

Student Perceptions of the ‘Best’ Feedback Practices – An Evaluation of Student-Led Teaching Award Nominations at a Higher Education Institution.

Tom Lowe, University of Winchester, Tom.Lowe@winchester.ac.uk

Cassie Shaw, University of Winchester, Cassie.Shaw@winchester.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

There is great emphasis in contemporary Higher Education (HE) to address the seemingly consistent issue of what students perceive to be good assessment feedback practice. Improving this aspect of the student experience continues to elude higher education institutions, as reflected in the nationally lower than average scores in the UK's annual National Student Survey questions on timely/prompt feedback (NSS, 2017, Gartland et al 2016), which makes this a topical area for further investigation and discussion. To investigate student perceptions of feedback, this article examines the qualitative data from three years of Student-Led Teaching Awards (SLTA) nominations for the category “Best Lecturer for Constructive and Efficient Feedback” at the University of Winchester. From this study, new revelations with regards to the student perception of the ‘best’ lecturers’ feedback practices have come to light including terminology, language and emphasis on email turnaround, rather than the actual format of the feedback itself (handwritten, audio, e-submission etc.). Key findings include that students focus on the quality of the linguistic elements of feedback, rather than the mode of delivery. This study also finds that students are often perceiving feedback in a literal sense, with many staff nominated based on their informal email responses, rather than the formal assignment feedback often attributed to this question in the NSS. In order to tease out the repetitive emerging themes for which practices students are perceiving to be “good” feedback, this paper will outline the findings of this study, including the methodology and nomination process of the SLTAs at the University of Winchester.

KEYWORDS

assessment, feedback, student engagement, Student led teaching awards

INTRODUCTION

The United Kingdom's (UK) Higher Education system has gone through significant changes during the last decade including; increased student numbers, increased student involvement in all aspects of Higher Education (HE), changes to the student loan structures, an ever diversifying student body, and an increased emphasis on student employability (Lea, 2015, 5). The course of consumerism is a powerful structural factor on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) in HE today (Levy, Little and Whelan, 2011, 2), with emphasis on a students as consumer model prominent within Western post-secondary education (Bunce et al, 2017) and transactional outcomes such as graduate employability programmes (Lackner, and Martini, 2017). An additional pressure on UK Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) is the external evaluation conducted annually with third year students in the National Student Survey (NSS), which asks final year undergraduate students 27 (previously 23) questions on how satisfied they were with several aspects of their HE experience (NSS, 2017). These results lead to University rankings in national leagues tables along with other sector measurable such as the survey counting towards 25% of the new Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (NSS, 2017; TEF, 2017; Ingham, 2016). The questions in the NSS on assessment and feedback, have notably been the biggest sources of dissatisfaction since the NSS was launched, with UK national satisfaction scores 73% satisfied, compared to 84% overall satisfaction (NSS, 2017). This causes HEIs across the sector to dwell over how to offer satisfactory, or preferably excellent, feedback practices to better student satisfaction on this question (Williams, 2014; NUS, 2008).

Assessment has been understood to be the key driver of students' learning in Higher Education, yet feedback practices still require enhancement (Harland et al, 2015; Jessop & Maleckar, 2016; Gillet & Hammond, 2009). The feedback puzzle has created a vast discourse within SOTL and at HEIs, with several different research discussions and policy decisions conducted to seek to enhance this aspect of the student experience (William, 2014). Beaumont and colleagues state that students perceived quality feedback as part of a dialogue process rather than an event (Beaumont et al 2011, 671) and outline their Dialogue Feedback Cycle, with pre and in task feedback as more effective than summative. Beaumont and colleagues also state that students experience a radically different culture of feedback at Higher Education (HE) compared to school and Further Education (FE) (Beaumont, 2011, 671). Bennet and Kane suggest that the engaged student perception and interpretations of the meanings of some of the NSS items relating to 'the teaching on my course' and to 'assessment and feedback' will differ from those of their non-engaged colleagues (Bennet & Kane, 2011, 135). This pedagogical issue and area of inquiry within SOTL is under particular pressure in UK HE. Solutions often suggested are moves towards online feedback for greater clarity and engagement, three-week turnarounds to meet student expectations (Debusse and Lawley, 2016) and enriched feedback experiences through formative feedback to feedforward on assessments as part of more programmatic assessment practices suggested by the TESTA process; A process that collects evidence about programme assessment patterns, providing a student-centred yet collegiate approach to enhancing student learning, based on assessment principles (Jessop et al, 2014).

