Can more dialogue in feedback enhance 'feed-forward'[1]?

Background

My starting point for developing this work was a growing awareness that some of our assessment procedures were not as effective as possible and a desire to enhance the emphasis on learning within the assessment process. Students testified to this in informal conversations and in the 2011 NSS, in which students on the Acting BA hons reported very positively in all areas of their learning experience except Assessment and feedback. [2] Making a comparison between the written feedback for the current and the previous semester revealed that many of the comments were repeated; some of the students were not acting on the feedback. It is not feeding forward.

 There could be many reasons for this lack of 'feed-forward': individual students develop different aspects of their acting and performance skills at different rates, and that might necessitate repeating a note or a phrase several times before it is acted upon.   There could even be a flaw in the course design and the teaching was not actually delivering the intended Learning outcomes, but then one would expect that the feedback for all students would contain repeated comments, and that was not the case.

I was interested in the qualitative aspect: how students' experienced feedback, how they understood its relationship to learning, how they could participate more actively in the process and how, if at all, this could affect their perception of assessment. It would be very difficult to take a quantitive approach and draw any meaningful conclusions from research conducted with such a small target group – just 14 students – so my choice was guided by practical considerations too.

Literature review

Assessment in Higher Education is a well-researched and documented area of investigation and research. In his chapter 'How assessment frames student learning'[3],   Graham Gibbs cites eleven 'Conditions under which assessment supports learning' which shows up some shortcomings in our current assessment practice. The aspects relating to quality,

---

[1] Hattie,J. and Timperley, H.: 'The Power of Feedback' *in Review of Education Research* vol 77, 2007.

[2] See appendix 1

[3] Gibbs, G. 'How Assessment frames student learning' *in Innovative Assessment in Higher education*, ed. C. Bryan and K.Clegg, Routledge, 2006, p.29-301

distribution, quality and level of student effort appear to be working well in our assessment procedure while the themes of 'Quantity and timing of feedback', and 'Quality of feedback' and 'Student response to feedback'[4] could be improved.

'6. Feedback is provided quickly enough to be useful to the students' [5]

 Usually, written feedback is given to the students at the end of the semester, but this is long after the project is over and for some elements of the modules they receive feedback as much as 8 weeks after the assignment is completed. They get formative verbal feedback constantly as part of the process of working, but it seems – from the NSS data [6] and from the questionnaire responses[7] - that they do not recognise this as having the same weight as the written feedback and the marks. This may be linked to an uneven level of student response to feedback and agency to improve their work is uneven. But giving them more structured, verbal feedback at an interim point in the delivery of a module, not just 'on the hoof' in classes, as notes on rehearsal, could mean that feedback was prompt 'enough to be useful' and signposted enough to be recognised, which in turn could allow them to act upon it. This change would also allow the written summative feedback for the Acting class to have a more formative function within the module.

'7. Feedback focusses on learning, rather than marks or students'. [8]

 This can be difficult to achieve within a small institution and giving feedback on acting, because the teacher develops a close relationship with the students and this can personalise the assessment. The worst scenario would be that the teacher assesses based on an expectation of student achievement which is fixed and prejudiced, as in 'That is a 2.2.student.' In this 'up close and personal' context, the student might reinterpret the given mark according to whether the tutor is seen to be a 'hard' or 'soft' marker or whether they think the tutor likes them or not. Teachers are also battling against a culture of mark-fixated primary and secondary education experience, which shapes student expectation. In assessment generally, students can personalise the mark, regarding it not as an evaluation of their work in that context, but of themselves, as in 'I am a 2.2 person', not 'I did a piece of work that got a 2.2'.   This can be damaging for the learning process, demotivating students, undermining their confidence and distracting them from the purpose of the work. It was desirable to create a mechanism for

---

[4] Gibbs, G (2006) op.cit

[5] Gibbs, G (2006) op.cit

[6] Appendix 1

[7] Appendix 2

[8] Gibbs, G (2006) op.cit

assessment that would focus on the learning and offer students and tutors an opportunity to sidestep the negative aspects of a close interpersonal relationship.

