E-assessment: how can we support tutors with their marking of electronically submitted assignments?
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item and marked online by markers working on computers at home or in marking centres, with marks then being collected and checked electronically. This reduces the arithmetical errors inevitably involved in marking processes. It has many other benefits, notably reducing the need for scripts to be physically transported back and forth to examiners, considerably reducing the scope for loss or misdelivery and also thereby saving process time and the environment. It further allows real-time monitoring of marking for both accuracy and speed and permits standardisation to be carried out, if desired, online – useful both for small subjects and those with more straightforward mark schemes. A further benefit is that it makes possible the random allocation of scripts and indeed of items within scripts thus eliminating a potential source of marker bias.

This is therefore, all very much work in progress, a transformation which, importantly, is happening on an incremental basis, so that it will be many years, if ever, before pen and paper exams are entirely banished. This incremental development, dictated to some extent by the speed with which different applications of the technology can be developed, is also important because it allows a body of experience to develop before the implementation of wide scale changes, essential if the full assessment and other implications of all the new technology has to offer for example responses to new types of stimulus material, are to be properly understood.

The technology to achieve this is highly complex and has entailed huge investments by Cambridge Assessment and UK Awarding Bodies. It introduces the possibility, once it is properly established and fully embedded, of making significant process improvements which should in turn result in efficiency savings, but these will need to be set against the tens of millions of pounds of up front investment. The prime driver, therefore, has been to improve quality assurance and improve the accuracy and security of marking, essential at a time of such extensive public scrutiny of Awarding Bodies and their activities.

Of course, in undertaking this venture, Cambridge Assessment is going back to the original purpose for which it was founded, namely the developing and making available to schools exams that help promote high educational standards. There are multiple challenges it faces in doing so and I hope this article has given a flavour of what these are, and in particular the way in which assessment interacts closely with technological and social factors, seeking to set consistent and accepted standards whilst being responsive to changes in the overall environment. This is a difficult balance to maintain, especially in a time of major policy turbulence in education. Cambridge Assessment’s wholehearted ethical commitment to using assessment to support learning should, however, enable it to continue to succeed, a positive expression of the University’s commitment to the community, manifesting itself in a direct and practical way that allows it to influence positively the lives of millions each year through the provision of widely available, world class qualifications.

Simon Lebus
Group Chief Executive of Cambridge Assessment and Chairman of OCR
Cambridge Assessment
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU
United Kingdom
http://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/

Strategic drivers for e-Assessment
Assessment is one of the major challenges for higher education today. This is partly because it traditionally squares the desire for improved constructivist learning against the demand for institutional reliability and accountability. The result is that assessment is often the ‘wolf in sheep’s clothing’ – doing little to support individual learners, and in reality, principally there for institutional quality assurance. Technology can help enhance assessment – but only if it is used with an awareness of this problem, and designed to improve the effectiveness of assessment from the learner’s point of view.

The principal facilitators which have been identified by Whitelock & Brasher (2006) for effective implementation of e-Assessment are active institutional support from senior management with strong staff development together with pedagogical and technical support for tutors from central services. The call for a pedagogically driven model for e-Assessment was acknowledged as part of a vision for teaching and learning in 2014 (ibid.) Experts believe that such a model will allow students in Higher Education to take more control of their learning and hence become more reflective. These are indeed laudable aims but how can they be implemented in practice?

One of the problems with tutor feedback to students is that a balanced combination of socio emotive and cognitive support is required from the teaching staff, and the feedback needs to be relevant to the assigned grade. Is it possible to capitalise on technology to build training systems for tutors in Higher Education, that will support them with their feedback to students, and which will encourage their students to become more reflective learners?

Solving the problem
One approach to this question is to build tools to support tutors in the feedback process. Our work (see Whitelock et al., 2004) has involved building an open-
source mentoring tool for tutors, known as Open Mentor (http://www.openmentor.org.uk/). This tool analyses and displays the different types of comments provided by the tutor as feedback to the student. It then provides reflective comments to the tutor about their use of feedback.

This work followed a pedagogically-driven development process, beginning by developing scenarios of use, then storyboards, and then putting in place an implementation which would follow closely the pattern of these storyboards. Open Mentor was not designed for use at institutional level, but to give teaching staff a tool that can be used in training and also later as personal support that will enable individual tutors to track their use of feedback to students.

We found that students both expect and receive feedback that is appropriate to the assigned grade. This feedback provides them with the supportive comments they need to feel confident about their level of work. Our studies and trials revealed that tutors believed that a final mark can speak for itself. Therefore socio-emotive comments of support are not seen as necessary for these high achieving students. However when the students gaining high marks were questioned, they did not always believe that their work was of a good quality even though they had received an excellent mark because they were not aware of the mean score for a given assignment. In other words, they still felt they could be bottom of the class even with a high scoring assignment. Open Mentor therefore guides tutors into providing clearer positive reinforcement for high achievers and prompts tutors to advise all students about how to improve their grades.

The idea behind the design of Open Mentor is fairly straightforward: it goes through marked assignments, extracting tutor comments and classifying them. We used pre-determined benchmarks (from Whitelock et al., 2004, although these can be adapted to different institutions) to estimate ‘ideal’ distributions of comments for each category, and then display the difference between the actual and the ideal. Although there are ‘normal’ bands of comments of each type, these vary (significantly) depending on the quality of the individual submissions and the number of submissions involved. A large proportion of positive comments in one context may be inappropriate in a second, and coincidental in a third.