Boud and Molloy speak of the importance of the 'feedback loop', or feedback as 'gifts', as important framing for feedback as an on-going process rather than a one-off product (Winstone & Nash, 2017; Molloy, 2013; Askew & Lodge, 2000) better scaffold students' learning and increase engagement with feedback. Nicol has emphasized that instructors/ Faculty need to take a different perspective to tackle dissatisfaction with feedback, blaming massified HE

to be squeezing out dialogue which has created a one way communication burden for students and staff alike (Nicol, 2010). Nicol argues that feedback should move away from a narrow focus on performing a pragmatic need, to ensuring that feedback is understandable, selective (not too much feedback), specific, contextualized, non-judgmental and of course timely (Nicol, 2010, p. 513). Ferguson agrees, concluding in his research that students seek timely and personalised feedback that has a certain amount of positivity to inspire confidence, acknowledging students' successes and give recommendations for future improvements (Ferguson, 2011, p. 60). Ferguson's research also outlines that students welcome online feedback and sometimes found face to face feedback in a lecturer's office intimidating (Ferguson, 2011, p. 60). The above studies will be taken into account in the research paper below.

STUDENT-LED TEACHING AWARDS

At the same time as these changes in UK HE, there has been an aligned emphasis on 'Student Engagement', which has largely been embraced by the sector, as a means of enhancing the student experience through engaging students in new places as students as partners in their learning communities (Lowe and Dunne, 2017; El Hakim, 2017; Wait and Bols, 2016; Bryson, 2015; QAA, 2012). As part of this growth of activity, many UK HEIs have adopted Student-Led Teaching Awards (SLTAs), which are student-led award schemes that offer positive feedback to Faculty and Professional Service Staff. At Winchester, the Student-Led Teaching Awards was a project borne from Winchester Student Union and the University of Winchester's shared agenda to expand student feedback on best practice and to enhance the student experience (Lowe, Shaw, Sims, King, Paddison, 2017). Feeding into wider institutional strategy, the SLTAs offer an opportunity to explore the unique perceptions from students that help to identify good practice and make a positive influence on learning (Swain, 2012). SLTAs provide students with a platform to anonymously nominate any staff for excellence in a host of categories, which can support staff professional development and boost morale (Arthur, 2009). Every member of staff who has been nominated for an award is notified of their nomination, to widen impact. Students nominate in categories such as 'Inspirational Lecturer of the Year' and 'Best use of Resources'. A student committee organises the SLTAs, discussing the nomination process, organising an annual ceremony and selecting winners based on the qualitative submissions.

As with many Universities, students at Winchester are provided with platforms to engage in representation and democracy, volunteering, research and creating change (Shaw and Lowe, 2017), however none previously gave students the ability to solely praise and commend staff for their work and support. The key aspect to the SLTAs is the commitment to being student-led, which includes determining the award categories, the winners and the coordination of the event. The committee includes the Student Union Vice President, Education and Student Engagement Assistant as co-chairs. The other members of the committee are students from across the institution who submit written applications. To ensure more students know about the SLTAs, a campaign of posters, merchandise and class talks are planned each year. The campaign has grown each year to include more exciting ways to promote the SLTAs and encourage more students to feedback positively about their educational experience. Laced with positivity and praise, by providing students with a platform to give thanks and encouragement to staff, the SLTAs bridge the gap between staff and students in a way that was previously untapped. One category is titled "Best Lecturer for Constructive and Efficient Feedback". The nominations for this category will be reviewed in this paper. The research team hope this inquiry will isolate

student perspectives of feedback and offer an additional new source for data surrounding the complex Feedback NSS issue in UK HE. Example nominations for this category include:

