

---

# *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENCE ARTS AND COMMERCE*

---

## **Strategies of providing feedback on student work: Enhancing Student Experience at Middle East College, Sultanate of Oman**

**Dr Kakul Agha**

Head, Department of Postgraduate Studies, Middle East College

Knowledge Oasis Muscat

**Dr Kiran GR**

Director, Teaching and Learning, Middle East College

Knowledge Oasis Muscat

---

### **Abstract**

*This research was conducted at an institutional level and a six-member team, led by the first author was constituted at Middle East College (MEC) during 2012 and investigates strategies of providing feedback on the academic work of students. The aim of the study was to comprehend the gaps and possible strategies of feed-backing that could be used at MEC for helping in value-addition for enhancing student experience within the learning process. Primary data collection and intense secondary research enabled knowledge expansion on feed-backing. The findings indicated that feed-backing was not focused and did not correspond to international strategies. The conclusions were that a structured and policy driven feed-backing system needs to be practiced at MEC, as the current system of feed-backing doesn't enable enhanced student experience. Further informative sessions and feedback collection from stakeholders need to be carried out to enhance the process for maximum benefits.*

**Keywords:** Feedback; Teaching and Learning; Student Satisfaction; Student Experience; Feed-backing Strategy; Middle East College.

### **1. Introduction**

Feedback is an important component of the learning process, which helps the student to know how to enhance his learning and performance. The possible sources of feedback on the learning

of student could flow from colleagues in the class, teachers, lab instructors, professionals and practitioners and other learners in the institution. This paper discusses the importance of feedback on student work. This paper is an output of the understanding generated from the work of a team of members at Middle East College who were designated to develop a proposal on strategies of providing feedback on student work within the college. During 2012 a proposal was generated after primary data collection and intense secondary literature review. The literature review was attempted to know the strategies deployed by leading academic institutions worldwide and primary data collection helped realize the gaps of feed-backing at MEC. Post-study, the proposal was presented and defended in front of the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC), the apex advisory body at MEC. It highlighted possible strategies and action plan of providing feedback on student work for level 0/1/2/3 modules at Undergraduate as well for Postgraduate programmers. This study is the culmination of knowledge generated during planning, preparation and implementation of the process of feed-backing on student work. It elucidates the importance and strategies of feed-backing and the value-addition it does to enhancing student experience within the learning process.

The paper talks about the aim and scope of the work taken up at MEC Sultanate of Oman. The methodology, output of the team and the importance of providing feedback to students on their academic work have been discussed in the paper. The literature review is on feed-backing strategies that are deployed internationally in modern universities. The discussion however revolves around the work done at Middle East College, Oman, the practices followed and the strategies to be adopted to enhance the situation in the college. It also highlights the responses collected from stakeholders on the effectiveness of the feed-backing process. The paper concludes with the explanation on the decisions taken by the college to strengthen the process of feed-backing on student work with the aim of enhancing student experience at Middle East College.

## **2. Literature review**

The learning process and the student-teacher relationship, owing to student work revolve around feedback so that both entities can expect it and provide it. It is important to ensure that the students are aware of the criteria against which their performance will be assessed. If the students indicate lack of understanding of the teacher's way of marking their work- assessments / evaluation criteria, then the feedback will carry little value for the student and they find it difficult to assess the gap between actual and desired performance/expectations. Feedback should be based on what was directly observed and should be phrased in non-judgmental language.

According to Andrade (2005, 27) "a rubric is an assessment tool that lists the criteria for a piece of work or what counts and articulates gradations of quality for each criterion from excellent to poor. Rubrics used to assign final grades represent not only a missed opportunity to teach but also a regrettable instance of the teacher as-a-sole-judge-of-quality model that puts our students

in a position of mindlessness and powerlessness”. Hence it is important that marking schemes are self- explanatory and students are well informed about it along with the assessments.

### **2.1.Feedback qualities and attributes**

Several qualities and attributes make feedback more reliable and acceptable. Based on reliable sources of literature like Race (n.d.) and GMV (2006) some qualities and traits have been detailed below.

