**Work plan for autumn semester 2021**

**Module Code and Title**: EAS502 Assessment and Feedback in Higher education

**Programme:** Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education (PgCHE)

**Credit value:** 15 credits

**Module Tutor:** Karma Utha

**Module Coordinator:** -

**General Objectives**

This module will enable students to develop an understanding of key concepts in assessment. It focuses on the paradigm shift from traditional to alternative assessment practices which cater to student-centered learning in higher education. The module also provides students with opportunities to gain practical experiences in designing, developing and using various assessment techniques and tools that cater to diverse students.

**Teaching, Learning and Assessment plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Module unit** | **Learning outcomes**  *At the end of the unit, the students will be able to:* | **Teaching strategies/activities/VLE platform** | **Assessment strategies** | **Resources** |
| Week I | Introduction to the module, assessment, expectation, regulations  Assessment: Meaning, types, purposes of assessment in higher education, Paradigm shift in assessment practice | -tell the expectation of the module  -describe the purpose of assessment in higher education;  -distinguish the different types of assessment;  -examine the need for paradigm shift in assessment | -Lecture  -Discussion on one’s classroom practice of assessment |  | - reflected at the end of work plan |
| Week II | -Characteristics of good assessment: validity, reliability, objectivity, discrimination,  -Designing assessment tasks: authentic, worthwhile, holistic, realistic, minimize plagiarism, criteria and task length.  -Assessment accommodation: definition, types, principles  -Professional responsibilities of a tutors in assessment | -describe the characteristics of good assessment;  -analyse good assessment practices in higher education;  -examine the relevance and effectiveness of assessment tasks to enhance the quality of learning;  -distinguish the types of assessment accommodation;  -analyse the tutors professional responsibilities in carrying out assessment | -3D  -Lecture |  |
| Week III &IV | **Formative Assessment:**  -Concept, principles, types, role of formative assessment in higher education.  -Strategies of formative assessment: Learning intentions, criteria for success, eliciting evidence of learning  -Self-assessment: Concept, purpose, guidelines for self-assessment  -Peer assessment: Concept, purpose, guidelines for peer assessment  -Formative use of summative | -critically analyse formative assessment practices in higher education;  -tell the purpose of self- and peer assessment  -Examine the guidelines of self- and per assessment in one’s context  -Examine how to use summative assessment formatively | -Reading  -Discussion  -Lecture  -Hands-on practice | 1. **Critical reflection on journal articles - 25%. Assessment will be include GAF criteria** |
| Week V & VI | Feedback:  -Concept, principles, types, role of feedback  -Errors in providing feedback: No feedback, generic feedback, error correction, feedback famine, prescription, vague feedback, legitimacy  -Effective feedback: Goal referenced, tangible, transparent, actionable, user friendly, timely, ongoing, consistent  -Steps in providing feedback: Problem identification, situation analysis, setting the stage, positive and negative feedback process, plan and implement change | -Tell the importance of feedback in closing the gap between teaching, learning and assessment;  -Anaylse the common error in giving a feedback and its impact on learning;  -provide effective feedback on the accomplished task following the guidelines | -Discussion  -Reflection on one’s practice and Experience sharing  -Lecture  -Video | B.**Providing effective feedback on students accomplished task - 20%** |
| Week VII | Summative assessment:  -Bloom Taxonomy: Concept and purpose of Bloom Taxonomy, Bloom level of thinking, normal distribution curve  -Webbs’ Depth of knowledge (Norman Web): Concept and purpose of Webbs’ Depth of knowledge, Depth of knowledge, significance | - get a conceptual understanding of Bloom’s thinking levels and Webb’s depth of Knowledge | -Flip -classroom approach (assigning reading, watching videos and answering to questions, followed by class discussion) |  |
| Week VIII & IX | Designing test blueprint: Concept, Procedure  -Developing competency-based test items: Concept, philosophy, attributes of competency based questions, setting competency based questions (Multiple choice, completion form items and essay items,), subject specific examples  -Scoring essay items: Analytical concept and global approach’s concept, advantages, disadvantages  -Grading: Functions, general strategies, minimizing students complaint about grading, making effective use of grading | -design test blueprint by applying Bloom’s taxonomy and Webb’s Depth of Knowledge;  -develop competency-based objective and essay type items following guidelines of developing effective test items;  -apply analytical and global approaches in assessing essay items;  -Describe the effective use of grading | -Lecture  -Hands on practice | **C.Preparation of test blueprint, Test items and model answer- 35%** |
| Week X | -Moderation: Purpose, scope, procedure  -Item Analysis: Concept, Purpose, Analysing and Interpreting Objective Items, Analysing and Interpreting Essay Items | -Describe the purpose of moderation  -Examine the steps in moderation  -Analyse and interpret test itmes | -Reflection  -Lecture  -Discussion  -Hands on practice | -Reflective practices  -One point rubric,  -summary writing |
| Week XI &XII | Assessment tools and techiniques:  -Point based system: concept, examples  -Checklist: Concept, development, examples of checklist  -Rating Scale: Concept, types, development, examples of rating scale  -Rubrics: Concept, components, types (Analytical and holistic), development, advantages, limitation of rubrics, Multiplying factor  -Formative Assessment Techniques: Concepts, types, examples | -apply various assessment tools and techniques to enhance tudents’ lerning; | -Reflection on their practice  -Lecture  -Discussion  -Hands on practice | **D.Development of rubrics - 20%**  **Assessment will be include GAF criteria** |
| Week XIII &XIV | Group work assessment techniques: Belbin’s team role model, self-reporting, peer-reporting, group reporting, system data.  Documentation: concept, purpose (accountability, progress, support), forms of documentation, guidelines in documentation, assessing using documentation | -analyse the importance of documentation for quality assessment; and  -objectively assess group work based on evidence (s). | -Lecture  -Discussion  -Reflective practices |  |
| Week XV | Revision and feedback | | | | |