- *“X is concise and constructive with feedback thus helping lots with future work. he also sticks well to deadlines”*
- *“X always provides constructive feedback, delivers work in a timely manner and makes time to go through feedback on a one-to-one basis should it be required”*
- *“X gives almost as much feedback on work as the work that has been done itself... She has a passion for teaching and using life examples and supports her students in pushing for the best marks”*

The team recognised the limitations of the award nominations as data for a study such as this, as well as the contention surrounding SLTAs (Madriaga and Morley, 2016). The notion of students being given the opportunity to award staff members on their performance throughout the year can be controversial amongst some staff. This is perhaps driven by the ‘terrors of performativity’ (Ball, 2003) where staff feel academic freedom and values are being displaced by incentivised effectivity, which dominates over educational honesty, causing a ‘values schizophrenia’ in a performative regime (Ball, 2003). There is a perception that the SLTAs are a popularity contest, whereby the most ‘entertaining’ staff member wins, rather than those conducting educationally purposeful academic work. Whilst there is opposition, the team felt assessing the feedback question draws least on ‘performativity’ factors alongside valuing the merit of the award nominations in offering a new researchable source of data. This paper will review these qualitative nominations below.

METHODOLOGY

The SLTAs have grown each year in the number of nominations and still have significant room to expand, given each students’ eligibility to nominate as awareness grows. The possible number of nominations able to be cast by students still means that the awards can continue to grow further before it reaches its maximum potential. Winchester Student Union began running the SLTA scheme in the academic year 2013-14 and for the purpose of this study, the team will assess the number of nominations for category ‘*Best Lecturer for Constructive and Efficient Feedback*’ across the years 2013-2016. A summary of the number of nominations is below:

ACADEMIC YEAR	NO. OF NOMINATIONS FOR CATEGORY
2013-14	37
2014-15	61
2015-16	135

Table 1: Nominations for ‘Best Lecturer for Constructive and Efficient Feedback’

Firstly, the team anonymized the data removing all names, course titles and any other information which may make the information identifiable, as the study would be used to report at internally SOTL fora. The team replaced each and all of those parts of the data with the letter ‘X’. The data was then coded in regards to common themes to seek out possible tangible best

practice or reoccurring themes which students referred to in their nominations across the three years. This was conducted through discussion between the two researchers who both work in the area of Student Engagement and SOTL. The codes were derived from the keywords used by the students in the feedback and in relation to the literature and the team’s experience work with Faculty around the topic of feedback. The largest categories such as Code 1 (Constructive) and Code 2 (Language Used) are amalgamations of similar keywords which mean similar aspects of feedback, for example ‘valuable’ and ‘transferable’ feedback are both constructive in line with HE language. Any disagreements were spoken through and a decision was made on a code allocation following a conversation in the research team. The results of this exercise and the themes identified the table below:

REF.	CODE / THEME	FREQ.
1	Constructive (Valuable, Transferable)	129
2	Language Used (Sensitive, Accessible, Clear, Personal)	35
3	Above and beyond (outside office hours/ Pastoral Care/ quick response to emails)	35
4	On time	29
5	Detailed	29
6	Prior to feedback due date	12
7	Concise	5
8	Trustworthy (consistency, reliable, fair)	5
9	Motivational	5
10	Relating to Learning Outcomes/ Marking Criteria	2
11	Engaging	1

Table 2: Summary of positive themes / codes drawn from the SLTA Data (2013-16)

When the team were analyzing the data for positive themes, the responses that included modes of feedback practice were recorded, which were originally thought to be the bulk of the data. Furthermore, the team recorded references to negative experiences of feedback, where the nomination would commend a Faculty member’s practice by referencing that they did not do a practice deemed negative by the student nominating. Both of these are summarized in the tables below:

REF.	CODE / THEME	FREQ.
12	Face to Face	15
13	Online Submission	1
14	Online Marking	2
15	Online Collection	1
16	Screencast/ Visual	2
17	Alternative Feedback Forms	1
18	Annotations	1
19	Audio Feedback	3