The sooner the better! It is argued that feedback should reach students in a timely manner not exceeding a maximum of two days or directly after the submission of assessment. In order to relate the feedback to his assessed content it is vital to give feedback almost straightaway. Further the feedback should be focused for the individual and should fit each student’s achievement. The teachers need to be careful that the feedback should be empowering the students. They shouldn’t be let down after reading or hearing the feedback, rather they should feel more aware of the issues their work faces and strategies of enhancing it to acceptable levels.

Feedback should be given in a very positive and motivating manner and in no way it should make the person loose self-respect. Poor feedback leads to closure of communication channels between the teacher and the learner and causes the learning process to stop. Additionally the teacher has to be completely aware of how to develop, frame and deliver the feedback to the student. It should neither be burdensome nor too less to understand anything. Feedback should be critical, but supportive to learning, so as to encourage a student’s confident scrutiny of his future work. It is important that the teacher should ably relate the feedback to the work itself especially focusing on the learning outcomes and criteria of the assessment and not on the person himself. Although editing skills are important but assessment feedback cannot revolve only around editing (grammar, spelling, mathematical notation, presentation) but rather relate to the learning outcomes of the piece of work. The style of providing feedback should be such that due respect is given to issues pertaining to gender, diversity, personality of student etc. Personality traits get manifested in the work of the student which can be observed and reviewed but these are not appropriate for review (Ende, 1983). The teacher should limit to the behaviours that are remedial.

Feedback helps and supports the student when he is completely aware of the meaning and usage of feedback and how they help him to improve and enhance his learning. Teacher led feedback should be balanced by finding out the students’ ideas of his performance and strategies of enhancing his work (Cantillon and Sargeant, 2008).

Feedback should lead to changes in the learner’s thought process, attitude and behaviour, and performance in future assessments. The feedback dialogue should be inclusive of strategies of enhancing his work and hence helping to narrow the gap between actual and desired performance (Cantillon and Sargeant, 2008).

Feedback should be an informed, non-evaluative, objective appraisal of performance and not the worth of an individual. Feedback should be in a relaxed atmosphere – care to be taken of the seating arrangement as well. The time, place and scope of the session could be negotiated and not dictated by the teacher. Further, the student's performance should be measured against pre-defined achievable and meaningful goals that have been communicated to the students at the time of the assessment. Surprise element is not appreciated in the feedback process. Feedback, especially negative, always is met by an emotional reaction impeding the processing of the information (Ende, 1983).

The feedback information should deal with specifics and teachers should avoid generalisations. The information that is fed back to the student should deal with actions not interpretations or assumed intentions of modifications in student attitude performance and behaviour. Accurate and precise language should be used by teachers for providing feedback to the student (Ende, 1983).

It is important that teachers help and enable students to understand and interpret the feedback in order to improve their work. Teachers need to have professional pre-service and in-service training for the specific requirements of providing feedback to the students on their work. Feedback should be explained in a language that is understandable to the student. Teacher's efforts to provide differential levels of feedback for learners of different levels of performance treat students inequitably hence should be avoided. Teachers should be encouraged to provide praise what is good (even though the overall performance is weak) as the former helps in building self-image which in turn produces high motivation, hence high achievement and love for learning (Sadler, 1998). The feedback should include details of the background of the level of work produced, balanced comments, criticisms with solutions and practical strategies, comfortable and acceptable tone and language, strategies on how to proceed and follow up of work, ways to enhance the work, critique of important and specific issues which may be the major issues of discussion too and lastly end on an open attitude which shows willingness to discuss and help the student (Sadler, 1998).

For every piece of work a specific and well-defined marking scheme is a must (Sadler, 1998). Additionally the teacher could create feedback exercises that force students to actively engage with that feedback (Rust, 2002). Teachers should ensure that there are in-class formative assessment tasks which help the student to know how and why feedback is helping to pace his learning (Rust, 2002). The feedback strategy should comprise praise, criticism and suggestions (Hyland and Hyland, 2001).

## **2.2. Some practical feedback methods**

At MEC more of written and verbal feedback on students' individual work is being provided. But work load pressure, innovative means of assessment, direct student demands and a range of other pressures, can lead to a need to use less traditional modes of feedback.