**Assessment Approach**

The module will be assessed through the following continuous assessments:

1. **Critical reflection on journal articles - 25%**

Students in groups will critically analyse a peer reviewed article on the formative assessment practices in

higher education. Within the group, each student will analyse one article within 500 words. They have to analyse the practice

against the theories learnt in the module and their own teaching experiences.  Combining all the individual

analysis, the group will come up with a review paper which is about 1000 words in length. The combined analysis will focus on the differences, similarities and select one which is more applicable to RUB teaching, learning and assessment practice. Justification for the selection needs to be clearly mentioned. Marks will be given for both individual and group contribution.

The assignment will be assessed by following marking criteria

1. Ability to analyse the article against the theories learnt with

substantive argument: 6 marks

1. Ability to analyse the article against their teaching experiences with

substantive argument: 5 marks

1. Logical presentation of ideas and thoughts: 3 marks
2. Appropriate use of language: 3 marks
3. Contribution (based on form IV) 5 marks
4. Team meetings (based on form III) 3 marks

\*Note: The work will be assessed out of 30% and converted to 15%.

Due Date: 3rd September 2021

1. **Providing effective feedback on students accomplished task - 20%**

Each student will be provided with a sample of University students’ accomplished assignment (it could also be their own assignment). They will provide feedback on it based on their own practices. Then based on the tutors’ input and literature review, they will make a comparative analysis on it and suggest improvement on the errors made. The analysis write-up should be between 500-700 words in length.

The comparative analysis will be assessed based on following marking criteria.

1. Identification of correct feedback provided: 4.5 marks
2. Identification of errors made in providing feedback: 4.5 marks
3. Critically analyse the errors and make improvement on it: 8 marks
4. Language Structure: 3 marks

**Due date: Ongoing process**

1. **Preparation of test blueprint, Test items and model answer- 35%**

Each student will have to prepare a test of 50 marks competency-based items in their subject of specialisation. The test should consist of a test blueprint, model answer and marking scheme. For their understanding and practice, students have to include all three testing items (i.e., multiple choice items, short answer questions and essay items) in the test.