Table 3: Summary of practice themes / codes drawn from the SLTA Data (2013-16)

REF.	CODE / THEME	FREQ.
20	'Vague'	1
21	Illegible Format	2
22	'Not Biased'	1
23	Unexplained Crosses on Work	1
24	'Ripping Essays Apart'	1
25	'Never leaves me feeling angry or upset'	1
26	'Rude'	1
27	Bulky Feedback Forms	1

Table 4: Summary of negative comparisons / codes drawn from the SLTA Data (2013-16)

With these data, the authors recognize that there are notable limitations prior to further analysis. Firstly, the qualitative data are award nominations and therefore largely positive and possibly persuasive. The accuracy of the accounts written by students in the nominations can be questioned, as they had a motive to write the award nomination for the individual lecturer who they wished to see awarded. Ethical approval was not needed as students were notified upon nominating that their nominations would be used to identify and enhance practice in teaching and learning and for the purposes of this study both the students and the staff are not identifiable. However, students were not asked for examples “good practice in feedback”, they were asked to nominate members of Faculty who they deemed to be deserving of the award for feedback. This

could arguably express a further limitation to the data, as even though it is a rich untapped resource to feed into the HE feedback discourse, it was gathered for an alternative purpose and so there are limitations for the specific use as identifying good practice. With these limitations in mind, it is also worth highlighting that the dataset does provide testament to practice students deemed to be commendable and thus provides a unique window into the student's perception of feedback practices.

DISCUSSION

When the team initially embarked on this inquiry project, the expected outcome was thought to be a qualitative bank of nominations outlining good practical aspects of feedback, such as e-feedback, audio feedback and certain feedback forms, which are often aligned with enhancing feedback practices (Debus and Lawley, 2016). References to the mode of delivery were lower than expected, although this could be due to proportionally less faculty using other modes of feedback delivery than the standard practice of written feedback. As noted above in Tables 2, 3 and 4, the majority of the codes derived from the data are in fact relation to more thematic practices in feedback such as; '*transferable*', '*above and beyond*' and '*constructive*', rather than the mode of the feedback, which are far lower in number in Table 3 following Ferguson and Nicol's studies (Ferguson, 2011; Nicol, 2010). Below, the team have grouped the coded findings and they will be discussed in context of contemporary HE.

'Constructive (Transferable, Valuable)' (Codes 1):

Students outlined constructive feedback as the best attribute to feedback, which had a frequency of occurrence within the nominations of 78. This coincides with the themes of feedback being transferable and valuable for future use in their assessed work (Jessop et al, 2014; Ferguson, 2011; Nicol, 2010). The concept of portability in feedback has shown to be key to the student's conceptualisation of what is 'best' for their feedback. Whilst there is strength in the argument that the word 'constructive' in the question has had a direct causal effect on its prominence in frequency in the nominations, the second adjective within the nomination title, 'efficient', has not emerged as a code in the data. This does not dismiss the probable causal effect of its frequency, however, it is a consideration to have. It is clear that the transferability of feedback for future work has played a vital role in what students are understanding to be the best practice for feedback.

'Language Used', 'Concise', 'Motivational' and 'Engaging' (Codes 2, 7, 9 & 11):

The linguistic elements of feedback have also shown to significantly influence student perceptions of what constitutes best feedback. Students often commented on the language used within their feedback as affecting how they engaged themselves with the feedback they were given. Students have stated in their nominations that they would like their feedback to be concise, personal, sensitive, motivating and engaging, which almost directly mirrors Nicol's recommendations of best practice (Nicol, 2010). Students often stated that they are aware that they can feel sensitive when receiving feedback on their work, so they appreciate the tutor taking due time and consideration towards their use of language as a tool to transfer the feedback in a motivational way. The 'language used' appeared joint second in the frequency of codes, which highlights how language can significantly affect the way students are engaging with their feedback.

