Co-creation of Marking Criteria: Students as partners in the Assessment Process.

Nicky Meer, University of Cumbria Business School

Dr Amanda Chapman, Academic Development, University of Cumbria

Research Article

Key words:

Marking criteria, peer assessment, self- assessment, formative assessment, partnership

Word Count: 6494

Corresponding author:

Nicky Meer

University of Cumbria Business School

Bowerham Road

Lancaster

LA1 3JD

Tel: 01524 384 384 ex. 2507

n.meer@cumbria.ac.uk

Contributors agreement sent to HEA

Abstract

This article focuses on the final iteration of a four-year longitudinal action research project that culminates in students acting as partners in the assessment process by co-creating and utilising marking criteria Three versions of the marking criteria are discussed, one written by the academic staff, one written by the students and a final version agreed through negotiation and collaboration. This article argues that this partnership working empowers the students and gives them ownership of the criteria which were then used in a peer and self-assessment exercise. Differences in values and language are discussed, with gaps between student understanding and lecturers' academic discourse. This article concludes that for students to fully understand marking criteria they need to be active participants in the process and using discussion and collaboration in this way brings students into the academic community of practice.

Introduction

A growing body of research has shown that students benefit from collaborative learning (Gibbs, 1999; Greenback, 2003). Collaborative learning can be defined as any learning process where students '*learn with and from each other'* (Boud, 2001:2).To fully engage students in this group assessment process they need to have a sense of both individual and shared ownership. This not only empowers them, but also encourages commitment and cooperation, skills that employers are looking for in graduates. This level of negotiation gives an authenticity to the assessment process, given the careers that Business and Management students often embark on upon graduation.

This article discusses the final intervention in a four-year cycle of an action research project with a module on a Business and Management undergraduate degree. This longitudinal study develops the students' role within their own learning and assessment. This particular intervention involves the students as partners in the assessment process with a co-creation of the marking criteria for one particular assignment. A peer and self-assessment task is used to inform a negotiated summative grade enabling the students to perform an active developmental role in the design, implementation and grading of the module assessment.

The aims of this research are threefold: to analyse the differences between marking criteria written by academics and students; to analyse peer, self and lecturer grading of assessment using co-creating marking criteria and finally to analyse the engagement and performance of the students during this intervention.

Literature Review

The assessment process is at the 'heart of the student experience' (Brown & Knight, 1994) and is therefore a key area that students focus on. To fully engage students in the process and improve performance, the higher education sector has focused on ensuring transparency within assessment regimes. It is seen as good practice for assessments to come complete with grade criteria, a marking matrix and level descriptors. Orr (2004) argued that the lack of academic cultural capital that students often have means that more work on tacit knowledge is also needed. This is reinforced by the research on developing a methodology for transferring both explicit and tacit knowledge with regards to assessment criteria (Rust *et al*, 2003; O'Donovan *et al*, 2004; Rust *et al*, 2005; O'Donovan *et al*, 2006 and Price *et al*, 2007). This in turn has led to more emphasis being placed on the need to create explicit and direct criteria for students to improve their understanding of requirements (Haggis & Pouget, 2002). All students are given a course booklet which contains, amongst other things, a clear marking criteria for each assessment. This is a relatively simple step, indeed the <u>explicit</u> side of the debate is easy to address. However, the process is considered to be much more complicated with <u>implicit</u> criteria. Lea and Stierer's (2000) approach developed the concept of academic literacies, and argued that these need to be absorbed over a period of time and cannot be taught. Orr (2007) observed that *Transparency seems to have become confused with the idea of writing things down* (Orr 2007: 646). A longitudinal study of assessment practice identified the *tacit* nature of assessment criteria as a key issue and emphasised the difficulty of transferring tacit knowledge to others (O'Donovan *et al*, 2001; Rust *et al*, 2003; O'Donovan *et al*, 2004). Assessment criteria often contain words such as 'analytical' and 'critically evaluate', but these words are meaningless without a framework and a common understanding. In order to address these issues, a social constructivist approach was used to enable students to embed themselves in the discourse of academic practice, where experts encouraged and shared knowledge with the novices, as in a community of practice. Wenger (1998) encourages cultivating communities of practice but higher education is often seen as an independent experience, with the creation of the 'Independent Learner' a key goal in curriculum development or partner (Hart et al, 2011). Price (2005) advocated that more discussions should take place between academic staff to form communities of practice between and within disciplines. This would ensure transparency and consistency of marking.