**How does Open Mentor work?**

To provide an appropriate mentoring framework, Open Mentor is based on Bales’ (1970) interactional categories, which provide four main categories of interaction: positive reactions, negative reactions, questions, and answers. These interactional categories illustrate the balance of socio-emotional comments that support the student. We found that tutors use different types of questions in different ways, both to stimulate reflection, and to point out, in a supportive way, that there are problems with parts of an essay. These results showed that about half of Bales’s interaction categories strongly correlated with grade of assessment in different ways, while others were rarely used in feedback to learners. This evidence of systematic connections between different types of tutor comments and level of attainment in assessment was the platform for the current work.

The advantage of the Bales model is that the classes used are domain-independent – we used this model to classify feedback in a range of different academic disciplines, and it has proven successful in all of them. An automatic classification system, therefore, can be used in all fields, without needing a new set of example comments and training for each different discipline. Others (e.g., Brown & Glover, 2006) have looked at a range of different classification systems, including Bales, and from these developed their own to bring out additional aspects of the tutor feedback, bringing back elements of the domain. In practice, no (useful) classification system can incorporate all comments. We selected, and still prefer, Bales because of its relative simplicity, its intuitive grasp by both students and tutors, and because it brings out the socio-emotive aspects of the dialogue, which is one aspect tutors are often unaware of.

![Figure 1: Screen dump of Open Mentor](image-url)

Open Mentor sets this framework on an open source foundation, to enable anyone to take these results and build on them. It is built using Java and an underlying database — the choice of technology designed to enable the software to be freely used without licensing costs. Open Mentor reads and opens assignments written in Microsoft Word, to extract the tutor comments – although it does not use Word itself. A standard charting component is used to provide interactive ‘bar chart’ views onto the tutors’ comments, showing the difference between actual and ideal comment distributions.

**Advantages**

In today’s educational climate, with the continued pressure on staff resources, making individual learning work is always going to be a challenge. But it is achievable, so long as we manage to maintain our empathy with the learner. Tools can help us achieve this by giving us frameworks where we can reflect on our social interaction, and...
ensure that it provides the emotional support as well as the conceptual guidance that our learners need. Tutors are provided with simple visual displays of their use of feedback, like that shown in Figure 1 above. Finally, using open source software makes the tool easier to adapt to different institutions’ and individuals’ needs than any off the shelf product.

Future Work
Assessment is a far more widespread issue than we had realised, and since starting work in this area, we found many other potential applications for this technology. These include:

• Providing students with formative feedback on their assessments, with feedback properly adjusted to the students’ needs
• Supporting the review process in academic conferences and competitive project proposals
• Automated generation of high quality reports (both in content and in presentation) based on complex data

Technology to enhance assessment is still in its early days, but the problems are not technical: assessment raises far wider social issues, and technologists have struggled in the past to resolve these issues with the respect they deserve. E-Assessment is starting to deliver potential improvements; but there is still much work to be done.
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CREDITWORTHY? AN APPROACH TO COURSEWORK, COMPLETION AND CREDIT

Now that course ‘completion’ has become the criterion for calculating the number of FTES (‘full time equivalent’ students), all departments and institutes of continuing education have had to be more demanding and more transparent in the ways they promote their level 1 courses: it has become important to set out clearly in prospectuses and publicity the demand for, and the nature of, assessment. In so doing departments have also had to be careful not to scare off students thinking of coming to (or coming back to) higher education for the first time. Equally, they must not alienate the large number of students who exemplify the value of ‘lifelong learning’ in the fullest, liberal sense of the term but for whom ‘working towards an award’ is the least of their reasons for signing up for courses.

It is instructive to see how different institutions are signalling the importance of assessment. Lancaster University Department of Continuing Education’s On Course (Summer 2007) includes the following questions and answers:

At what level are the courses?
For most certificates the level of study is at the equivalent of first year undergraduate study. This means that face-to-face classes will include lots of discussion and opportunities for you to share your own ideas and experience.

Will I have to take an exam?
There are no exams on Certificate programmes. Course work is integral to the courses, and may include keeping a diary, working on a project or case study, or preparing a presentation.

Nottingham University’s Centre for Continuing Education adopts a similar question-and-answer approach:

What are credits?
Each module is ‘credit-rated’ to show you the value of the module, i.e. a 15 credit module requires more work than a 10 credit module.

In essence, credits are awarded if you can show that you are learning at a level and standard that is recognisably ‘Higher Education’ and in a way that can be assessed.

What do you mean by assessment?
All learning in HE needs to be assessed. This can be done in different ways:

Portfolios and written work
Presentations and group work

It does not mean, however, that you will have to take exams … All modules are completed by continuous assessment, ie work that is undertaken throughout the module. No exams are taken at any point during your studies.

Assessment is necessary so that your learning and understanding of the subject can be demonstrated in some way and that a mark can be given.¹

UEA’s Courses for Everyone Summer 2007 handbook both highlights the value of assessment and spells out the link between assessment and funding:

Coursework and Assessment
Completing assignments is an integral part of your learning and will add to the satisfaction that you gain from the course. Assessment is also the mechanism for achieving credit, which you can accumulate towards your award …

Credit bearing courses receive government funding which supports and subsidises the costs of the Continuing Education programme. It is a requirement of public funding that students engage fully in the course, including coursework and assessment.

We recognise that the thought of undertaking assessed work may be worrying, but our experience and