing evaluation?&lt;br&gt;Is there regular review of assessment and feedback practices?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 4 Supporting the development of the programme.&lt;br&gt;Am I giving useful feedback on how to enhance assessment feedback practice? How am I owning the programme?</td>
<td>Does your institution provide you with opportunities to develop and contribute to the programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H
Professional Development
Recognition and Reward

Assessment and Fellowships

In the following section, guidance on meeting associate, fellow, senior fellow and principal fellow recognition (Advance HE) utilising assessment examples are included. In preparing your case, prompts are provided to support reflection on your own practice.
Descriptor 1: Engage HEA Associate Fellow

You will need to provide evidence of effectiveness in relation to your professional role which will include some teaching and or support of learning and teaching activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible roles</th>
<th>Is this you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early career researchers with some teaching responsibilities (e.g., UG and PhD students, GTAs, contract researchers/postdoctoral students etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New to teaching (including those with part-time academic responsibilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting academic provision (e.g., learning technologists, learning developers and learning resource/library staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrator/ technician role with some teaching-related responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced staff in relevant professional areas but new to teaching and/or supporting learning, and/or who have a limited teaching portfolio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in supervising students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Examples of relevant activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrates an understanding of specific aspects of effective teaching, learning support methods and student learning | - Teaching/mentoring responsibilities as a team member within an established programme
- Informing assessment literacy: working with learners/ supporting understanding of what good is.
- Providing constructive feedback: (formative and summative) to students in teaching/facilitation roles
- Contributing to assessment design: Developing learning and teaching materials, resources, methods and approaches.
- Contributing to skills development of learners/students, e.g., introducing the use of techniques and/or equipment.
- Using a range of technologies to support the learning of others and one’s own professional development in relation to teaching
- Evaluation of sessions or activities, reflecting on the information and changing practice
- Critically evaluating the support offered to learners
- Establishing an initial appreciation and knowledge of HE quality assurance processes |
| 1.1 Successful engagement with Areas of Activity | |
| 1.2 Appropriate teaching and practices related to chosen activity areas | |
| 1.3 Appropriate Core Knowledge and understanding of at least K1 and K2 | |
| 1.4 A commitment to appropriate Professional Values in facilitating others’ learning (V1–4) | |
| 1.5 Relevant professional practices, subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities | |
| 1.6 Successful engagement, where appropriate, in professional development activity related to teaching, learning and assessment responsibilities | |
Descriptor 2: Engage HEA Fellow

Recognises effectiveness in teaching (assessment practices) and enhancing the student learning experience, combined with scholarship, research and/or other professional activities; this is more broadly based learning and teaching compared to AFHEA. You are expected to meet all UKPSF descriptors and would usually be most applicable for those with at least two years’ experience within a higher education environment in teacher and/or supporting learning and teaching. You are likely to be an established member of one or more academic/academic related teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible roles:</th>
<th>Is this you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early career academics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic-related and/or support staff holding substantive teaching and learning responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced academics relatively new to UK higher education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting academic provision (e.g., learning technologists, learning developers and learning resource/library staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff with (sometimes significant) teaching-only responsibilities including, for example, within work-based settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff involved in PGR/PGT doctoral supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In exceptional circumstances UG/PG students engaged in sustained support of RAP activities*
Descriptor 2: Engage HEA Fellow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Examples of relevant activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of effective approaches to teaching and learning support as key contributions to high quality student learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of:</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Literacy</strong>&lt;br&gt; ■ Developing processes to enhance doctoral supervision&lt;br&gt; ■ Identifying core and threshold concepts within your discipline,&lt;br&gt; ■ Developing guidance materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Successful engagement with all Areas of Activity</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Feedback</strong>&lt;br&gt; ■ Selecting and utilising relevant assessment instruments and criteria for formative and summative assessment&lt;br&gt; ■ Providing critical and constructive feedback and guidance to learners&lt;br&gt; ■ Supervising students work in learning, teaching and/or research activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Successful engagement in appropriate teaching and practices related to these areas</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Design</strong>&lt;br&gt; ■ Identifying the learning needs of students and writing appropriate learning outcomes.&lt;br&gt; ■ Ensuring alignment between the content, learning and teaching methods and materials, and the learning outcomes.&lt;br&gt; ■ Selecting and developing appropriate teaching methods and materials for a variety of scenarios (ranging from small group tutorials to large lectures).&lt;br&gt; ■ Selecting and utilising appropriate technologies to support and enhance approaches to learning, teaching and assessment.&lt;br&gt; ■ Using reflection to develop personal teaching, e.g., modifying practice in response to student and peer review/feedback, analysis of the effectiveness of teaching design and delivery.&lt;br&gt; ■ Participating in teaching-related observations and mentoring activities to improve professional practice.&lt;br&gt; ■ Engaging with formal internal quality assurance processes mediated by an external examiner.&lt;br&gt; ■ Engaging in training and development opportunities to improve your personal practice including peer feedback; analysis of effectiveness of design/delivery; analysis of learner needs.&lt;br&gt; ■ Consolidating knowledge of the role of external evaluation as part of formal assurance processes. Developing and reviewing QA processes to support learning and teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Appropriate knowledge and understanding across all aspects of Core Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 A commitment to all Professional Values in facilitating others’ learning (V1–4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Successful engagement in continuing professional development in relation to teaching, learning, assessment and, where appropriate, related professional practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptor 3: Engage HEA Senior Fellow