Tacit knowledge is transferred by experience and involvement and informally through participation rather than instruction (Rust *et al*, 2005; O'Donovan *et al*, 2008). Williams (2005) experimented with a large cohort of students and their lecturers, asking each to define a variety of assessment task verbs. The difference found, he argued, warranted a further look at assessment practices to ensure inclusiveness and fairness. Channock (2000) argued that the language used by academics in relation to assessments is largely *opaque* to new students and Fung (2006) stated that students need to be bilingual, in their own language and the more unfamiliar academic language. This may even extend to different academics across disciplines. This may be seen as a barrier by many students who feel alienated by academic discourse. Encouraging students to engage with this language and come to a shared understanding is a focus of this research, both in terms of co-creating the marking criteria and also actively using the criteria to peer and self-assess.

Peer and self-assessment can be a useful tool to engage students in using marking criteria. Nulty (2011) argued that peer and self-assessment should take place in the first year of university, introducing students in their transition period to expectations at higher education. Gordon (2010) found in his study that students are far more active when peer assessing and therefore more engaged and attentive. Thomas, Martin & Pleasants (2011) found that both peer and self-assessment can have a long lasting learning effect so that students can utilise lessons learnt in future assessments. This concurs with the study by Walser (2009) who found that self-assessment offer students the chance to be self-reflective which in turn motivates them to do well in further activities. This reflection is a key component of both peer and self-assessment. If students are focused on the work of their cohort and can see their mistakes, they can then use this knowledge to improve their own performance.

To fully engage students, a 'learning-oriented assessment' was used which focused on developing the *learning* elements of assessment, rather than measurement (Carless, Joughhin & Mok, 2006). Carless (2007) outlined three principles which provide a framework for understanding the conceptual base of this type of assessment:

1) Assessment tasks should be designed to stimulate sound learning practices amongst students.

2) Assessment should involve students actively in engaging with criteria, quality, their own and/or peers performance.

3) Feedback should be timely and forward-looking so as to support current and future student learning.

This is also described in some literature as 'Assessment *for* Learning' (McDowell *et al,* 2009; Wiliam, 2011) or 'Assessment *as* Learning' (Earl, 2003) where the learner takes responsibility for their own learning and progress. The validity of the assessment is also important for student engagement so the skills gained have genuine value. This idea of *authentic assessment* (Brown, Collins and Duguid, 1989; Swaffield, 2011) aligns with the module under discussion here.

Methodology

The participants in this research project are students on a second year Human Resource Development course of an undergraduate Business and Management degree. The assessment chosen for this action research took the form of a training needs analysis. This was a group assignment where the cohort of 24 was divided into four groups of six. They were tasked with identifying, and subsequently filling, a skills gap within the rest of the cohort. This is a tried and tested summative assessment (worth 40% of the overall grade for this module) that has been successful in previous years. The initial aim of this research in 2010 was to explore ways to enable more effective student engagement with the assessment process in order to enhance their learning. By doing this it was believed that students would develop their ability to gain higher quality outcomes from their efforts leading to greater summative assessment grades.

Action research was chosen as the natural research method because

> *'It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities'* Reason & Bradbury (2001:1)

Although this paper focuses on the final intervention completed in 2013, it is part of a four year longitudinal study of action research cycles that took a spiral process rather than an iterative one in order to allow subsequent interventions to scaffold from the previous ones (McNiff 2005).

The four interventions were:

1) 2010: Re-designing the module 'Human Resource Development' and its assessment from a traditional content-based one with individual essays to an assessment as the learning which has the content introduced and explored through the process of completing the assessments themselves, an Assessment *for* Learning approach (McDowell *et al,* 2009).
2) 2011: Introducing formative peer and self-evaluation of assessment one which is a group training needs intervention delivered to all other student groups. This feeds forward to assessment two which is an individual report write-up of the training needs analysis completed linked to assignment one.
3) 2012: Created detailed and comprehensive marking criteria for both linked assessments. In-class discussions were held to help students gain a shared understanding of what was required.
4) 2013 (current iteration): Students as full partners in the assignment process. This included student and lecturer co-creation of marking criteria; Lecturer, student peer and self-assessment of the task that forms a negotiated summative grade for assessment one.