The assignment will be assessed on the following areas:

1. Test blueprint: 11 marks
2. Test items: 14 marks
3. Model answer: 10 marks

**Marking criteria**

a). An analytical rubric to assess Test Blueprint

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Excellent**  **(4 points)** | **Good**  **(3 points)** | **Satisfactory (2 points)** | **Need improvement (1 or less points)** | **MF** |
| Distribution of items across the level of thinking | All items are correctly distributed across the six level of thinking/DOK | Few items are not correctly distributed across the six level of thinking/DOK | Many items are not correctly distributed across the six levels of thinking/DOK | Most of the items are not correctly distributed across the six levels of thinking/DOK | 4 |
| Distribution of marks across the subject content as per the syllabus | All the subject contents are included and weighting is as per the syllabus. | Most of the subject contents are included and weighting is as per the syllabus | Few subject contents are included and weighting is as per the syllabus. | Items are mostly from few selected subject contents. | 5 |
| Layout of the test blueprint | The layout of test blueprint is shown explicitly as per the standard design discussed in the class | The layout of the test blueprint is shown as per the standard design discussed in the class | The layout of the test blueprint is somewhat similar to the standard design discussed in the class | The layout of the test blueprint does not match with the standard design discussed in the class | 2 |

1. **Marking criteria to assess Test items:** 
   1. Items are categorised into various test strategies such as multiple choice items, short or completion form items and essay items: 3 marks
   2. Items follow principles of its development: 6 marks
   3. Items are numbered and arranged systematically: 2 marks
   4. Language is clear without grammatical errors: 3 marks
2. **The marking criteria to assess model answer:**
   1. All model answers are given: 2 marks
   2. All the model answers are articulated clearly: 2 marks
   3. The model answers are divided clearly into points

when analytical marking approach is used: 3 marks

* 1. The model answers are comprehensive enough for

a substitute teacher: 3 marks

Due date: 1st October 2021

1. **Development of rubrics - 20%**

Each group consisting of about 4 students will choose an assessment task (e.g., essay, project work, presentation, etc) and develop an analytical or holistic rubric for it following all required steps. The developed rubric will be presented in the form of gallery work. Rubrics exhibited in the gallery walk will be assessed in following areas using an analytical rubric attached below.

**Marking criteria**

**The rubrics developed will be assessed by following rubric.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent (3.1-4)** | **Good (2.1-3)** | **Satisfactory (1.1-2)** | **Need Improvement (0.1-1 )** | **MF** |
| **Clarity of criteria** | All the criteria are distinct and in lined with the objectives of the task | Most of the criteria are distinct and in lined with the objectives of the task | Few criteria are distinct and in lined with the objectives of the task | Criteria lacks clarity and are not in lined with the objective of the task | 7 |
| **Terminologies** | All the terminologies used in the descriptors are consistent across the level of achievement | Few terminologies used in the descriptors are not consistent across the level of achievement | Most of the terminologies used in the descriptors are not consistent across the level achievement | Only one to two terminologies used in the descriptors are consistent across the level of achievement | 6 |
| **Distinction between levels** | Each level is distinct and progresses in a clear and logical order | Most of the distinction between levels is clear and progresses in logical order | Some distinction between levels are evident, but remain unclear | Little/no distinction can be made between levels of achievement | 5 |
| **Steps involved in development of rubrics** | All the steps involved in development of rubrics are clearly explained | Most of the steps involved in the development of rubrics clearly explained | Few steps involved in the development of rubrics are explained | Many steps involved in development of rubrics are missing | 4 |
| Contribution (form 3) |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Team meetings (form 2) |  |  |  |  | 3 |

\*Note: The work will be assessed out of 30% and converted to 25%.

Due Date: 22nd October 2021
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