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Why do the research?

High NSS score for our Education Studies course in 2015. However, analysis of the feedback showed lower scores for assessment and feedback.

Desire to explore this so conducted a small scale piece of action research to improve practice.


Phase 2 data collected..... now on to analysis.
Academic Buoyancy

According to Martin (2013), academic buoyancy is the ability to deal with ‘everyday setbacks’ and ‘hassles’ and refers to all students whereas academic resilience refers more to the few who may suffer more extreme adverse circumstances who may be the ‘hard to reach’ students.
Effective feedback can be used to encourage self-efficacy and self-regulation which in turn can enhance learning. Assessors need to develop a *dialogic tone* in their written feedback.

Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick (2006)

**Scaffolding of learning**

Bruner (1978)
Research into practice

‘theory-practice conversations’
McAteer (2013:12)

Improving the democratic nature of teaching
Elliott (2015)
Changes to Practice

Skills sessions – explicit focus on academic buoyancy and the ‘big five’

1. Demonstrate an internal locus of control
2. Understand the grade
3. Look forward
4. Look to improve
5. Be action-orientated
Changes to Practice

Feedback practice – change to feedback sheets

Clearer grade descriptors
Section for strengths
Section for recommendations
Section for student action points
Changes to Practice

Students bring action points to personal tutor meetings
Phase 2: Working Research Questions

1. What is the impact of the new practice on students’ perceptions of the value of the revised assessment feedback process?

2. How does this relate to their academic development, their emotions and their overall satisfaction with the BA Education course as a whole?

3. How does knowledge of the ‘Big 5’ support students’ Academic Buoyancy?
Phase 2: Data Collection

Focus groups
Individual interviews
Emerging findings...

Are indicating that students:

• have found the changes useful and find the Big 5 helpful.
• feel that the ‘strengths’ section is really important and helps to manage the process.
• value the holistic approach where dialogue is supported and encouraged.
• feel the relational aspect of the course ethos makes a real difference to their academic buoyancy.
• However, students observe that there are inconsistencies between the markers.
Questions?
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