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Overview

- Why use e-marking and feedback
- The School of Health Sciences 2013-14 pilot
- Demonstration
- Questions and Answers
What do we already know?

- University of Glamorgan (2010) - Turn it in or Turn it off? A Pilot Project for Turnitin and Grademark Experience.
- University of Glamorgan (2012) - Assessment Diaries & Grademark.
Glamorgan 2010

104 students from 4 Faculties

Positives

- Convenient
- No need for hard copies
- Raises awareness of plagiarism
- Easy to use
- Confirmation of submission
- Encourages early submission
- More detailed feedback

Negatives

- Difficult to interpret Originality Reports
- Poor preview layout.
- Double work if also asked to submit hard copy.
Exeter 2010

An indirect evaluation of student experiences (view of academic and admin staff)

- Discrepancies in the (staff) perceptions of benefits
- 45% felt feedback experience hadn’t changed
- 26% felt feedback experience had gone worse
Glamorgan 2012

296 students – surveys and focus groups.

**Advantages**
- Easy to use
- Legibility
- Student engagement with feedback

**Disadvantages**
- Online access
- Reading on screen
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Survey (n=804) and focus groups

Benefits

- Easier to submit (no travel)
- Avoids printing – printing panic
- Confident submission was received
- Legibility
- More detailed / clearer feedback
Current Approach

- Paper submissions
  - Marked
  - Annotated / Feedback sheets
- Electronic submissions
  - TurnitinUK
  - Originality reports
Why?

- School Academic Quality and Standards Committee
  - University
    - Aware that the UoL is looking into policy/guidance
  - Students
    - Benefits?
  - Staff
    - Increased discussion
Evaluation

- 23 modules in 2013-14
  - 6 undergraduate programmes
    - Diagnostic Radiography, Nursing, Occupational Therapy, Orthoptics, Physiotherapy, Radiotherapy.
  - 1 postgraduate programme
    - PGDip in Radiotherapy
Evaluation

935 submissions (Sem. 1 - 439, Sem. 2 - 496)

40 members of staff
Submission Details

Semester 2 Assessment Details

Pre-submission to View Originality Report - Assignment 2
- Enabled: Statistics Tracking
- Any assignments submitted using the TurnitinUK link in this folder do not constitute a formal submission and will not be viewed or marked by staff.

e-Submission for Marking - Assignment 2
- Enabled: Statistics Tracking

Answer the following question
Compare and contrast the reliability and validity of data collected from the following two types of research designs: randomised controlled trials and interviews.

Electronic Submission
- The School of Health Sciences is currently evaluating the use of e-submission and electronic marking. Assignment 2 of this module has been selected for inclusion in this evaluation.
- Two folders are located below both of which contain a link to submit work to TurnitinUK. Please note:
  1. The submission link in the pre-submission to view originality report folder enables you to submit a draft version of your report and then view an originality report. Any submissions made using this link do not constitute a formal submission of your assignment and they will not be viewed or marked by members of staff.
  2. The submission link in the e-submission for marking folder enables you to submit a single version of your assignment for assessment purposes i.e. it will be this submission that is marked.

12 noon on Monday 19th May 2014
Submission Details

Guidance on e-Submission

The School of Health Sciences is currently evaluating the use of the TurnitinUK GradeMark system for the marking of student assignments. The assignment associated with this module has been selected for this evaluation. The School’s Assessment policy still applies to this assignment as does the instructions given in the Assessment section of this VITAL course. In the context of this evaluation, a number of modifications have been made. These include:

1. You are not required to submit a paper-based/printed copy of your assignment. You only need to submit an electronic version of your assignment using the link found in this section (e-submission for marking).
2. To comply with the policy of anonymous marking, the file you submit should not include your name or student ID number either in its name or its content.
3. The front page of your assignment should contain the module code (HEAL116) and title (Research Skills), Assignment 2, the submission date and word count. DO NOT INCLUDE YOUR NAME OR STUDENT ID NUMBER.
4. The second page should, if required, state if you have been given an extension for late submission and the details of the extension.
5. The second page should also, if required, state if you have have an agreed Support Plan, developed by the Disability Support Team, and any reasonable adjustments it suggests that need to be applied when your work is marked.

Provisional marks and feedback will be available in VITAL from 4 pm on Tuesday 10th June 2014. All marks are provisional and subject to ratification at the School Examination Board. Final marks will then be released as usual by email on Monday 30th June 2014 and published in Liverpool Life at 5 pm on the same day.