Some of the more innovative methods of feed-backing as given by GMV (2006) could be including generic feedback during sessions. The mode of giving feedback could be even in lectures and workshops. A very interesting tool is a Feedback Statement Bank. This includes a list of carefully framing feedback comments relating to the learning outcomes and the expectations of the piece of work. Individual spaces could enable the student to place his feedback and opinions too. It is crucial that students understand the relevance and usage of the statements and are aware of how the comments can be incorporated within their work. Using a checklist for the assessment criteria, would enable the student to self-assess for higher level modules. Moodle (E learning tool) could also be used in combination with the statements banks. Beyond written feedback, Individual verbal feedback is also a great way of providing feedback to the higher level or M level of students. Further marking schemes through a checklist allows students to receive their feedback in a very structured manner. Care should be taken to allow students to give statements that they feel important as a response to the feedback provided on the work of the student. Moodle encourages feedback to be exchanged electronically. A good way is to have online Forums. Online feedback can be provided over the Moodle to enable students to view it anywhere and everywhere apart from the ease that the student gets to discuss the same with his colleagues in the class. It actually enables greater students' understanding about the strategies of enhancement of his work.

Debriefing of the examinations in a cohort is a successful tool to enhance the student experience. The students with good feedback can be helpful in explaining or giving viewpoints as to how to enhance the work of other students. They even explain their answers to the other students in the cohort (Cooper and Robinson, 2000).

### **2.3.Suggestions for enhancing efficiency in the feedback process**

Few important suggestions provided by GMV (2006) for enhancing efficiency in the feedback process may be understood through several means. One of the most interesting ones includes preparing a set of model answers, along with focused comments on stating and explaining the quality of answers. It would also include the common mistakes and strategies of enhancing the whole content of the assessment. The teacher could even make use of the statement banks prepared for each assessment. It is important that the marking or assessment criteria are made known to the students beforehand so that their work falls in line with the expectations of the assessment. This helps in providing detailed and consistent feedback without being biased. On the contrary personalization of feedback may become difficult in this technique.

To enhance the efficiency the teachers can even use peer feedback system where feedback is shared by peers in a classroom setting. Further they can provide feedback within the class to a group of students addressing common problems and issues within the cohort or a set of students. In some institutions the task of reverting back on feedback after evaluation can be taken by teaching assistants for the module. Further formative assessments enable students to self-assess

their work and find out the issues. These issues could be handled electronically or through interactions with large cohorts to solve issues and address problems in a common manner.

It is important to enhance the speed and efficiency of the feedback system in an institution. It is vital that a teacher balances the time and efforts in a positive manner and provides well arranged, meaningful and constructive feedback to the students which help the students enhance the quality of their future assessments.

### **3. Research Methodology**

A team of six members of the college was formed in 2012 to prepare a proposal after preliminary research on strategies of providing feedback on student work. The proposal had to be submitted to the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC), the highest Teaching and learning advisory body at MEC. On approval the proposal had to be enacted upon by the various academic departments in the college.

The group followed the following methodology to complete the task:

- Collection of real time information pertaining to providing feedback on student work from MEC by meeting Programme Coordinators, Programme Managers and Head of departments. Different members were made responsible for data collection from different people in the organisation. The methodology adopted for data collection was that feedback strategies for level 0, 1, 2, and 3 modules along with Postgraduate modules shall be collected and compared to have a generic understanding of the level and type of feedback being provided to students on their work.
- Collection of data from various online resources including academic institutions and other relevant academic bodies relating to best practices and possible benchmarks. The aim behind this strategy was to be aware of the international practices and strategies being deployed in the institutions across the world. This would promote a better understanding of the strategies that could be suggested for MEC.
- Review of research articles on providing feedback on student work to the student was another relevant methodology chosen for getting to know the latest developments and interventions being used or being planned for usage. Based on the data collection through various sources, a gap analysis was conducted to understand the missing link at MEC and provide suitable suggestions. Gap analysis enables to provide the true picture of what could be adopted as possible interventions within the given system.

The parameters of data collection and analysis that the team was looking at were as follow:

- Process of providing the feedback to student: The team was interested in looking at the process in which feedback is being provided at MEC and other international academic institutions. This enables to generate an understanding of the framework that could be followed at MEC.