'On Time' and 'Prior to Due Date' (Codes 4 & 6):

The timeliness of assessment feedback is directly asked in NSS question 7 (NSS Questions from 2005-2016) / question 10 (NSS Questions 2017-present) (NSS, 2017). The data seemed to show that for students, timeliness can be simply having the feedback on time, to actually receiving the feedback prior to the date that is set. Whilst setting the standard for feedback being prior to the due date seems unreasonable when considering the academic's workload schedule, it is interesting to note that 'best' practice is outlined here to be receiving feedback on time. This suggests the benchmark for exceptional feedback practice is set at a level that should be considered standard practice; receiving your feedback 'on time'. If it is best practice to receive feedback on time, as should be the benchmark, perhaps we should be concerned that too many are falling below this benchmark in order to make such practice exceptional - even award worthy.

'Detailed' (Code 5):

A high proportion of the nominations made reference to 'detailed' feedback, suggesting a high volume or level of scrutiny in the feedback. This is possibly an understandable reason to nominate, yet it is less discussed in the literature or policy, which often focuses on turnaround times, usefulness and means of delivery (Debus and Lawley, 2016; Ferguson, 2011). Noting the detailed nature of feedback as an award worthy attribute suggests the additional time Faculty are committing to feedback on the minutiae elements of student work is appreciated and celebrated. Seeing effort in return for the student's own effort offers an interesting perspective on the feedback discourse and certainly links to the identified code below of 'Above and Beyond'. This code emphasises the student's desire for more than receiving a grade with generic feedback points. 'Detailed' suggests a thorough or personal examination of students' work. The suggestion that students value detailed feedback also alludes to students taking the time to thoroughly read and use that feedback.

'Above and Beyond' (Code 3):

This code provided some interesting and possibly concerning attributes. Going 'above and beyond' for students meant anything from really useful draft feedback for their assignment, to responding to emails no matter what hour of day, or night in some instances, they contacted them. What was particularly key in this code was that the word 'feedback' was not directly related to their assignment feedback, but also feedback to queries on emails. The nominations that contributed to this code focused quite considerably on the quick responses from tutors to their emails. This is perhaps a vital consideration for the NSS questions on feedback when many Universities choose to set assignment marking and feedback deadlines. If the 'timeliness' of feedback, does not solely related to assignment feedback being delivered on time, tutors might also start to consider how 'timely' their feedback is to student email queries, if this is how the NSS is being interpreted by students. As Bennet and Kane caution above, students' understanding of certain words such as 'feedback' in HE can be understood differently effecting responses (Bennet and Kane, 2014).

'Trustworthy' ('Consistency', 'Reliable', 'Fair') (Code 8):

Students' commending Faculty feedback practices for being 'trustworthy', 'fair' or 'reliable' received five nominations which could be argued as an outcome of a pressured HE system that places emphasis on student outcomes and achievements. Although this is a positive

nomination, this code is concerning as for some to be commended for giving trustworthy feedback (or marks on assignments) suggests that others are perhaps not. At a time in HE where there are increased pressures on students who are locked into a “*hierarchy of success*”, due to high tuition fees and a desire for a graduate outcome (Bovill, 2017), these commendations suggest that those students who nominated for these reasons have found other Faculty to not be trustworthy or reliable. Although a commendation, this identifies an issue that could be occurring behind the data, which can be helped through departmental marking calibration workshops and transparency of marks attributed to comprehensive marking criteria.

‘Relating to Learning Outcomes’ / ‘Marking Criteria’ (Code 10):

Perhaps worryingly for some policy makers who champion aligning feedback to Learning Outcomes or Marking Criteria, only two nominations featured students celebrating this practice. As this is a far less frequent code, this could be reflected upon either positively or negatively. In a positive sense, it may be that colleagues are rarely emphasising the importance of cross referencing the marks awarded to the Learning Outcomes or Marking Criteria, which could be a useful step forward for the sector building the trustworthiness of their marking. However, if viewed negatively, it could also be that students are not engaging with the marking criteria at all because they do not value this practice. Finally, in neither a positive nor negative sense, it could be that engaging with the Learning Outcomes and Marking Criteria is seen as standard practice by students, which is why it is not referenced in the nominations, as this is expected practice rather than award worthy.