These cycles of interventions have developed over time in accordance with the principles outlined by Carless (2007) with the focus on the students being at the heart of the learning experience. The 'new' element for this year's intervention was twofold: a co-created marking criteria and a robust peer and self-assessment exercise which was designed to allow students to become active and equal partners in the assignment itself. Fluckiger *et al* (2010) found that using students as partners in the assessment process *maximises accomplishment* and encourages students *to change their own learning tactics.*
This partnership approach may highlight differences between the lecturers interpretation of marking criteria and the students. The social constructivist approach taken within this action research should help to mitigate these differences and lead to a shared understanding. Social constructivism requires participation rather than instruction so the process of creating the criteria and using them to peer and self-assess brings in the active application that develops understanding. O'Donovan *et al* (2008) use a nested hierarchy which takes students from a passive 'laissez-faire' approach through social constructivist methods as outlined above and culminates with a 'community of practice' where students have become absorbed into the academic practices of their discipline.

Method

In order to co-create the marking criteria for this assessment, the 24 students (4 groups of 6) were given Marking Criteria 1, see appendix 1. These are the marking criteria written by the academic staff that appears in the course booklet at the beginning of the year. As these are second year students in semester two they are well versed in these, having already completed half of their degree programme. A lecturer led in-class discussion was held with all students about their understanding of the marking criteria given (MC1). The student groups were then given one week to recreate the marking criteria in their own words and to come together just prior to their normal class contact to agree and finalise a set of student marking criteria (MC2), see appendix 2.

Once the students had finalised their criteria, the two versions (MC1 & MC2) were compared in-class during week three of the Semester with the lecturer and students evaluating the language and meaning of the words within each individual box in order to combine them. This fulfilled both the academic needs of marking criteria with student understanding and relevancy (MC3). See appendix 3. These co-created marking criteria then became the official ones which were then used for the assessment in weeks seven and eight and the students were given copies to enable them to peer and self-assess each group.

Each group presented their training task session which lasted 30 minutes during which peer and lecturer assessment was completed. This session was filmed and played back to the students so they could take on board their group performance and self-assess.

Finally each group negotiated with the lecturer to agree on a final percentage grade, based on the lecturer's assessment, the peer assessment from the wider cohort and the self-assessment from the group themselves.

At the end of the course during week eleven, an independent researcher discussed with all students their feelings and experiences of the process. This was done through a semi-structured focus group and written responses to questions. The students were asked to reflect on the three versions of the marking criteria and about co-creation; how they felt about self and peer marking and finally what they had learnt overall. An interview was also held with the lecturer to ascertain their feelings about the process.

Results

The first finding was one of student engagement with the whole process which was very high as evidenced in the focus group. The creation of the student marking criteria (MC2) was formative and so voluntary however all 24 students engaged with this as it clearly had a direct correlation and feed-forward to the summative assessment. One student said:

> *'First time I have utilised and understood marking criteria and referred to it in an assignment'*

The students contributed to discussion and took the process seriously, especially the peer assessment which was carried out with clarity and precision. The lecturer concerned said:

> *'I felt it went really well, I was pleased with their engagement. They weren't sure at the beginning but by giving them the opportunity they took it. I believe that it helped, they owned it – it was their criteria'*

The exercise with the marking criteria resulted in some striking differences as can be seen within the marking criteria (see appendices). The marking criteria that were originally in the course booklet (MC1), written by academic staff are extremely complicated and verbose compared to MC2, the marking criteria written by the students. However, MC2 is over simplistic and brief, particularly in the language used. The students also had a different notion of excellence to the academic staff and had problems articulating value, especially within the first classification.

For the grading exercise, a summary of the grade given by each of the various assessing groupings is given in Table 1:

Table 1: Grades given by the Lecturer, via peer assessment and via self assessment.

As can be seen from Table 1 the students had some problems with self-assessment, compared to the agreed mark, often over-marking. However the opposite occurred for peer marking where under marking was evident in three of the groups.