- Techniques used to provide the feedback: The team also wanted to probe into possible techniques that were being used or could be used to provide feedback to students on their academic work.
- Feedback for different levels of modules – Level 0,1, 2, 3 Modules / UG Projects / GFP (General Foundation Programme) / PG Assessments / PG Dissertation: The team further looked into the different levels of UG modules ranging from 0 to 3 along with the UG projects. Additionally as MEC offers PG programmes as well, the proposal probed into the system of providing feedback to the PG modules and dissertation also. The overall aim of including this parameter was to find out the suitable strategies of feed-backing being used and to be used to suit different modules being taken by different level of students.
- Types of assessments – Formative; Summative and End semester examinations: The team also investigated the different strategies for the different types of assessments. The aim was again to understand the intricacies of the feedback that vary with the type of assessments.

#### **4. Findings of the practices in the Academic Departments of MEC**

There are programme offering and non-programme offering departments at MEC. The data collection was carried out at the department of computing, management studies, electronics, creative studies, and the Postgraduate studies. There were some good practices which were understood, however the larger understanding was pointing out that there is no organisational framework for providing feedback for all modules. Owing to this there are various practices and norms followed by faculty of different departments for providing feedback to the students on their work. There was no standard manner in which modules of different nature and level with varying assessments were treated; rather a common way of providing feedback was being used. This varied with the choice, time available, and individual style of faculty. It sometimes could also be related to the norms of the particular department or could be dependent on the style of the mentor in the department or the background of the faculty member himself.

For instance in the department of Computing giving feedback on the formative assessments was more widely practiced rather than giving feedback on summative assessments. There's no differentiation on the feedback methods used for modules at different levels. Feedback on student work is given in the different ways. Formative assessments are conducted every week on the topic discussed in the previous week as well as a special formative assessment, with the goal of helping the student in the end semester exam is conducted two weeks before the end semester exam. Oral feedback, online feedback [through Moodle, CIS (College Information System of MEC) and Turnitin] was provided to students. Oral questions in general were asked to the student in the classroom to listen to their responses about some activities or assessment given to them. Sometimes students were given feedback forms too. Other assessment need to be submitted via Moodle so some comments were provided on Moodle. Roughly 50% of the assessments of level

2-3 modules are submitted as Turnitin assignments for which the automatically generated feedback is given to the student. The above mentioned assessments are conducted as real time quizzes on the Moodle and feedback is given immediately in the class based on the responses. If more than 4 people have answered a certain question wrongly, that concept is explained in the class again. Forums are also conducted on the Moodle every 3 weeks, written feedback is given if time permits. Feedback on Summative assessments, in general, is limited to the Assessment Criteria Grid Sheet which is handed over to the student along with the Assessment. Oral feedback is given to students on the closed book test (CBT), only if a student comes back to the faculty to get it. Certain faculty members also discuss the correct answers of the CBT, in the week following the CBT for the purpose of giving feedback.

For Projects, written feedback is given through Moodle using forums or individually if time permits. Mostly Oral feedback is practiced as written feedback is time-consuming. For the department of Mathematics and Applied Sciences all the members are following the same way to provide the feedback to the student's work. For all the assessment, majority of the teachers are using the written feedback where the comments are given to the students in writing. For the good work they use to write 'excellent' and 'well done' and for the poor work they write a comment such as 'why' or 'see me..'. Especially for the weak students the faculty confirmed that they try their best to meet the students in the office and sometimes after the lecture to explain orally their weakness and encourage them to attend tutorial classes. Sometimes the faculty themselves try to provide support with the help of good students. At the department of Creative Technologies the mechanism followed for giving feedback formatively is by giving assignments every week in the class on the concepts discussed and delivering the feedback mostly oral, sometimes written in the class itself. Before summative assessments, sample questions with good as well as bad answers are discussed. On Summative assessments, written feedback is given to the students in detail. This could possibly be attributed to having less number of students in each cohort. The feedback again is discussed with only those students who wish to see it.

At the department of Management Studies, feedback is written on the assignment and if students choose to come and view the feedback, they have the opportunity to discuss the feedback with the teacher. A 10-15 min session after the session is used for discussion on feedback during the class timings. The Moodle answers to quiz are self-explanatory and hence no additional feedback is provided. Level 2 module students receive generic feedback on evaluation sheets. No feedback is provided on end semester examinations. In the Electronics department the data collected reveals that It is not mandatory to give formative feedback for all coursework assessments except for projects, reports or case studies. No specific template or format or protocol is followed for providing feedback. No feedback is given on final assessments (examination, project presentation, report, conceptual understanding). For Projects, formative feedback is given on project reports (chapter-wise), using Review option in MS Word or through email or one-to-one through discussion between project supervisor and student/s. Formative feedback on circuit designing and for successful project implementation is given at different stages, through

discussions between project supervisor and student/s or through comments written on weekly project diary.