Gibbs suggests that 'It is not until students apply criteria and standards to judge their own work as part of self- supervision while working (omitted text) that their work will improve'[9]. This notion of internalising the learning outcomes could provide a way of not only evaluating their work, but also of enhancing their learning. However, Gammon and Lawrence, in their investigation of applying 'flow theory' to assessment, seem to advocate the opposite: that 'not giving details of what is required to complete the assessment successfully' would allow the students to 'focus on the (learning) activity for its own sake' [10] This illuminates the particular nature of actors in training: the activity of acting can be seen to require that the students 'trust their abilities and skills', to 'let go of the ledge'[11] and the assessment could be incorporated into the critical reflection process that is part of creative practice.

'8. Feedback is linked to the purpose of the assignment and the criteria'[12]

 This seems to relate to issues of standards, transparency and fairness. It is our policy to use the language of the Learning Outcomes in writing feedback and then to particularise this in order to respond to what the student actually did. But while acknowledging the value and rigour of an LO driven system, there may be other ways of conforming to sector-wide benchmarks without limiting our capacity to respond to very creative and original work. We must and should be confident enough to be able to recognise and accredit the 'Wow factor' as Janey Gordon put it in her article on assessing creative arts.[13] She refers to an encouraging quote from Laing in his review of benchmarks for QAA in 2002 that benchmark statements are 'forcing us all to break cover and own up to what we think our subjects are all about and why they matter'. I want my students to make interpretive choices and express ideas in ways that I had not thought of myself and I want to be able to reward that in assessment without scuttling back to redraft (and revalidate) the Learning Outcomes. In describing the development of a practice of 'negotiated learning outcomes' for the Acting course at LIPA in 1995, Paul Kleiman described limiting the number of generic Learning Outcomes for each assignment and then negotiating some specific

[9] Gibbs, G. 'How Assessment frames student learning' in *Innovative Assessment in Higher education*, ed. C. Bryan and K.Clegg, Routledge, 2006, p.28

[10] Gammon, S. and Lawrence, L. 'Improving student experience through making assessments 'flow' in *Innovative Assessment in Higher education*, ed. C. Bryan and K.Clegg, Routledge, 2006, p.

[11] Gammon, S and Lawrence, L (2006) ibid

[12] Gibbs, G (2006) ibid

[13] Gordon, J 'The 'wow' factors: the assessment of practical media and creative arts subjects' in *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education V*ol 3 Number 1, Intellect 2004

3

outcomes for each student, based on what the tutor and student imagined was possible within the scope of the activity[14]. Doing this might allow us more space and time to talk about what we are actually seeing and responding to, rather than ensnaring us in the reductive exercise of quantifying it so we can mark it.

In order to ensure that there is transparency and fairness, it would be vital that the assessment is made with as much knowledge and understanding as possible of the piece of work to be marked and in the case of practical performance, that there is knowledge of the process that led to the performance.

'9. Feedback is understandable to the students, given their sophistication' and '10. Feedback is received by the students and attended to'[15]

Despite our best efforts to use simple, unambiguous, explicit language in written feedback, some students do not understand some of their feedback. We can unpick the language and make sure the student understands it in a Personal Academic Tutorial, but there is a time lapse between the student receiving the feedback and the tutorial, so any misunderstanding is not resolved quickly. Also the PAT tutor is unlikely to have taught the class or written the feedback, and they may not have a comprehensive grasp of the feedback either. To enhance clarity and to give the student the most opportunity to act on the feedback, we need to deliver feedback as quickly as possible, with fewer stages and filters, to make the contact between teacher and learner in the assessment process more direct.

All this directs me to devise a feedback system that involves a face to face meeting, to devolve the power of assessment to the students, and to make the student the 'agents' and not the 'objects' of assessments. As Walt Haney said:
"You've got to involve students actively, not just view them as objects of assessment, but as agents of assessment. This can be done in many ways. One is that you ask students systematically what they have learned. It's a simple idea; it's rarely done.....You find that students say some remarkable things. Often what they perceive as most important is not the academic learning, but social skills, attitudes, and how to learn, where to find what they want to know."
(Walt Haney, Professor of Education, Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation and Educational Policy, Boston, USA.[16])

---

[14] Staff development session, Rose Bruford College, 12th Sept 2012

[15] Gibbs, G (2006) op.cit

[16] Paul Kleiman, http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/subjects/palatine/starting-out-in-assessing-performance.pdf, accessed 13th Sept 2012

The Survey and what it revealed

I devised an anonymous online survey[17] which yielded more information about the students' perspective. I had already planned my research activity when I created the questions, so my intention was to find out what they thought about their feedback, how they used it and whether the idea of having an assessment dialogue would appeal to them. The response rate was about 33% of the L5 cohort (13 students) so may not be statistically significant, but the comments that they offered were valuable and underlined the complexity of the issues. While in some significant areas it did not tell me what I anticipated, it helped to guide my choices.