The table of results demonstrates that the marks awarded by the lecturer, peer and self-assessment broadly correlate with the widest deviation being just 6%, indicating that the creation and subsequent discussions around marking criteria enabled the students to effectively engage with the assessment process from an academic's community of practice.

Discussion

As mentioned above the language difference between MC1 and MC2 is particularly visible. The students all described MC1 to the independent researcher as overly complicated although there were differing responses to the language:

> *'Over-laden with information. However the language used is quite clear and concise'*
>
> *'Some things a bit unclear and needed clarification'*

Once the students had started to "translate" MC1 into their own language to form MC2, they could discuss meaning and clarity amongst themselves and with the lecturer. This discussion and exposure to the academic language starts the process of integration into the subject community of practice. The students are novices here and need the 'expert' to guide them. Wenger (1998) suggests structured activities that can cultivate communities with participation at different levels. The academic discourse, described by one student in this study as '*academic linguistics',* can be a barrier to some students. The creation of a learning space where students can mentor each other and cohorts can mix can help form these communities.

On discussing MC2 the students said:

> *'It looks very plain but is straight to the point and easier to understand. I would be more likely to read it during an assessment'*
>
> *'Slightly vague but much easier to follow'*

The students all agreed that MC3 provided the perfect compromise between the two previous versions. One said:

> *'Perfect amount of detail, not overly complicated and not too simple. It allowed reflection of what the students also wanted'*

Using this agreed criteria, the students then set about the second half of the exercise – peer and self-assessment. This forms the second principle of the learning-oriented assessment design by Carless (2007) whereby assessment should involve students actively in engaging with criteria, quality, their own and/or peers performance.

Despite the broad correlations between the marks, students in this group found peer assessment easier than self-assessment. The grades given indicate that with peer assessment they were far more accurate (when compared to the lecturer's grading). Therefore they were able to utilise the marking criteria and make better judgments of their peers. They said:

> *'Found MC3 easy to follow during peer assessment, could see clear difference between boundaries'*
>
> *'Assessing others was easier as we knew and understood the specific requirements'*

The students also recognised the wider implications of peer assessment. One said:

> *'I feel it helped to ensure that peers paid attention and showed respect'*

Peer assessment is also useful for improving self-efficacy. One said:

> *'Improved personal work as could see where people had made mistakes'*

Both of these statements allude to peer assessment engaging students a lot more in the classroom. Whilst they will have watched many presentations by their peers in other modules, having to grade the work focuses their attention a lot more. It turns 'being the audience' from a passive activity to an active one, vital for the social constructivist approach and for developing the share understanding to create a community of practice.

The self-assessment proved to be more of a challenge, with most groups over-marking. They said:

> *'easier to mark yourself as you knew what work you had done but would be easy to over-mark'*

> *'difficult to mark ourselves, but a useful experience'*

> *'It is hard not to be biased as we knew the reasons why we did things but others may not have understood why'*

These statements, which are typical of the group, perhaps offer an explanation of the over-marking. The students, when self-assessing, bring in all the work that they have put in prior to the training session. So if they are trying to explain a particular concept, they are judging the time it took them to understand it themselves, all the experiments that they tried and rejected and all the time spent in the library. This is in direct contrast to the lecturer and student audience who only evaluate the end result. This is a key difference: the three judges: staff, peers and self are not assessing the same piece of work.

In order to finalise their summative grade, a negotiation took place between the groups and the lecturer immediately following the video replay. This gave the students a real opportunity to influence their grade through evaluating all comments by the lecturer, peers and self and addressing any repeated or strong comments either positive or negative. This gave the lecturer an opportunity to become involved, and be influenced by the process and student journey, rather than simply evaluating the end result. These discussions enabled the groups and the lecturer to come to an agreed final percentage grade for this part of the module assessment. As can be seen in Table 1 three of the groups negotiated a small increase in their grade from the lecturers' original mark, making the process worthwhile. However, those three groups had also over-marked in the self-assessment.