During using Case-studies (in certain level 2/3 modules), formative feedback is given once in 3 weeks with inputs for improvement for the final presentation in week 9/10. Whereas for assignments for math based modules do not receive any formative feedback. Faculty is of the opinion that for such assignments, feedback or learning information before the assessment is more important as this will provide guidelines to complete the assignment. Students, who meet faculty for support for these assignments, get support only on the approach towards solving particular problems and are guided accordingly. For Written Tests (coursework) feedback comments are written on the answer script and are available for students to view. However, it is not mandatory for all students to check their answer scripts. Some teachers ask students to check their answer scripts to know their marks and only then upload marks on the CIS. This is more practically possible for sessions having small cohort of students. For Laboratory work, there are marks assigned for weekly performance of students in lab. This is monitored by the lab instructors for Level 0/1 modules and by teaching faculty for level 2/3 modules. Continuous feedback (verbal and/or written) is given for students' improvement. Written feedback is mainly on lab journals on the report submitted for each experiment.

During Tutorial hours, (one contact hour) more examples (numerical problems) are done with teachers being around for assistance and students independently taking efforts in learning. Feedback provided to students during tutorial hours help them in knowing their weak areas for improvement. For Formative assessments given at the end of every unit for level 0/1 modules, feedback is provided to students on their level of understanding of topic and encourages them to put-in more efforts to perform better in the summative assessments. For Postgraduate Studies [MBA and MSc programmes] Use of written feedback is the dominant way of providing feedback on student work. Extensive use of Moodle is being done for both PG programmes. Feedback is provided for all components of assessments over the Moodle. In the past the department used to keep printed versions of feedback on a template with PG Desk. The students used to come and collect it – few of them did not come to collect. Currently the same process is followed through Moodle. For Dissertations, there is a feedback form and the feedback is placed on the Moodle. For formative exercises, oral and written feedback is provided over the Moodle for which discussion forums are used. The student may meet the teacher over an appointment or after the class to collect oral feedback or prefer to write over the discussion forum.

## **5. Findings**

As a policy there is no written or common understanding amongst various academic departments on how feedback should be provided to the student on his/her work. There is no established process and no identified techniques to be used at MEC. Hence it is completely dependent on the faculty members' / departments' understanding of the value, importance, purpose, depth and process to be adopted for giving feedback on student work to the student.

“Without feedback good performance is not reinforced and poor performance may be repeated at the expense of the student’s performance. Properly handled, feedback enhances the teacher-learner relationship and leads to beneficial changes in learners’ behaviour” (Cantillon and Sargeant, 2008, p. 1294).

If little or no feedback is given by faculty then (Cantillon and Sargeant, 2008):

- Good performance is not reinforced and poor performance remains uncorrected;
- If a teacher makes no comment, students may assume that all is well;
- Students may depend on other classmates for feedback which they desperately need;
- Students may have to guess their level of competence, based on how well they are coping;
- Students may have to learn by trial and error at their own expense.

Incorporating feedback is surely as fundamental a characteristic of responsible and responsive learning systems as having a teacher at all (Sadler, 1998) and good feedback lies at the heart of good pedagogy. However data collected from academic departments at MEC, the following findings can be listed:

The group realised that there is little understanding of the purpose of the feedback amongst the faculty members. Most of the faculty members end up justifying the marks and tend to avoid meeting students for giving feedback, as students argue in order to get a raise in their marks. Students also lack an understanding of the purpose and relevance of the feedback of their own work. Feedback is collected from the teacher only by those students who are really interested in knowing their weaknesses. However in such meeting they come to know the strengths and weaknesses of their work only. There is lack of an effort to provide constructive feedback to the students. The approach of the teachers is such that feedback is not considered a way of scaffolding the learning process of the student. Strategies for improvement are seldom or never provided to the students. Most of the feedback is indicative of good and bad. Criteria for performance measurement are not being provided to the students at the time of giving the assessment. Feedback like ‘great job, well done’ may appear good but it will not help the learner to improve performance nor guide future learning. Faculty gives feedback not on specific pieces of work but on general performance.