You need to be able to demonstrate **sustained effectiveness and academic leadership** in developing assessment practice and in enhancing the student learning experience, combined with scholarship, research and/or other professional activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible roles:</th>
<th>Is this you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced staff able to demonstrate, impact and influence through, for example, responsibility for leading, managing or organising programmes, subjects and/or disciplinary areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced subject mentors and staff who support those new to teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced staff with departmental and/or wider teaching and learning support advisory responsibilities within an institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced staff supporting the development of doctoral supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues leading on learning and teaching initiatives that may not be part of their official role (e.g., RAP representatives for a discipline; university task-group leader; research network lead etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In exceptional circumstances UG/PG students engaged in sustained support of RAP activities*
## Descriptor 3: Engage HEA Senior Fellow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Examples of relevant activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrates a broad understanding of effective approaches to teaching and learning support as key contributions to high quality student learning. (3.7) This requires the successful co-ordination, support, supervision, management and/or mentoring of others (individuals and/or teams) in relation to teaching and learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of: | ■ Demonstrating leadership in the design, delivery and evaluation of programmes of study  
■ Designing and utilising innovative teaching approaches and materials, incorporating the use of technology where appropriate  
■ Incorporation of discipline and pedagogic research and/or scholarship into learning and teaching, and evaluating its effectiveness  
■ Ensuring that programme design and delivery complies with relevant quality standards and regulations  
■ Successful co-ordination, support, supervision, management and/or mentoring of others (whether individuals and/or teams) in relation to teaching and learning  
■ Operational leadership within own institutional setting (e.g., in developing and/or leading local policy, implementation, participating in relevant committees, peer review of programme validation and subject review, participation in the ENGAGE Accreditation Panel and/or engage Management Group  
■ Providing pedagogic leadership in initiatives/projects, providing peer feedback e.g., as a mentor  
■ Undertaking responsibilities in an external capacity beyond your institution (e.g., serving scholarly/professional societies; reviewing and providing feedback as a peer reviewer; contributing to pedagogically focused research journals/grant awarding bodies  
■ Demonstrating effective practice as an external assessor  
■ Contributing to reviews of internal quality assurance processes |
| 3.1 /3.4 Successful engagement with all Areas of Activity and successful engagement in appropriate teaching and practices related to these areas |  
| 3.2 Appropriate knowledge and understanding across all aspects of Core Knowledge |  
| 3.3 A commitment to all Professional Values |  
| 3.5 Successful incorporation of subject and pedagogic research and/or scholarship within the above activities, as part of an integrated approach to academic practice |  
| 3.6 Successful engagement in continuing professional development in relation to teaching, learning, assessment and related professional practices  
3.7 needs to be applied to all above |
Descriptor 4: Engage HEA Principal Fellow

Recognises a **sustained and effective record of impact at strategic level** in developing assessment practice; and/ or a wider commitment to academic practice and strategic leadership in teaching and enhancing the student learning experience at institutional, national and/or international categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible roles:</th>
<th>Is this you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly experienced and/or senior staff with wide-ranging academic or academic-related strategic leadership responsibilities in connection with key aspects of teaching and supporting learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff responsible for, and/or engaged in, institutional strategic leadership and policy-making in the area of teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff who have strategic impact and influence in relation to teaching and learning that extends beyond their own institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Descriptor 4: Engage HEA Principal Fellow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Examples of relevant activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrates a sustained record of effective strategic leadership in academic practice and academic development as a key contribution to high quality student learning. Individuals should be able to provide evidence of: | - Strategic leadership in relation to the management of change and innovation to enhance students’ and colleagues’ understanding of, and engagement in, assessment and feedback across the institution, or of wider influence e.g., innovations in assessment and feedback  
- Making a significant and sustained leadership contribution to assessment and feedback within the institution at a policy level (e.g., initiating and/or leading changes in assessment; participating in (and often chairing) programme evaluation, review of assessment and feedback; other audit-related activity), including where appropriate reviews of quality assurance and quality enhancement processes  
- External roles (e.g., consultancy/professional advice, external examining, institutional reviews, programme evaluations, contributions to scholarly and professional societies, contributions to wider policy making and the development of assessment and feedback practice)  
- Achieving national and/or international recognition through contributions to the development of research and practice in assessment and feedback (including pedagogic innovation, applied (e.g., educational, pedagogic research and scholarship, research funding; scaling-up initiatives; presentations, impact on enhancement of assessment practices within and beyond the institution through curriculum development)  
- Integrated academic practice |
| 1. Active commitment to and championing of all Dimensions of the Framework, through work with students and staff, and in institutional developments |  
| 2. Successful, strategic leadership to enhance student learning, with a particular, but not necessarily exclusive, focus on enhancing teaching quality in institutional, and/or (inter)national settings |  
| 3. Establishing effective organisational policies and/or strategies for supporting and promoting others (e.g., through mentoring, coaching) in delivering high quality teaching and support for learning |  
| 4. Championing, within institutional and/or wider settings, an integrated approach to academic practice (incorporating, for example, teaching, learning, research, scholarship, administration etc.) |  
| 5. A sustained and successful commitment to, and engagement in, continuing professional development related to academic, institutional and/or other professional practices |
Developing Case Studies