When asked by the independent researcher at the end of the module about this opportunity to negotiate their grade the students said:

> *'Allowed us to argue our corner'*

> *'Working together with the lecturer to get the mark makes it fair and it was good to be heard and be involved'*

> *'it was a great feeling to get involved in the marking process. I think it was the most fair marking possible'*

Not all the students were happy about the process though. One said:

> *'Didn't feel we had the chance to portray our feelings and arguments. Mark seemed pre-determined'*

This was the only dissenter though, the rest of the students welcomed the opportunity to discuss their grades and felt that the process had been extremely useful in terms of engaging with the marking criteria. When asked what they had learnt from the process they said:

> *'would like to see this in more modules as was very helpful'*

> *'I understood the marking criteria and what lecturers look for'*

> *'learnt more on looking back on ourselves and evaluating performance'*

The students were also asked what they thought the academic staff should learn from this process. There is a selection of comments:

> *'Tutors should look at how academic guidelines are written. Students seem to prefer simple, clear*

guidelines'

'Marking criteria needs to make sense to students'

'Overconfidence should not boost marks'

'Other lecturers could find it useful to use this method so an understanding is created both ways instead of "perceptions" which causes confusion'

Discussions about marking criteria within academic teams are necessary to ensure transparency and consistency in the marking process however; bringing the students into this debate would enhance that process leading to increased clarity on both sides. This is recommended by Price (2005) who advocates more sharing of assessment standards and engagement within module teams and across departments.

Conclusion

The aims of this research were to analyse the differences between a set of marking criteria written by an academic and one written by students; to analyse the grading of peer assessment, self assessment and by an academic and finally to analyse the engagement and performance of the students using this process.

In addressing the first aim, the notable difference between MC1 and MC2 is the simplistic nature of the student version in terms of both language used and depth. The reverse of this conclusion is the over-complication of the academic staff version, which begs the question: Who are these created for? It may be the case that the need for 'impressing' external examiners and quality procedures are outweighing the accessibility needed for the students. When looking in detail at the two marking criteria, one finding from this research project is the students understanding of 'excellence' which appears to be very different from the academic staff, indeed a whole classification difference. This could stem from a difference in 'values' with students giving more value to tangible criteria like time and communication skills. For example, the student version of the marking criteria, MC2, gave over 20% just for turning up.

The second aim of this research, analysing the grading of peer assessment, self-assessment and the lecturers led to issues of varying expectations and self awareness. The student comments indicate that peer assessment and self assessment are useful tools for collaborative learning. The more practice that students have in dealing with marking criteria the better will be their understanding of the process. This is evident by the fact that the students are better at grading each other than themselves. They can use marking criteria objectively when faced with another group but, even when shown a video replay, the self reflection needed for self-assessment is a difficult area. This is exacerbated by students seeming to mark both the product (assessment) and the process (effort and journey taken to get to the final piece) whereas with both peer and tutor assessment, just the product is marked as per the marking criteria guidelines. Therefore, effort is not seen by students to be directly rewarded by lecturers in normal assessment practices.

The final aim was one of student engagement. This was judged by the lecturer in terms of participation in discussions and peer assessment. Engagement was high across the student body but the students that produced and performed with the most success in terms of actual grades achieved were initially considered to be the weaker of the student cohort. So, whilst all students benefitted from the exercise, the grades achieved by the weaker students were notably higher in this course than in others for this part of the assessment. This was also the case with the second part of the assessment which was an individual report where weaker students performed better than predicted, although not as high as part one. This exercise therefore enhanced the tacit academic skills of those students who previously lacked knowledge in this area and who were failing to fully engage with the assessment process through a potential lack of engaging with their community of practice and academic norms.

Overall, this study indicates that in order to engage students in the academic discourse of marking criteria they need to be *active participants* not passive recipients.

Limitations and further research

This is a small-scale longitudinal study with manageable group sizes allowing discussions to take place within the timetabled sessions. Whilst this was a beneficial process for the students, the results show that they would benefit more if this engagement with the marking criteria could happen earlier in their student journey. Therefore the authors plan to repeat this research project in a larger course setting in the first year of undergraduate study. This would enable the students to engage more effectively with marking criteria as part of the transition process to university.

Word Count 6655

Appendix 1: MC1: Marking Criteria created by academic staff

The criteria are based on the university guidelines but are adapted for this assessment, this helps you to see clearly where marks are allocated and for what.