Some faculty members conduct several formative assessments along with summative assessments. A good practice ongoing at MEC is that most of the teachers provide a lot of oral feedback on formative assessments that helps students in improving their work. It also provides the student an opportunity to meet the teacher. The intent of the formative assessment and therefore feedback is to share information about performance in order to support and enhance learning whereas summative assessment is more about conferring judgment.

## 6. Possible Strategies

The group identified certain possible strategies that could be adopted by MEC as an institution which would help enhance the process of feed-backing at the college and render its benefits to the student, helping them enhance the student experience at MEC.

The suggested strategies were as follows:

- a) Devise a policy related to providing feedback on student work.
- b) Awareness workshops to be conducted for faculty members regarding relevance, process / techniques of providing feedback on student work.
- c) Awareness workshops/sessions to be conducted for students regarding the relevance, process and techniques of providing feedback on their work. Information given would be related to the level/type of module.
- d) Turnaround time (1 or 2 weeks) to be agreed upon for all academic departments for providing the feedback to students. [This could vary with the level of module / UG or PG / Module vs Project] Details need to be mentioned on the MIS every semester-every module on the time and mode of feedback on student work.
- e) Feedback to be directly based on the learning outcomes of the module and pre-given assessment criteria for the assessment (to be given along with the assessment to the student).
- f) Feedback on student work should be critical in nature with detailed comments that also provide strategies for enhancement and improvement to the student.
- g) Use of Moodle / CIS to provide written feedback should be agreed upon, for Level 2 and 3 modules, UG projects and PG Modules and dissertation. It would be valuable as it can be retrieved by the student anytime, anywhere.
- h) Provide generic oral feedback. Faculty should refrain from pointing out details about a student or a group of students. The individual sessions can be organised during office hours / on appointment.
- i) Continue with the formative assessments and feedback as a good practice. Those departments who are not conducting formative assessments / feedback should understand and follow this best practice.
- j) For large cohorts and Level 0 and 1 modules, feedback statement banks can be developed which could be used to provide feedback. The module leader will be compiling this bank along with the other faculty members who deal with the module.
- k) Checklist for assessment criteria to be developed and mandatorily provided with each piece of module assessment to the student (this checklist has to be provided as part of the assessment question paper).

l) Use Supplementary Instructors (SIs) or peer-tutors (whichever module it is applicable) to communicate individual/group feedback along with specific measures for improvement.

m) Hold debriefing of exams on the last day of end semester examinations to provide generic oral feedback to the students who attend the session. Even if the attendance is poor, the faculty should hold the 1 session per module feedback session.

## **7. Proposed Strategies for MEC**

Post data collection, analysis and feedback collected from the head of academic departments at MEC, proposed strategies have been listed below for approval at TLC. The head of the group presented the below mentioned strategies to the TLC and after deliberation and discussion they were agreed upon.

The proposed strategies for MEC were as follows:

### **1. POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

Devise a MEC policy related to providing feedback on student work.

“Feedback on student work shall be provided to each student for each assessment in all modules every semester”

### **2. ACTIVITIES TO OPERATIONALISE**

a) Awareness workshops to be conducted for faculty members and students. A minimum of 2 workshops to be conducted every semester.

b) Turnaround time (1 or 2 weeks) to be agreed upon for all MEC academic departments for providing the feedback to students. [This could vary with the level of module / UG or PG / Module vs Project] Details need to be mentioned on the Module Information Sheet (MIS) every semester. The mode of feedback provided to students for every assessment in a module would be devised by the module leader / instructor and approved by that a mechanism created by the head of the department for this purpose.

c) Use of Moodle / CIS to provide written feedback should be agreed upon, for Level 2 and 3 modules, UG projects and PG Modules and dissertation. It would be valuable as it can be retrieved by the student anytime, anywhere.

d) For large cohorts and Level 0 and 1 modules, feedback statement banks can be developed which could be used to provide feedback. The module leader will be compiling this bank along with the other faculty members who deal with the module.

e) Checklist for assessment criteria to be developed and mandatorily provided with each piece of module assessment to the student (this checklist has to be provided as part of the assessment question paper).