     In response to the question 'When you get your mark for practical classes, is the number useful?' the respondents were overwhelmingly positive (91%), stating 'Its acts as a useful yardstick for where you are in your learning' and 'Because it highlights where i need to improve, and as i have high standards, a low mark will push me more, so i aim higher.' Both of these statements indicate a positive response to the numbers they receive for their work and identify the usefulness as relating to orientation – how well they are achieving, what are weaker/stronger aspects of their work - and also have an influence on where they will direct future efforts. I had viewed marks as a necessary evil and a potential inhibitor of learning in some contexts, so this perspective was useful.

     The first question – which asked students to evaluate the clarity, and impact of feedback – elicited a range of affirmative responses of 53% to 69%. The question 'Did the feedback match your experience?' had the lowest percentage. The students identified good practice as clarity in the language used, suggestions for improving their work and that feedback is specific to the individual student, while feedback that is generalised, opinionated, uses metaphorical language and not constructive (by which they mean lacking in suggestions for improvement) is unhelpful. They also said that the timing of feedback has an impact on its usefulness. This seemed to support the idea I was developing.

     I anticipated that students would express a preference for verbal feedback, which they did, but I was struck by the value they attached to written feedback, as 'a solid piece of well thought out constructive criticism that can be referenced back to in self-analysis.' as one student put it. The common theme seemed to be that they wanted an

---

[17] Appendix 2

opportunity to discuss their work in order to interrogate their mark and feedback and understand it better and they also wanted the ability to reflect on written feedback and digest it. It is possible that the range of responses reflects the cohort, their learning styles, the natural of their studies and skill area; they are in actor training and this may give them a preference for verbal feedback and interaction because it reflects their core activity more closely.

The question 'Would you like to engage in a process of self-assessment and/or negotiate your mark with your tutor?' drew responses that illustrated some key ideas. There was some resistance: 'No! I don't feel that as a student I am in a position to guage what standard I'm at when a professional staff member is able to.' But one student welcomed the idea because 'if there is anything the teacher wasn't sure on and vice versa, it could be discussed and understood by both. This could make the feedback less vague and more precise'. Another 'would appreciate the opportunity to fight my corner!', an interesting adversarial allusion. Questions about power and responsibility within assessment are exposed here; in some cases the student is expecting the tutor to assess their work because the tutor is the 'professional' in the relationship; the student submits himself to the judgement of the master. This student does not want the responsibility of self-assessment or does not feel he has the knowledge or experience to make a valid judgement.   In others, there is a sense that the tutor can use that power unfairly, that the students have no redress, that the unfairness can stem from a lack of knowledge and understanding on the tutors part as to what the students think they have done, what they have done as part of their preparation and process, and what has influenced their choices.

The language of feedback also emerges as a potential barrier to learning. Some students comment that negative feedback undermines their confidence.   In assessing acting, there is an observable tendency to note and remark upon what has not been achieved, rather than what has been.   Put simply, it is easier to talk about what is not good, rather than identify what is good. Perhaps this is because we try to avoid a narrow definition of excellence. There are many ways to play Juliet successfully for example and students are capable of articulating new definitions of creative excellence in their work.   It appears that 'deficit' focussed feedback inhibits this.

Action Research

I worked with Level 5 Actor Musician students on an Acting class which is described in the Module brief. [18]

The class was delivered in two parts. First, the group engaged in a laboratory studio work on playing Shakespeare; then they worked on short scenes in pairs or small groups. I led rehearsals for each scene for 1 hour per week over six weeks, while the students had independent rehearsals for 8 hours per week, and the project culminated in a classroom performance for the peer group and staff. After this short project, the students would do a full time project on similar material – Shakespeare or Jacobean play – which was performed in the college theatre. Marks for scene study, the project and some written work contribute to the module mark, and the mark and the written feedback –both formative and summative – is given to the students on completion of the module. The scene study can be seen as a class in which ideas and practice can be developed and tested, then developed further in the subsequent project under more traditional performance conditions. As the Acting class was completed at an interim point in the module, taking the opportunity to give feedback at that moment could increase its effectiveness and allow the students to feed it forward and perform better. In a sense, I hoped that the intervention would increase the formative impact of the feedback.