Module Title:	**Level: 5**	**Weighted: 40%**	**Assessment: Group Teaching & Learning Exercise**

Criteria and Weighting	To obtain 70% or above (1st Class):-	To obtain 60% (Upper 2nd Class):-	To obtain 50% (Lower 2nd Class):-	To obtain 40% (3rd Class):-	To obtain a Fail grade of between 39-20 %:-	To obtain a substantial fail of between 19-0%:-
Introduction and planning of the seminar 10%	Clear and detailed plan of the training seminar, aims and timings given. Self-introductions and confidence shown. Excellent flow of training seminar between trainers and topics. Evidence of a great deal of preparation.	Accurate plan of the training seminar, aims and timings given. Self-introductions given. Good flow of training seminar between trainers and or topics. Evidence of good preparation	Some form of a training plan that could include timings, topics and or self-introductions given. Seminar was planned and mainly on time with adequate flow between trainers and topics. Some evidence of preparation.	Limited and patchy introduction and planning shown. Some evidence of preparation.	Inadequate introduction, very little evidence of preparation or planning of the session with little or no development or practice done.	Very poor or missing introductions, poor flow between trainees and topics, lack of practice and cohesion.
Training and development skills and ability Demonstrated 40%	All trainers were confident in their ability and led the seminar accurately and with evidence of excellent development of oral, organisational and interpersonal skills that encouraged, engaged and informed the trainees.	The majority of the trainers demonstrated a good level of confidence in their own ability and led the session well demonstrating generally good levels of skills development throughout	Some good levels of confidence and interpersonal skills were demonstrated resulting in a mainly positive training experience	Basic level of training demonstrated which ensured that the learning was acceptable. Training skills need to be developed.	Signs of emerging ability to lead a seminar and undertake training however the session did not flow well and trainees did not engage with the seminar or the trainers.	Did not demonstrate any skills or ability to successfully train people. Lacked a general understanding of the role of a trainer and did not demonstrate any of the skills needed.
Analysis/ Assessment of the training need against the chosen method of development 40%	Excellent choice of T&D seminar that accurately matches the organisational needs with the needs and ability of the trainees. Timing and activities undertaken were high quality and directly led to trainees' skills and knowledge development.	Shows evidence of good analysis and assessment of the training needs and needs/skills of the trainees. Timing and activities done were engaging and appropriate. Aims of the session were clearly met.	Clear links between the training need and learners' abilities. Mainly good timing and activities which met the learning aims and outcomes.	Some links and thoughts to how the organisational needs could be met against the trainees' ability and main aims and objectives of the training have been met.	Little or no analysis given to how the training goals could be achieved and the type/level of the trainees. Activities undertaken did not enable training needs to be met.	Poor training session that did not meet the learning or organisational needs and activities undertaken were of poor quality and inappropriate to the learners.
Organisation and format 10%	Excellent organisation, presentation and seminar given.	Good organisation, presentation and seminar given.	Generally good organisation, presentation and seminar given.	Adequate organisation, presentation and seminar given.	Poor organisation, presentation and seminar given.	Little evidence of organisation, presentation and poor seminar given.

Appendix 2: MC2: Marking Criteria created by the students

The criteria are based on the university guidelines but are adapted for this assessment, this helps you to see clearly where marks are allocated and for what.

Module Title:	**Level: 5**	**Weighted: 40%**	**Assessment: Group Teaching & Learning Exercise**

Criteria and Weighting	To obtain 70% or above (1st Class):-	To obtain 60% (Upper 2nd Class):-	To obtain 50% (Lower 2nd Class):-	To obtain 40% (3rd Class):-	To obtain a Fail grade of between 39-20 %:-	To obtain a substantial fail of between 19-0%:-
Introduction and planning of the seminar 10%	• Well planned, considered and thought out. • Practiced and good flow	• Planned and thought about, flows reasonably well	• Evidence of some planning a training plan. • Well timed	• Little planning • Some evidence of planning	• Poor planning	DIDN'T TURN UP ☺
Training and development skills and ability Demonstrated 40%	• Communicated clearly and confidently	• Well communicated • Confidence shown	• Majority of the group communicate throughout the activity • Some confidence and clarity	• Some of the group communicate on a basic level • Patchy training	• Very little communication	
Analysis/ Assessment of the training need against the chosen method of development 40%	• Relevant content • Tailors to needs of audience through participation	• Keep time well • Analyse what they are doing and purpose • Aims of task explained and reached	• Trainers interact with the learners • Aims are highlighted	• Little interaction with learners • One or two relevant points	• No task to develop training base • Lecture style over seminar	

Organisation and format 10%	• Clear organization and professional format	• Organised • Well timed	• Average presentation • Generally well timed	• Basic presentation • Below par timing	• Poor timing • Poor presentation	

Appendix 3: MC3: Marking Criteria AGREED

The criteria are based on the university guidelines but are adapted for this assessment, this helps you to see clearly where marks are allocated and for what.