Practical Themes (Codes 12-19):

In Table 3 there are examples of assessment that students saw to be particularly valuable assets to the feedback experience. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the most frequently cited method of receiving feedback was the use of a face to face tutorial. This is a practice that is often referred to as the best method of delivering feedback to students, as it opens up a dialogue (Merry et al, 2013). There are practical elements to consider here, such as the time needed to deliver this type of feedback to all student. Whilst students recognise this is the best delivery of feedback, this is not the most time efficient mode of delivery. Other tools such as audio feedback and screencasting feedback were valued by students, as it adds a personal dimension to the feedback students receive. Where written text can be often perceived negatively, hearing the voice of the marker can change the interpretation of feedback through the tone of delivery. Students commented in their nominations that the tone of delivery for feedback, both linguistically and audibly, made a considerable difference to their response to the feedback.

Negative Themes (Codes 20-27):

Whilst the SLTAs are a platform for praise and commending staff, there were occurrences in the data where a student would be praising their nominee through contrasting them to (an always anonymous) other experience of bad practice. For example, students would say a tutor provides incredibly constructive feedback, instead of ‘ripping essays apart’. These codes were interesting because it showed some of the experiences the students have also had that has comparatively made their nominee an exemplary model for good feedback practices. These codes are shown in Appendix 1 and Table 4. In Table 4 we can see a student commented on the ‘bulky feedback forms’ that led to their negative experience, which their nominee contrastingly did not do. This is again another example of the word feedback being attributed to ‘feedback

forms' and not assessment feedback. The NSS feedback question is perhaps being interpreted to mean the feedback forms students fill in for staff, in the form of module evaluations etc. This paper is mostly interested in the positive attributes of feedback for which students have commended staff, however, the negative codes provide some interesting insight to the students' perceptions of experiences could be deemed to be 'worst', in opposition to 'best', feedback practices.