After the scene study performance, I met with each student for a feedback tutorial. I asked them to prepare for the tutorial by thinking about the learning outcomes for the module and some additional aspects, such their use of skills, partnerships in the process, acting methodologies, their personal aims and their independent work and to frame it as a 'learning story'[19], a narrative that which would clarify the stages of their learning. My intention was to help them to identify this learning as part of a continuum, to recognise their progress and to identify the next steps.

 In the tutorials I aimed to:

* ensure there was a dialogue and elicit their perspective on the work,

* reinforce any learning that they felt they had achieved and to identify any positive aspects of their learning that I had observed,

---

[18] See Appendix 3

[19] Description of Learning stories in 'Future' page 12.

- set targets for the next stage of the module and allow them to propose and justify a mark for their work.

The final mark for this part of the module would also be negotiated in the tutorial.

Outcomes

I had aimed to let them lead the feedback tutorial, but this aspect was inconsistent. Some students initiated the dialogue, but some needed more prompts and feedback from me in order to do participate. This illustrates that some students not feel empowered to assess themselves. They are habituated to a receptive role and they would need time, encouragement and training to be able to overcome this. I had planned to have a preparation session before the feedback tutorial, but I did not have time to deliver this to the group so I sent them an e mail instead. The e mail listed some questions to help them start the process and this was successful for the more able and articulate students, less so for the rest.

Some tutorials were held on the day after the performance of the scene study and we – me and the students - were exhausted. Consequently, these tutorials are not examples of 'good practice': the language used lacks clarity, the notes I give seem obscure or vague or incoherent and the feedback doesn't reflect the given Learning Outcomes closely. However, the recording cannot give a full sense of the live communication in the room and the students did testify to the usefulness of the dialogue in the tutorial, so they did not feel disadvantaged by this.

The quality of the final six tutorials was exceptionally good. These were held during the week following the project, when sufficient time had elapsed for us to have a sense of perspective on the work and to extrapolate the potentially useful learning from the whole experience. Here, the students were much better prepared and able to lead the discussion. My role was responsive, offering my perspective on their points and suggesting ways that they might improve aspects of their work. This allowed the students to be more active in their learning and fully capable of engaging in their assessment.

In both sets of tutorials, the marks that the students awarded themselves mostly coincided with my marks, and a maximum of 3% lower than my marks for their work. This showed that they understood the marking criteria and could make a reasonable assessment of their work.

 One student, however, marked himself 6% higher than I thought his work deserved and in the higher grade banding. On the recording, I am clearly uncomfortable in the discussion,

and this came from a sense that I was not keeping to my stated intention of making the observations positive, based on what they had achieved and not 'deficit' based. This student was putting more emphasis on how much work he had done than the outcomes of the work, and it is also clear that his understanding of the work showed 'multi-structural' learning, rather than embodied and transformational learning. His account of his process was a list of activities, and did not describe a process of development, an accumulation of understanding that a narrative account could have done. I was able to use that lack to underline the need for him to integrate his skills and take a more holistic approach to his work.

In the final meeting with the group, the students expressed a positive response to the assessment process and said they had enjoyed and benefitted from it. They reported that the dialogue made this feedback more formative and they felt it had an impact on their progress. One student said 'I discovered many things just by talking to you and that made me feel good about the scene study and want to do more in the project….' while someone else qualified this as a two-step process: 'I discovered a lot when I was having to think about them (the reflection prompts I had sent them) and write them, then when you agreed with that, it was confirmation that what I'd thought was true.' Another student recognised that the quality of the reflection was deeper because it was guided by the prompts and learning outcomes, and because she was reflecting as preparation for the tutorial. They all felt verbal feedback was productive: 'It is great to be given the chance to actually speak and be listened to. It's great to have feedback as well from a tutor, but when it works both ways, this conversational to-ing and fro-ing…..I felt relieved.'