Module Title:	Level: 5	Weighted: 40%	Assessment: Group Teaching & Learning Exercise

Criteria and Weighting	To obtain 70% or above (1st Class):-	To obtain 60% (Upper 2nd Class):-	To obtain 50% (Lower 2nd Class):-	To obtain 40% (3rd Class):-	To obtain a Fail grade of between 39-20 %:-	To obtain a substantial fail of between 19-0%:-
Introduction and planning of the seminar 10%	Clear and Detailed plan, introductions, aims and timings given well. Well prepared, excellent flow between trainers and engaged delegates.	Well planned, considered and thought out seminar. Practiced and good flow throughout	Planned and thought about, flows reasonably well	Evidence of some planning had a training plan. Well timed	Little planning Some evidence of organisation	Poor planning or no planning done
Training and development skills and ability Demonstrated 40%	Skills such as communication, organisation, confidence, timing, interpersonal, group working, engaging the delegates all demonstrated to a high level throughout.	Communicated clearly and confidently, most skills and abilities demonstrated well	Generally good communication and, Confidence shown & other skills and abilities were evident but patchy	Majority of the group basic communication. Some confidence and clarity but generally poor skills demonstrated.	The groups communicate on a basic level. Patchy skills shown at best	Very little communication and poor or no skills demonstrated
Analysis/ Assessment of the training need against the chosen method of development 40%	Clear match between aims and objectives of the seminar and what methods were chosen to do. Engaged & relevant to learner needs.	Relevant content Tailored to needs of audience, good match between aims and methods	Aims of task explained and reached through ok training methods	Trainers interact with the learners Aims are highlighted Training mostly met the aims	Little interaction with learners One or two relevant points Seminar did not meet any or all of the aims	No task to develop training base Lecture style over seminar. Did not meet any aims
Organisation and format 10%	Excellent organisation of the presentation, slick seminar given, timing and engagement perfect	Clear organization and professional format	Organised Generally Well timed	Average presentation Generally well timed	Basic presentation Below par timing	Poor timing Poor presentation

References

Boud, D. (2001). 'Introduction: Making the Move to Peer Learning'. In Boud, D., Cohen, Ruth & Sampson, Jane (Ed.). Peer Learning in Higher Education: Learning From & With Each Other. London: Kogan Page Ltd, 1–17.

Brown, J.S., Collins, A. & Duguid, P. (1989) Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning. Educational Researcher. 18 (1) pp32-42

Brown, S. & Knight, P. (1994) Assessing Learners in Higher Education. London: Kogan Page

Carless, D. (2007) Learning-orientated assessment: conceptual bases and practical implications, Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44 (1), pp 57-66

Carless, D., Joughin, G. & Mok, M. (2006) Learning –orientated assessment: principles and practice. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. 31 (4), pp 395-398

Channock, K. (2000) Comments on essays: do students understand what tutors write? Teaching in Higher Education. 5 (1) pp 95-105

Earl, L. M. (2003) Assessment as Learning: Using classroom Assessment to maximize student Learning. Thousand Oaks. Corwin Press.