Declaration of Academic Integrity

I confirm that:

1. I have read and understood the University of Liverpool’s Code of Practice on Assessment and the Academic Integrity Policy.
2. I am aware of the Academic Integrity Scheme and penalties that might be applied under the scheme which are outlined in the Guidance for Staff and Students document.
3. In accordance with regulatory and professional bodies, the names of places, patients, other service users and health professionals referred to in this work are anonymous.
4. This work has not been submitted previously on this or any other programme of study except where permission has been explicitly given.

I also confirm that it is this submission which will be marked in accordance with the School of Health Sciences and the University of Liverpool's Assessment Policies. Any submissions made through the 'pre-submission TurnitinUK originality report' will not be assessed or receive a mark.

You need to click on the 'Mark Reviewed' link below to reveal the TurnitinUK submission link.

Mark Reviewed
Submission Details

Declaration of Academic Integrity

Enabled: Review
I confirm that:

1. I have read and understood the University of Liverpool's Code of Practice on Assessment and the Academic Integrity Policy.
2. I am aware of the Academic Integrity Scheme and penalties that might be applied under the scheme which are outlined in the Guidance for Staff and Students document.
3. In accordance with regulatory and professional bodies, the names of places, patients, other service users and health professionals referred to in this work are anonymous.
4. This work has not been submitted previously on this or any other programme of study except where permission has been explicitly given.

I also confirm that it is this submission which will be marked in accordance with the School of Health Sciences and the University of Liverpool's Assessment Policies. Any submissions made through the 'pre-submission TurnitinUK originality report' will not be assessed or receive a mark.

You need to click on the 'Mark Reviewed' link below to reveal the TurnitinUK submission link.

- e-Submission for Marking - Assignment 2 (Marker 1)
  Enabled: Adaptive Release
  >> View/Complete

- e-Submission for Marking - Assignment 2 (Marker 2)
  Enabled: Adaptive Release
  >> View/Complete

- e-Submission for Marking - Assignment 2 (Marker 3)
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Marking

Quick Marks
In-text annotations

To assess the reliability and validity of the data collected by randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and interviews, it is important to first understand what these methods entail and the types of data that are subsequently collected.

Within the field of health sciences, RCTs are used to test new drugs or treatments. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence defines an RCT as "a study in which a number of similar people are randomly assigned to two (or more) groups to test a specific drug or treatment." (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). One group - the experimental group - will be assigned the drug being tested, whilst the other group is prescribed a placebo or no treatment at all, in order to provide a baseline for comparison. RCTs collect quantitative data which is analysed statistically. Meanwhile, the majority of data collected by interviews is qualitative and must therefore be analysed thematically; however, quantitative data could also be obtained in interviews by the use of tools such as Likert scales. An interview is defined as "a qualitative research technique that involves a detailed, face-to-face conversation between a researcher and a respondent on a particular issue or topic." (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). There are several types of interviews that can be used. A structured interview is "a research technique in which the interviewer asks a list of pre-set questions." (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). A semi-structured interview is when "the interviewer asks a number of open-ended questions and follows up on areas of interest in response to the information given." (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). Unstructured interviews are "interviews in which neither the question nor the answer categories are predetermined." (Minichiello et al., 1990, as cited by Zhang & Wildermuth, 2009). In this case, the only prompt the researcher will have is a topic into which they must investigate.
Marking

Quick Marks
In-text annotations

To assess the reliability and validity of the data collected by randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and interviews, it is important to first understand what entail and the types of data that are subsequently collected.

Within the field of health sciences, RCTs are used to test new drugs. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence defines an RCT, which a number of similar people are randomly assigned to two (or more) and test a specific drug or treatment.” (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). One group – the experimental group – will be assigned the drug being reviewed, whilst the other group is prescribed a placebo or no treatment at all, in order to provide a baseline for comparison. RCTs collect quantitative data which is analysed statistically. Meanwhile, the majority of data collected by interviews is qualitative and must therefore be analysed thematically, however, quantitative data could also be obtained in interviews by the use of tools such as Likert scales. An interview is defined as “A qualitative research technique that involves a detailed, face-to-face conversation between a researcher and a respondent on a particular issue or topic.” (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). There are several types of interviews that can be used. A structured interview is “A research technique in which the interviewer asks the study participants a list of pre-set questions.” (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). A semi-structured interview is when “The interviewer asks a number of open-ended questions and follows up on areas of interest in response to the information given.” (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). Unstructured interviews are “Interviews in which neither the question nor the answer categories are predetermined.” (Minichiello et al., 1990, as cited by Zheng & Wildermuth, 2000). In this case, the only prompt the researcher will have is a topic into which they must investigate.
Marking

General Comments

To assess the reliability and validity of the data collected by randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and interviews, it is important to first understand what data collection methods entail and the types of data that are subsequently collected.