CONCLUSION

This paper has added to the discourse surrounding student satisfaction and the student perspective of the 'best' feedback practices. While this is a small-scale study, which may not be generalisable, it nevertheless sheds an interesting light on the perceptions students have on assessment and feedback practices. There are four main take-away messages available from this study at one HEI. One message clear to the reader will be that there is significant response and focus on the quality of the linguistic elements of feedback, such as transferable feedback, the types of language used and the detailed personalisation of the feedback. Secondly, it was intriguing to note how the mode of delivery of the feedback was not as frequently referred to in the nominations as the researchers expected, with few references to feedback modes (audio, written etc). It is worthwhile also highlighting that students value the legibility of written feedback, so, if written, typed feedback is advised. For the students in this dataset it was the trustworthiness of the feedback itself that mattered to the students, so transparency and reference to the marking criteria has been discussed. Equally, the data has shown that students appreciate their feedback being returned to them on time, deeming such practice as award worthy, which perhaps alludes to the benchmark of what should be standard practice being set quite low, if this is practice considered exceptional by students. The final take away message is that the team have found that students are including 'best' feedback practice to be inclusive of email responses (formatives and informal feedback), feedback forms and not just the formal assignment feedback. Perhaps caution should be advised to Faculty and Senior Administrators who often focus entirely on formal summative assignment turnarounds once submitted. This study has shown that students are interpreting 'feedback' in a broader and perhaps literal sense, compared to that of HEIs, where feedback is focused on as part of the assessment process only. From this study, readers from UK HEIs should take caution that students may be thinking of informal feedback practice on emails rather than solely assessment feedback when completing the National Student Survey. For example, students are more frequently voting for staff who answer emails outside of their office hours. Therefore, it might not be clear which aspect of feedback should be focused on if a HEI wishes to increase student satisfaction – perhaps feedback for assessments, emails and feedback forms should all be focused on together to achieve increased student satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Arthur, L. (2009). From Performativity to Professionalism: Lecturers Responses to Student Feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*. pp. 441-454.
- Askew, S., & Lodge, C. (2000). Gifts, ping-pong and loops-linking feedback and learning. *Feedback for learning*, pp.1-17.
- Ball, S. J. (2003). The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*. pp. 215-228.
- Beaumont, C., O'Doherty, M., & Shannon, L. (2011). Reconceptualising assessment feedback: a key to improving student learning? *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(6), pp.671-687.
- Bennett, R., & Kane, S. (2014). Students' interpretations of the meanings of questionnaire items in the National Student Survey. *Quality in higher education*, 20(2), pp.129-164.
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: the challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), pp.698-712.
- Bovill, C. (2017). Maintaining criticality: attempts to stop an unacceptable proportion of students from feeling alienated. *The Journal of Educational Innovation, Partnership and Change*, 3(1), 14-17.
- Bryson, C. (2015). Researching, Advancing and Inspiring Student Engagement (RAISE) IN: Lea, J. ed., 2015. *Enhancing learning and teaching in higher education: Engaging with the dimensions of practice*. Open University Press.
- Bunce, L., Baird, A., & Jones, S.E. (2017). The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), pp.1958-1978.
- Debusse, J.C., & Lawley, M. (2016). Benefits and drawbacks of computer-based assessment and feedback systems: Student and educator perspectives. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 47(2), pp.294-301.
- El Hakim, Y. (2017). Where next for Student Engagement?. *The Journal of Educational Innovation, Partnership and Change*, 3(1), pp.90-92.
- Ferguson, P. (2011). Student perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(1), pp.51-62.
- Gartland, K., Shapiro, A., McAleavy, L., McDermott, J., Nimmo, A. & Armstrong, M. (2016). Feedback for Future Learning: Delivering Enhancements and Evidencing Impacts on the Student Learning Experience. *New Directions in the Teaching of Physical Sciences*, (11).
- Gillett, A., & Hammond, A. (2009). Mapping the maze of assessment: An investigation into practice. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 10(2), pp.120-137.
- HEA, (2018). Student Led Teaching Awards. Retrieved from: <http://www.studentledteachingawards.org.uk/history-of-the-project/> (Accessed 30 September 2018).
- Ingham, D. (2016). An answer from research to the Teaching Excellence Framework—student engagement and graduate engagement to evidence legacy. *Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal*, 1(1).
- Jessop, T., El Hakim, Y., & Gibbs, G. (2014). TESTA in 2014: A way of thinking about assessment and feedback. *Educational Developments*, 15(2), pp.21-24.
- Jessop, T., & Maleckar, B. (2016). The influence of disciplinary assessment patterns on student learning: a comparative study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(4), pp.696-711.