Key Considerations

- What is your specific assessment focus and why is it important?
- What is the bigger picture regarding what you are focusing on? What viewpoints predominate? What have been key developments in this area (across disciplines and contexts from local to international level)?
- What key research (conceptual and empirical) and practice has informed what you are doing? What are the dominant theoretical perspectives and approaches that are relevant to what you are doing?
- Explain the nature of the context in which you are working. What is the scale of inquiry (individual; team; discipline; faculty/school; university and cross-institutional).
- Explain the rationale underpinning your approaches. What are the core ideas and practices that embody what you are doing (the central premise; underpinning beliefs and values; modus operandi)?
- How have you designed and implemented your ideas/concepts?
- How have you evaluated the relative success of what you have done?
- How have you addressed ethical concerns in the development and evaluation of your practice?
- How can your findings be used, and adapted by others?

See Evans, Kandiko-Howson, Forsythe, and Edwards (2020)
Developing Case Studies continued

Evaluating the Quality of your Case Study (ies)

1. **Pedagogical Clarity** – (i) the specific pedagogical approaches being used; (ii) has impact been considered?; what is being evaluated for impact?; (iii) what are the context requirements and issues? Is it clear what you did and how you did it for someone to be able to replicate it?

2. **Methodological Transparency** – is it clear how you did what you did – what informed your approach, how did you carry it out – how was evaluation planned into what you did and how were the students informed of what you were doing as part of the teaching and learning experience.

3. **Methodological Congruence** – coherence between claims and what you did and how it was evaluated.

4. **Evidence-based** – (i) Are your conclusions supported by your data? To what extent can your claims be upheld? How are you addressing issues of reliability and validity? What is the nature of the quality of the data you collected? What about students who did not participate? Are patterns persistent? Are any recorded changes in behaviour sustained? Do all students benefit equally? Are you evidencing what works and what also doesn’t?

5. **Accessibility of Findings** – are implications and recommendations from the study explicit and accessible to those outside of your discipline?

6. **Transferability** – do the findings have applications in other situations beyond the immediate discipline?
Critical Reflection on Practice: Supporting Senior and Principal Fellowship Applications

(Evans, 2015)

Context
- Scene setting: What is the context in which you are working: your roles within and beyond HE? What is possible?
- Domains within you work: discipline specific/generic; within and beyond Faculty...
- Areas of specific responsibility...
- Passion: what drives your learning and teaching/strategy – why is it important?
- What are your aspirations regarding development of your pedagogic approach (SF)/ and wider reaching strategy (PF)?

Pedagogical Approach
- What are the key features/elements of your learning and teaching approach/strategy?
- What has informed your development of these?
- What key principles/theoretical frameworks underpin your work and how have you enacted these in practice?
- How has research and practice impacted your approach?
- What is your understanding of effective practice within your domain?
- Clarify your integrated approach to practice (PF)?
Critical Reflection on Practice: Supporting Senior and Principal Fellowship Applications continued

(Evans, 2015)

Your Learning Journey
- How has CPD – formal and informal (e.g., events; training; experiences at work; research) impacted your beliefs and practice?
- Which experiences have been particularly significant to you and why?
- Note specific achievements/qualifications...
- How have you used these experiences/ideas within your practice?
- Can you provide evidence of sustained commitment and engagement in CPD and evidence of impact (PF)?

Impact/Evidence
- In what ways has your work impacted your own development and practice and that of others’?
- On what evidence are you drawing to evaluate levels of success? How do we know...
- Can you provide a range of suitable evidence? (Brookfield’s lenses (self; colleagues; students; research, etc.)
- Can you evidence sustained impact (SF/PF)?
- Can you evidence impact in wider learning and teaching contexts (PF)?
- Be specific!
Critical Reflection on Practice: Supporting Senior and Principal Fellowship Applications continued

(Evans, 2015)

Case Studies/Descriptors
- Do you have a clear rationale for your choice of cases/descriptors? Do they complement one another to show the range and depth of your work? (What are the key golden nuggets you want to stress?)
- What was your specific role in initiatives?
  - (Cases: SF must show leadership – coordinating, supporting, managing and mentoring of others with sustained effect on learning and teaching);
  - (Descriptors: PF must tap into your leadership of a strategic integrated approach to academic practice institutionally and/or internationally.

Critical Evaluation
- What were the key elements that led to success – was it equally successful for all? What was less successful and why? (think critical pedagogy)
- What have you learnt personally from this journey?
- How have you used feedback to develop ideas?
- What can be done to further improve your approaches? How are you taking your ideas forward and why?
- Further potential of work...
- What further CPD are you engaging in and supporting the development of (PF)?
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