When I asked if they felt the process had allowed them to take responsibility for their work , one said 'I think we have to meet you halfway…..I've always been the type who, if someone says something to me, I might not agree with it straight away, but as soon as I have the self-reflection and I realise it myself, then that's the only way I can move forward so I think it's essential for us to have a moment in time so that we can have self-reflection even if that's (just) to talk to you …….We all want to improve so even though you're saying that you are trained and you have to get us there, it's your job, we have to meet you halfway. We have to want to improve ourselves.'

.

Reflection

9

As a piece of academic research, this action has not been wholly successful; the process was not always consistent with the plan I had devised and I have not proved a positive outcome for the feed-forward of feedback. There was a change of deployment while I was in the middle of the research which meant that I couldn't follow the students work into the rehearsals for the projects, and this limited my ability to observe the 'feed-forward' effect of the tutorials. But there have been positive outcomes and the students preferred this assessment model. They understood it, contributed to it and their work improved in the final project. Citing a higher level of attainment in the project that followed the intervention would not prove that the effectiveness of the assessment model because there were too many variables that influenced their performance, eg, the role, the production, the students' relationship with their director etc. But the action had a profound effect on the students' perceptions of the process, gave them a deeper and more active relationship with the aims and outcomes of the module and gave most of them greater autonomy in their learning.

The students' positive view of this assessment model could be attributed to several different factors. Certainly the timing of the feedback was better in that it was more immediate and it was more accessible to the students in that it was generated by both of us. But the timing could also hamper 'feed-forward' if it is too soon after the showing to allow for reflection to develop. The difference between the quality of the first and second 'batch' of tutorials was marked. The whole process took longer than I had anticipated: I had planned for 10 to 15 minutes, but if they are to be meaningful exchanges, they require at least 20mins, sometimes more. It would be possible to be more concise and more incisive with more specific preparation on my part and if I followed the Learning outcomes more closely as a guide to the conversation in the room. However, the length of time it takes to deliver tutorials is a possible impediment to rolling out this process across a whole course and would have deployment implications. The written feedback was easier and faster to produce at the end of the process and this might be offset against the tutorial time.

I talked much more than I had intended in the first tutorials, even dominated some conversations despite my stated aim of allowing the student to take the lead. This reveals some underlying and unexpected tensions that I was experiencing: an anxiety to be seen to be feeding back and giving the students the tools that they need to improve - that is what I am paid for, after all. Perhaps also I had an unconscious reluctance to relinquish the reins of the power to assess. My memory of the tutorials, that the students did most of the talking, was contradicted by the recordings of the early and that is informative for my teaching. As Brookfield says, in 'The Getting of Wisdom', dialogue and discussion in the classroom and who speaks can be a minefield and 'discussions in which teachers are

mostly silent are mostly regarded as the best discussions of all.' [20] But I also needed to express my beliefs and values in order to engage in dialogue with the student and with what the students were evaluating.

There was some shift in the power relationship in that the assessment was in common ownership; both the student and I shared the responsibility for identifying what the student had learned and for evaluating that. This liberated me from my habitual role in assessment. We were no longer 'High Priest' and 'Novice', but assessment partners. Their work was still the object of the assessment, so they could be described as more vulnerable in the process, but the aspect of depersonalising the assessment, of separating the student's identity and sense of themselves from the work they had done, was successful: 'I felt relieved....' And I can observe no threat to academic standards within this process. Despite devolving some of the power and despite the students' perception that self-assessment would allow them to 'argue for a better mark', when we were negotiating marks the students marks coincided with mine to within 3%. The degree-worthiness of the work is enshrined in the Learning outcomes and the criteria that map onto those. When both parties understand these criteria, the mark is evident and a consensus is easily reached.

The shift in my role in the assessment process meant that my creative role in the classes could be acknowledged. In the classroom I have a dual role: teacher and director. As a director, I want to test ideas and develop and refine the articulation of an idea in the space and I am a participant in learning activity, more than someone who is teaching chemistry might be. However, if I have sole responsibility for the Learning Outcomes, I am invisible in the assessment – the process is focusses solely on the student and how successfully the task had been achieved. In this model, there is a sense that my actions could be part of the conversations, that any difficulties or mistakes I made could be accommodated without disrupting the learning and that I could be on the same side of the fence as the student without the fence falling down.