Within the field of health sciences, RCTs are used to test new drugs or treatments. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence defines an RCT as "A study in which a number of similar people are randomly assigned to two (or more) groups to test a specific drug or treatment." (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). One group – the experimental group – will be assigned the drug being tested, whilst the other group is prescribed a placebo or no treatment at all, in order to provide a baseline for comparison. RCTs collect quantitative data which is analysed statistically. Meanwhile, the majority of data collected by interviews is qualitative and must therefore be analysed thematically; however, quantitative data could also be obtained in interviews by the use of tools such as Likert scales.

An interview is defined as "A qualitative research technique that involves a detailed, face-to-face conversation between a researcher and a respondent on a particular issue or topic." (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). There are several types of interviews that can be used. A structured interview is "A research technique in which the interviewer asks all study participants a list of pre-set questions." (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). A semi-structured interview is when "The interviewer asks a series of open-ended questions and follows up on areas of interest in response to the information given." (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). Unstructured interviews are "Interviews in which neither the question nor the answer categories are predetermined." (Minichiello et al., 1990, as cited by Zhang & Wildermuth, 2009). In this case, the only prompt the researcher will have is a topic into which they must investigate.

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence defines reliability as "The ability of a measure to yield consistent results over time and across similar populations." The validity of a measure refers to how well it measures what it is intended to measure. It is important to ensure that the data collected is both reliable and valid in order to draw meaningful conclusions from the research.

Strengths:

Areas for improvement:

Action Plan:

The errors in your referencing are classified as Category A errors (Minor errors) in the Academic Integrity Policy.
Marking

Within the field of health sciences, RCTs are used to test new drugs or treatments. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence defines an RCT as “A study in which a number of similar people are randomly assigned to two (or more) groups to test a specific drug or treatment.” (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). One group – the experimental group – will be assigned the drug being tested, whilst the other group is prescribed a placebo or no treatment at all, in order to provide a baseline for comparison. RCTs collect quantitative data which is analysed statistically. Meanwhile, the majority of data collected by interviews is qualitative and must therefore be analysed thematically, however quantitative data could also be obtained in interviews by the use of tools such as Likert scales. An interview is defined as “A qualitative research technique that involves a detailed, face-to-face conversation between a researcher and a respondent on a particular issue or topic.” (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). There are several types of interviews that can be used. A structured interview is “A research technique in which the interviewer asks the study participants a list of pre-set questions.” (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). A semi-structured interview is when “The interviewer asks a number of open-ended questions and follows up on areas of interest in response to the information given.” (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2011). Unstructured interviews are “Interviews in which neither the question nor the answer categories are predetermined.” (Minuch E. et al. 1990, as cited by Zheng & Wildmuth, 2000). In this case, the only prompt the researcher will have is a topic into which they must investigate.
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# Marking

## 1st yr assignment feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>100-60</th>
<th>79-70</th>
<th>69-60</th>
<th>59-50</th>
<th>49-40</th>
<th>39-30</th>
<th>29-0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong>&lt;br&gt;presentation of assignment</td>
<td>Exceptional presentation, with no flaws</td>
<td>Shows a polished and imaginative approach to the topic</td>
<td>Carrying and logically organized</td>
<td>Shows organisation and coherence</td>
<td>Shows some attempt to organise in a logical manner</td>
<td>Disorganised/incoherent</td>
<td>Disorganised/incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity</strong>&lt;br&gt;clarity of expression (incl. accuracy, spelling, grammar, punctuation)</td>
<td>Exceptionally clear writing style</td>
<td>Fluent writing style appropriate to document, Grammar and spelling accurate</td>
<td>Language fluent, Grammar and spelling accurate</td>
<td>Language relatively fluent, Grammar and spelling generally accurate</td>
<td>Reading apparent, but language not always fluent, Grammar and/or spelling contain errors</td>
<td>Meaning unclear and/or grammar and/or spelling contain frequent errors</td>
<td>Meaning very unclear and/or poor spelling and grammar throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conforming</strong>&lt;br&gt;conforming with instructions (e.g. word length)</td>
<td>Work has been submitted within time boundaries and within prescribed parameters</td>
<td>Work has been submitted within time boundaries and within prescribed parameters</td>
<td>Work has been submitted within time boundaries and within prescribed parameters</td>
<td>Work has been submitted within time boundaries and within prescribed parameters</td>
<td>Work has been submitted late with no extra-credit bonus, or deviates significantly from the required parameters</td>
<td>Work has been submitted late with no extra-credit bonus, or deviates significantly from the required parameters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong>&lt;br&gt;attention to purpose</td>
<td>Has addressed the purpose of the assignment in an exceptionally clear and imaginative style</td>
<td>Has addressed the purpose of the assignment comprehensively and imaginatively</td>
<td>Has addressed the main purpose of the assignment</td>
<td>Has addressed the main purpose of the assignment</td>
<td>Some of the work is focused on the theme and themes of the assignment</td>
<td>Fails to address the task set</td>
<td>Fails to address the task set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referencing</strong></td>
<td>Referencing is consistently accurate</td>
<td>Referencing is consistently accurate</td>
<td>Referencing is mostly accurate</td>
<td>Recommended attempt with some errors</td>
<td>Some attempt at referencing</td>
<td>Referencing is unsystematic</td>
<td>Referencing is absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This qualitative model will not result in a score. However, it is a valuable feedback mechanism for students and writers.
Example