- Harland, T., McLean, A., Wass, R., Miller, E., & Sim, K. (2015). An assessment arms race and its fallout: high-stakes grading and the case for slow scholarship. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(4), pp.528-541.
- Lackner, C., & Martini, T. (2017). Helping University Students Succeed at Employment Interviews: The Role of Self-Reflection in e-Portfolios. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, 5(2), pp.3-15.
- Lea, J. ed. (2015). *Enhancing learning and teaching in higher education: Engaging with the dimensions of practice*. Open University Press.
- Levy, P., Little, S., & Whelan, N. (2011). Perspectives on Staff-Student Partnerships in Learning, Research and Educational Enhancement. In: Little, S. 2011. *Staff-Student Partnerships in Higher Education*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Lowe, T., & Dunne, E. (2017). Setting the Scene for the REACT Programme: Aims, Challenges and the Way Ahead. *Journal of Educational Innovation, Partnership and Change*. Vol 3 (1). ISSN 2055-4990.
- Lowe, T., Shaw, C., Sims, S., King, S., & Paddison, A. (2017). The Development of Contemporary Student Engagement Practices at the University of Winchester. *International Journal of Students as Partners*. Vol. 1(1).
- Madriaga, M., & Morley, K. (2016). Awarding Teaching Excellence: ‘What is it supposed to Achieve?’. *Teaching in Higher Education*. pp. 166-174.
- Merry, S., Price, M., Carless, D., & Taras, M. eds., (2013). *Reconceptualising feedback in higher education: Developing dialogue with students*. Routledge.
- National Union of Students [NUS] 2008. “Student Experience Report”. Retrieved from: http://www.nus.org.uk/PageFiles/4017/NUS_StudentExperienceReport.pdf
- National Student Survey [NSS] (2017) [ONLINE] Available at: <http://www.thestudentsurvey.com/about.php> [Accessed 18 October 2017].
- Nicol, D., (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), pp.501-517.
- QAA (2012). *UK Quality Code for Higher Education*. Chapter B5: Student Engagement. Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency.
- Shaw, C., & Lowe, T. (2017) ‘The Student Participation Map: A tool to map student participations, engagements, opportunities and extra-curricular activities across a Higher Education Institution.’ *Dialogue: Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 1. pp. 45-50. ISSN 23399-701X
- Swain, J. (2012) Scoping the Landscape: An audit of Student led teaching awards project provision across the UK. Higher Education Academy [HEA] and National Union of Students [NUS].
- The Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework [TEF] (2017) [Online] Available at: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/tef/> [Accessed 9 December 2017].
- Wait, R., & Bols, A. (2015). Making Student Engagement a Reality: Turning Theory into Practice, Guild HE. Retrieved from: <http://www.guildhe.ac.uk/blog/making-student-engagement-a-reality-turning-theory-into-practice/>
- Williams, J. (2014). Student Feedback on the Experience of Higher Education. In *Using data to improve higher education* (pp. 67-80). Sense Publishers.
- Winstone, N., Nash, R., Rowntree, J., & Parker, M. (2017). ‘It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it’: barriers to university students’ feedback seeking and recipience. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), pp.2026-2041.

APPENDICES

Student Led-Teaching Awards Data

Table of codes: 2013-2014 (37 Nominations)

CODE	FREQ.
Quick Email Correspondence	6
Constructive (Valuable, Transferable)	22
Fair	1
Concise	1
Trustworthy	1
On time	3
Quick to solve issues	1
Above and beyond (outside office hours)	9
Positive Personal Attributes/ Characteristics	7
Face to Face	3
Detailed	5
Relating to Learning Outcomes/ Marking Criteria	1
Structured	1
Prior to feedback due date	2
Clear	1
Accessible Language	1
Sensitive Language	1
NEGATIVE CODES	
‘Vague’	1
‘Scruffy Handwriting’	1
‘Not Biased’	1

Table of codes: 2014-2015 (61 Nominations)

CODE	FREQ.
Quick Email Correspondence	4
Constructive (Valuable, Transferable)	31
Concise	1
On time	11
Above and beyond (outside office hours)	5
Positive Personal Attributes/ Characteristics in Feedback	2
Face to Face	3
Detailed	11
Relating to Learning Outcomes/ Marking Criteria	1
Prior to feedback due date	6
Clear	5
Sensitive Language	1
Online Submission	1
Online Marking	2
Online Collection	1
Screencast	1
Alternative Feedback Forms	1
Motivational	1
NEGATIVE CODES	
Illegible format	1
Unexplained Crosses on Work	1
'Ripping Essays Apart'	1
'Never leaves me feeling angry or upset'	1
Bulky Feedback Forms	1

Table of codes: 2015-2016 (135 Nominations)

CODE	FREQ.
Quick Email Correspondence	6
Constructive (Valuable, Transferable)	74
Fair	1
Concise	3
Trustworthy (fair)	2
On time	15
Above and beyond (outside office hours, pastoral care)	4
Positive Personal Attributes/ Characteristics in Feedback	5
Face to Face	7
Detailed	11
Prior to feedback due date	4
Clear	10
Accessible Language	1
Sensitive Language	1
Screen Cast/ Visual	1
Motivational	4
Quantity	1
Annotations	1
Consistency in Marking	1
Critical	2
Audio Feedback	3
Engaging	1