Preparation of the students is a key factor for ensuring fairness and also for enhancing the quality of assessment. It was clear in the tutorials that some students were better able to reflect upon, and evaluate, the work than others. In my project, I sent detailed instructions by e mail to help the group prepare for the tutorial: this introduced another variable to the research. The quality of their self-assessment was affected by their ability to understand the email and act upon it, as well as their ability to self-assess.   I suspect that there would always be a varied level of competence in the self-evaluation whatever

---

[20] Brookfield, S: The Getting of Wisdom: What Critically Reflective Teaching is and Why It's Important. 1995

the preparation, but a more thorough, face to face induction might have improved the dialogue for some students.

Future

In 'Outcomes' above, I discuss the benefits of closer adherence to Learning Outcomes in the tutorials and it is probably true that this would give a more solid framework for the discussion and more rigorous application of academic standards. But it might also limit our capacity to recognise and reward what the student experienced and testified to. It seems crucially important to develop assessment strategies and standards that recognise and respond to creativity and innovation in a student's work. If I am generating Learning Outcomes based on what I believe is achievable and what I can imagine is possible, these Learning outcomes are unlikely to be able to evaluate and reward innovative practice and originality in the students' work. One way to ameliorate the lag in my understanding is to make sure I am constantly exposed to current practice in acting and theatre. But this idea points strongly to the desirability of a more democratic shared assessment strategy, in which Learning Outcomes can be more responsive to what has actually been achieved.

At LIPA, staff developed and implements a system of negotiated assessment in order to tackle this. A marking tutor would meet with the student to develop some specific Learning outcomes, based on some generic Learning outcomes for that module. These were then used as the basis for assessment with the student describing how far they had achieved what they intended.[21] This seems to offer a partial solution to the problem of assessing creativity, and the best one available to us at present.

As a result of my researching this area and also from the impact of the workshop on Assessment that Paul Kleiman delivered at Rose Bruford College, we are implementing a new assessment strategy for making performance at level 5 and 6. The principles that underpin the process are dialogic feedback and negotiated learning outcomes.

        In pursuit of a more responsive system, I have been drawn to the idea of using 'Learning Stories' for assessment. This aspect was somewhat side-lined in my research project as I didn't have much scope to follow it. But there are key aspects of this idea which could be useful in thinking about assessing creativity. Wandering on the internet , I came across 'Assessment in the 21st century classroom'[22], a powerpoint by Conrad Glogowski, in which he describes a 'socio-cultural' approach to assessment, based on ' Te Whariki', the early years curriculum from New Zealand. It is founded on these aspirations for children: 'To grow up as competent and confident learners and communicators,

---

[21] Paul Kleiman, 2012 op cit

[22] http://www.slideshare.net/teachandlearn/assessment-in-the-21stcentury-classroom-presentation, accessed 8th Oct 2012

healthy in mind, body and spirit, secure in their sense of belonging and in the knowledge that they make a valued contribution to society.'[23] The system has evolved from Maori beliefs and cultural practices, and encourages recognising the social and ecological context of learning. Part of the assessment strategy employ is the use of Learning Stories which are initiated by the child and draws on the human tradition of oral story telling. I suspect that the use of narrative to describe the learning process in actor training can help to order and evaluate the discoveries made in a creative journey.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[23] Ministry of Education, 'The Whariki curriculum of early education', cited in http://
www.slideshare.net/teachandlearn/assessment-in-the-21stcentury-classroom-presentation

Books

Boud, D. *Enhancing Learning through Self-Assessment*. 2003. Kogan Page

Bryan, C and K. Clegg. Ed. I*n Innovative Assessment in Higher education*, Routledge, 2006

Friere, P. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 1970. Coninuum

Webpages

Brookfield, S. The Getting of Wisdom: What Critically Reflective Teaching is and Why It's Important. Webpage (accessed 1/10/12) Available at **http://www3.nl.edu/academics/cas/ace/facultypapers/StephenBrookfield_Wisdom.cfm**

D.R Clark (2004) 'Learning through reflection', available at http://nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/development/reflection.html