Details

- 4 different markers
- Random allocation of students to markers

Tools/Approach

- VITAL groups
- 4 TurnitinUK submission links
- VITAL adaptive release rules
OUTCOMES
Feedback – Semester 1

18 June 2014

- Year 1 modules
  - 29/44 36/41 20/40 20/37 38/38

- Year 2 modules
  - 22/33 20/33 29/32 50/57 19/33 20/22

25% students have not accessed feedback
Staff - Views

- This was a positive experience which I enjoyed and from the comments from the students they also seemed positive.
- Took some time to set up the specific comments needed for this assignment but once they were written it was easy to use for remaining assignments.
- I enjoyed the experience. I was slow starting initially, because I was adding to the standard comments section. After the first few assignments, this section made the process much faster overall because I was tending to make similar comments on the assignments. So well worth investing the time and effort in developing the comments section initially.
Issues

- One ‘lost’ submission
  - Be careful on the ‘TurnitinUK Assignments By Groups’ screen
- School Policies
  - Need modifying
- Financial suspension of students
  - MWS accounts and VITAL
Student Handbooks
E-Submission Guidance

Electronic submission of written assignments to TurnitinUK

TurnitinUK is an online service that can be used to identify similarities in submitted work to a database of previously submitted work, websites and other sources. Each module in VITAL will have separate TurnitinUK links for any written assignments associated with that module. Typically for each written assignment there will be a ‘draft checking’ TurnitinUK link and an ‘e-submission for marking’ TurnitinUK link.

The ‘draft checking’ TurnitinUK link allows students to upload a draft version of their written assignment in order to view a TurnitinUK Originality report. An Originality report is an indication of similarities between a piece of work submitted by a student and a database of previously submitted work, websites and other sources. Any submissions made using ‘draft checking’, TurnitinUK links in VITAL are draft submissions and will not be marked. This is an optional facility that students might want to use to help develop their written assignment.

The final version of the written assignment must be uploaded to the ‘e-submission for marking’ TurnitinUK link. It is ONLY this submitted file which will be formally assessed by internal examiners. It is the student’s responsibility to ensure the correct file is uploaded to the correct ‘e-submission for marking’ TurnitinUK link. In the event of a mistake being made, students must notify the Directorate Assessment Officer, or the Programme Secretary at the earliest opportunity prior to the assignment submission deadline.
E-Submission Guidance

Draft checking links
- Students allowed to view Originality reports

E-submission for marking links
- The only submission that will be marked

Digital receipts confirm submission
- No digital receipt – assume no submission
Single submission

- Contact Assessment Officer or Programme Secretary if a mistake has been made
- Digital receipts needed to withdraw an assignment.
- Requests to re-submit not normally considered within 2 working days of due date.
E-Submission Guidance

Financial Suspension

- Restrictions placed on MWS user account
- Students need to contact the Director of Studies to make alternative arrangements.
- Late or non-submission due to FS will be penalised if DoS has not been contacted
E-Submission Guidance

Hard Copy & e-Submissions

- Both must be made before submission deadline.
- If either comes in after the submission deadline, the date of the latest submission will be used to calculate penalty.
- If one is missing – incomplete submission and a zero mark will be awarded.
- Guidance will be given about what can be excluded from the e-submission (appendices or reference list).
- If the two submissions are different a penalty will be applied.
Conclusions

- Technical environment – okay
  - Fairly intuitive to use
  - Some national issues (slowness)

- Policies
  - Modification
  - Guidance for students & staff

- Students
  - Valued access to Originality reports
  - Feedback improvements

- Staff
  - Support and training
  - Changes to working practice
Finally

School Guides

- GradeMark  http://goo.gl/42wFP6
- TurnitinUK  http://goo.gl/vuaAQt
- Multiple TurnitinUK Inboxes  http://goo.gl/emDmZ9

Contacts

Steve McKinnell  smck@liv.ac.uk
Denis Parkinson  denis@liv.ac.uk
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