Fluckiger, J., Tixier y Vigil, Y., Pasco, R & Danielson, K. (2010) Formative Feedback: Involving Students as Partners in Assessment to enhance learning. College teaching. 58 (4), pp 136-140

Fung, D. (2006) Telling Tales (2): a fresh look at student experience and learning in higher education. Presented at HEA Conference. June

Gibbs, G. (1999) Using Assessment Strategically to change the way students learn. In Brown, S. & Glasner, A. (Eds) Assessment Matters in Higher Education – choosing and using diverse approaches. Buckingham: SRHE

Gordon, N (2010) Group working and peer assessment – using WEBPA to encourage student engagement and participation. ITALICS, 9 (1) pp 20-31

Greenbank, P. (2003) Collaboration in the Assessment Process: an initial evaluation of collaboration on an undergraduate business and management course. Teaching in Higher Education, 8 (3), pp 317-331

Haggis, T. & Pouget, M. (2002) Trying to be motivated: perspectives on learning from younger students accessing higher education. Teaching in Higher Education, 7 (3) pp 323-336

Hart, A., Davies, C., Aumann, K., Wenger, E., Aranda, K., Heaver, B., & Wolff, D. (2013). Mobilising knowledge in community− university partnerships: what does a community of practice approach contribute? Contemporary Social Science, 8(3), 278-291.

Lea, M.R. & Stierer, B. (Eds) (2000) Student Writing in Higher Education. Buckingham, Open University Press

McDowell, L., Sambell, K. and Davison, G. (2009) Assessment for Learning: a brief history and review of terminology. In: Improving Student Learning through the Curriculum. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development. Pp 56-64.

McNiff, J. (2005) Action Research: Principles and Practice, 2nd edn. London: Routledge

Nulty, D. (2011) Peer and self-assessment in the first year of university. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. 36 (5) pp 493-507

O'Donovan, B., Price, M. & Rust, C. (2001) The student experience of criterion referenced assessment (through the introduction of a common criteria assessment grid. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 38 (1) pp74-85

O'Donovan, B., Price, M. & Rust, C. (2004) Know what I mean? Enhancing student understanding of assessment standards and criteria. Teaching in Higher Education, 9 (3) pp. 325-335

O'Donovan, B., Rust, C., Price, M. and Carroll, J. (2006) 'Staying the distance: the unfolding story of discovery and development through long-term collaborative research into assessment', Brookes e-learning Journal of Learning and Teaching, 1 (4), pp. 1-4

O'Donovan, B., Price, M. & Rust, C. (2008) Developing Student Understanding of Assessment Practices: a nested hierarchy of approaches. Teaching in Higher Education. 13 (2) pp 205-217

Orr, S. (2004) Transparent opacity: Assessment in the inclusive academy. In Rust C (Ed.) 12th International Symposium: Improving Student Learning: Diversity and Inclusivity. Birmingham Oxford Brookes University Press.

Orr, S. (2007) Assessment Moderation: Constructing the Marks and Constructing the Students. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. 32 (6) pp 645-656

Price, M. (2005) Assessment Standards: the role of communities of practice and the scholarship of assessment. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education. 30 (3) pp. 215-230

Price, M., O'Donovan, B. and Rust, C. (2007) 'Putting a social-constructivist assessment process model into practice: Building the feedback loop into the assessment process through peer-feedback', Innovations in Education and Teaching International, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 143-152

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2001) Inquiry and participation in search of a world worthy of human aspiration. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds). ,Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice. London: Sage

Rust, C., Price, M. & O'Donovan, B. (2003) Improving Students' Learning by developing their Understanding of Assessment Criteria and Processes Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28 (2) pp 147

Rust, C., Price, M. and O'Donovan, B. (2005) 'A social constructivist assessment process model: how the research literature shows us that this should be best practice', Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 231-240

Swaffield, S. (2011) Getting to the heart of authentic assessment for learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 18 (4), pp 433-449.

Thomas, G., Martin, D & Pleasants, K. (2011) Using self and peer-assessment to enhance students' future learning in higher education. Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 8 (1) article 5

Walser, T. (2009) An Action Research study of student self-assessment in higher education. Innov High Educ. 34, pp 299-306

Wenger, E. (1998) Communities of Practice, learning, meaning and identity. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Wiliam, D. (2011) What is assessment for learning?. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 37 (1),pp 3-14.

Williams, K. (2005) Lecturer and first year student (mis) understanding of assessment task verbs: 'Mind the Gap'. Teaching in Higher Education, 10 (2) pp 157-173

Table 1: Grades given by the Lecturer, via peer assessment and via self- assessment.

	Lecturer's grade	Average Peer assessment grade	Average Self-assessment grade	Agreed grade
Group 1	72	68	78	74
Group 2	60	62	65	63
Group 3	70	72	75	72
Group 4	70	68	70	70