Cousin, G. (2010) 'Neither teacher centred nor student centred : threshold concepts and research partnerships.' Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education. Available at http://www.aldinhe.ac.uk/ojs/index.php?journal=jldhe&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=64&path%5B%5D=41 (accessed on 8.10.12)

Glogowski, Conrad:'Assessment in the 21st century', available at http://www.slideshare.net/teachandlearn/assessment-in-the-21stcentury-classroom-presentation (accessed 8.10.12)

Kleiman, Paul. 'Starting Out in Assessing Performance', available at http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/subjects/palatine/starting-out-in-assessing-performance.pdf (accessed 13.9. 2012)

Mayer, J and R.Land (2003) 'Threshold concepts and Troublesome knowledge', available at

http://www.etl.tla.ed.ac.uk/docs/ETLreport4.pdf (accessed 8.10.12)

McNiff, J. 'Action research for professional development' available at

http://www.jeanmcniff.com/ar-booklet.asp (accessed on 8.10.12)

Moon, J: 'A handbook for Critical Reflection' (2004) available at http://vle.bruford.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/14252/mod_resource/content/0/A_Framework_for_Reflective_Writing_Jenny_Moon.pdf (accessed 8.10.12)

White, Eddy: 'Does your feedback feed-forward?' available at http://www.slideshare.net/teachandlearn/assessment-in-the-21stcentury-classroom-presentation (accessed 8.10.12)

Appendix One

Appendix Two:

 E mail sent to students to prepare for Assessment tutorial.

Hi all

On Friday in the afternoon, I'd like to see you all for a tutorial about acting class, we can work this around the singing auditions.

In the tutorial we will discuss your feedback and the mark you should get for the Acting class which is 20% of module AM404 (the rest is the essay and the project.)

In the tutorial we will aim to create a 'learning story', i.e. a description of what you did and what I did and the stages of your learning. There is an acknowledgement in this process that you haven't learned everything that it is possible to learn, but the emphasis should be on what you feel is most concrete and solid and constitutes the steps you feel that you have understood and owned in your work. We can use this to identify goals for the Poetic text project and I would like to meet with you again after that to address how far you have managed to achieve them in the project.

The Learning outcomes for this module are -

<u>Learning outcomes</u>
On successful completion of this module, students will be able to;
- Contribute to the exploration of scenes, animate concepts, and test ideas in practice, make informed interpretive choices and engage with the aesthetic of a production
- Prepare and reflect on their work
- Sustain a run of performance
- Sustain, engage in and enhance the aesthetics of a production
- Use techniques of acting, voice and movement in acting this work
- Make conscious and appropriate acting choices informed by the text and the production and to show an understanding of the historical context of the play and its impact and resonance for a contemporary audience.
- Demonstrate skill in handling rhetorical and poetic text, using extended breath, enhanced tone and muscular diction to communicate with clarity and precision.
- Extend the use of body and of the playing space beyond the confines of modern realism or naturalism, and to explore a clear communicative physical vocabulary specific to the scenes and plays, and to the interpretation of them presented.
- Work with independence and originality
- Conduct independent research and communicate ideas and understanding through verbal and written analysis
- Show professional conduct, in preparation, punctuality and collaboration with others.
- Identify the musical potential of a cast group and given text
- Create and facilitate music as an integrated part of the rehearsal process

In addition to this I'd like you to think about:

- The way you employed your skills in the work
- Your partnerships in the process (explicit or not)
- The methods you employed - where they came from, what they were, how useful they were.
- Rehearsals outside classes - I don't know what you did and I need you to tell me.
- Your own targets and aims going into the scene study.
- Your choices - character, the atmosphere of the scene, the language.

Use the above to write your 'learning story' - your story of how you developed the work, and to give yourself a mark for the Acting Class in relation to the Learning Outcomes above. Spend no more than 1 hour doing this. Write in note form or storyboard/ stick man sketch if you want. We will record our tutorial and I'll use all of this to write your feedback. We will negotiate what your mark is - so I'll bring a mark and you should bring a mark too. We'll negotiate the final mark.

So on Fri morning when we meet for the Semester evaluation, we'll create a tutorial list, and if we can't fit everyone in on Friday afternoon, I'll make time after rehearsals finish in the evening to have a tutorial then.

Thanks

Alison