The action points that were agreed after presenting the proposal are as follows:

The policy formulated by the group “Feedback on student work shall be provided to each student for each assessment in all modules every semester” was readily accepted. The proposal that awareness workshops is to be conducted for faculty members regarding relevance, process / techniques of providing feedback on student work was presented and was approved.

The proposal for the turnaround time was put forward as “Turnaround time (1 or 2 weeks) to be agreed upon for all academic departments for providing the feedback to students. [This could vary with the level of module / UG or PG / Module vs Project] Details need to be mentioned on the MIS every semester-every module on the time and mode of feedback on student work” and was accepted in principle. The suggestion to widen the usage of Moodle in giving feedbacks especially for Level 2 and 3 modules, UG projects and PG Modules and dissertation was also accepted unanimously. It was also suggested by the group that for large cohorts, to use feedback statement banks collated by the module leaders with the help of other faculty members, which again was accepted by TLC in principle.

TLC also decided to agree to the recommendation of the group that “Checklist for assessment criteria to be developed and mandatorily provided with each piece of module assessment to the student (this checklist has to be provided as part of the assessment question paper).” Further to this, it was also decided the PG assessment criteria and the assessment criteria as followed in the partner university will be sent across by the Chair to the all the TLC members. Based on some more deliberations TLC also concluded that it is more appropriate to give detailed documented feedback which need not be individual. The mechanism including the types and level of details for feed backing can be decided by each department as suitable for their type of subjects and the number of students handled.

## **8. Conclusions**

Once the group task concluded, the group leader was requested to deliver awareness workshops to the teaching staff of all departments. Additionally, one department that offers programmes in Arabic language is being handled in a special manner. Specialised sessions are being held for them so that a more comprehensive and standardized approach can be adopted for all the departments of MEC. The slides (see Annexure 1) and exercises (see Annexure 2) that are being used for the workshop have been attached for usage by the practicing academicians worldwide. At the current point in time, the policy of feed-backing is being followed throughout MEC. All the departments are providing feedback for each module and for each assessment offered. This leads to a substantial shift in student experience of MEC students.

## **References**

Andrade, H.G. (2005). Teaching With Rubrics, The Good, The Bad, And The Ugly. *College Teaching*, 53, 1, 27-30, [Online] Available: <https://webmail.csuchico.edu/vpaa/assessment/documents/AndradeTeachingWithRubrics.pdf>

(November 20, 2012)

Cantillon, P.&Sargeant, J. (2008). Giving feedback in clinical settings. *British Medical Journal*, 337: a1961. doi:10.1136/bmj.a1961.

Cooper, J. L. & Robinson, P. (2000). Getting Started: Informal Small-Group Strategies in Large Classes. 81, [Online] Available: <http://bama.ua.edu/~sprenric/695%20Cooper%20&%20Robinson%202000.pdf> (November 10,

2012)

Ende, J. (1983). Feedback in Clinical Medical Education. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 250, 6, 777-781.

GMV, (2006). Assessment feedback to students, University of Bath. [Online] Available: <http://www.hcmute.edu.vn/Resources/Docs/dh->

[cd/NhapMonNganhCNKTCK/assessmentfeedback.pdf](http://www.hcmute.edu.vn/Resources/Docs/dh-cd/NhapMonNganhCNKTCK/assessmentfeedback.pdf) (November 15, 2012)

Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 185– 212.

Middle East College, Sultanate of Oman. [Online] Available: [www.mec.edu.om](http://www.mec.edu.om) (November 26, 2012)

Moodle.org: open-source community-based tools for learning. [Online] Available: [www.Moodle.org](http://www.Moodle.org) (November 26, 2012)

Race, P. (n.d.). Using feedback to help students to learn, [Online] Available: [http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/resources/resourcedatabase/id432\\_using\\_feedback.k.pdf](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/resources/resourcedatabase/id432_using_feedback.k.pdf) (November 22, 2012)

Rust, C. (2002). The impact of assessment on student learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 3, 2, 145–158.

Sadler, D.R. (1998). Formative assessment: Revisiting the territory. *Assessment in Education*, 5, 1, p. 77.

