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Chapter 2: Teaching Cycle 1

Assessment Feedback for UG Students
(Semester Two, 2006-2007 Session)

Context to Cycle & Issues Addressed
This first cycle of my portfolio is somewhat misleading, as it is not in fact the first teaching cycle I completed. Before I ever began my full-time post, I initiated a student peer-review group in which those who requested additional assistance on writing introductions and conclusions to essays would gain additional practice by writing examples and comparing them to each other. What became increasingly clear to me, however, was that the students did not understand what was being asked of them, and almost certainly did not understand the assessment criteria through which we judged their work. This lead to the creation of a peer-review cycle in my first year of the PGCTHE, where I created a group within an option module and conducted a series of student surveys (this emerged from my planned teaching cycle after the induction sessions). This cycle did not go very well, due to the fact that I tried to get students to produce non-assessed work as practice, when they felt too pressured by the actual assessment. Furthermore, only two of the twelve students selected really engaged in peer review. Nevertheless, reflection on these cycles pointed out to me that one of the most important elements of assessment, at least in order to promote learning, was the usefulness and appropriateness of assessment feedback to students. This primarily involves the formative elements of feedback, and includes the way in which feedback works, the way in which students respond to feedback, and the types of feedback that they felt were most useful. As a result of this, I decided to undertake a teaching cycle on assessment feedback.

Structure of Cycle
The cycle began with a questionnaire that was designed to elicit information about students’ perceptions on assessment. As the twenty students on the module, EN33730 Postmodern Fictions, were primarily final-year undergraduates, I could assume that they had undertaken a variety of assessment forms (traditional essays across a range of modules, portfolio assessment in a Level 2 core module, and oral presentation in specific option modules). The aim of the questionnaire was initially to identify which form of assessment was preferred as a general introduction, and then move their thoughts into how they responded to feedback. Furthermore, the questionnaire was devised to gain specific information about the particular types of feedback they found most useful, divided into general feedback, skills, and practical elements.

The first aspect of this involved giving students three sample response sheets, a grid response (indicating their attainment in particular criteria, with a short space for comments), a criteria response (using a narrative response within criteria sub-headings), and a narrative response (“open” discursive comments on the assessment task). The grid response is used in other departments within the university, and whilst I have personal reservations about it (it is too reliant on the assessment criteria, and gives little opportunity for personalised feedback) it does enable students to see why they have received the mark they have; in properly constructed assessment criteria, which utilise demonstrable actions to benchmark performance, students can very clearly identify which assessment-related “actions” they have (and have not) performed. My usual form of feedback was (and is) to provide a narrative response, not only because it is, I believe, the departmental norm, but because it is the form of written feedback that demonstrates the most evidence of engagement with students’ work. Thus, it is the form of feedback that most demonstrates my “valuing” of their time and effort. The aim behind the criteria response was to bridge between these two forms, and yet allowing space for discursive comments relating specifically to the attainment of assessment criteria. The aim of providing this choice was to allow students to vote for the type of written feedback I would use on their assignments.

The second aspect of this questionnaire was on the particular elements of their assignments that I would focus on in my feedback (for example, structure or expression). Based upon the most popular responses, upon receipt of module essays, I endeavoured to provide the kinds of feedback that they would find most useful, and focused upon balancing summative and formative discursive comments. I also, as usual, also provided students with the opportunity of coming to discuss their essays with me personally. My feedback, due to the nature of the module as being assessed against criteria, was by necessity “criterion-referenced”
rather than “norm-referenced” (see Biggs 2003: 143-145), although in the case of the highest-performing essays, I also stated that “this is one of the best essays I have marked on this module.” (Note that this is not something I would ever do for weaker-performing essays.) Furthermore, because these comments are related to criteria, I endeavoured to state that something has not been demonstrated in the assessment, rather than inferring something about the students through the assessment; that is, not to state “you have not understood” but rather “you have not demonstrated understanding.”

At the conclusion of the module, at the same time as module evaluation, the penultimate week of the course, I distributed a second questionnaire about assessment, in order to compare, where possible how their attitudes to assessment feedback had shifted, and whether they felt the changes that I had incorporated into my own marking were effective or not.

Running the Cycle
The responses to the initial questionnaire (a summary is attached) were interesting and somewhat surprising. (Note: All documents said to be “attached” are available at the close of this cycle, printed on blue paper.)

In terms of their experience of assessment forms (Q1), the students sampled preferred more traditional written types of assessment, essays and portfolios, because they knew what was expected of them in such forms. Furthermore, the split between essays and portfolio preferences was primarily predicated upon the individual student’s feeling about demonstrating breadth (portfolios) versus depth (essays) of learning. Despite my expectation that students would prefer oral assessment (there is a perception of it as being somehow “easier” than the other forms), many felt uncomfortable with oral assessment because of its perceived “performative” nature. Negative comments were also expressed about portfolio assessment, because of the perception of its restrictive nature on individual components of the assessment, thus making essays easily the preferred mode of assessment. Note that the fact that this module, EN33730, is an essay-assessed module (two 3,000 word essays) may have biased these results somewhat.

The distinction between Q3 and Q5 was the split between past experience (Q3) and choice for future (Q5). In terms of past experience of assessment feedback, students opted for oral feedback as their preferred mode of assessment feedback. The stated reasons were because of the opportunity to get feedback on the feedback and ask questions. I have always endeavoured to provide this type of feedback through essay return sessions for precisely this reason, as well as to ensure that I have seen students read and understood the cover sheets, addressed any concerns they may have, and understood why they received the mark. Surprisingly, the second most popular form of feedback was essay annotations, which I had not expected, with the reason being that it demonstrated clear strengths and weaknesses within the assessment itself. Whilst I have tried to also incorporate this in my cover sheets, it is clear that highlighting particular sections of the assessment enables students to understand the most and least successful areas of any given assignment. As I was already going to offer oral feedback on the assignments, I gave students the choice for future written feedback to take one of three forms. The students voted very clearly for narrative responses as their preferred means of assessment for this module (no change, in essence, to what I was intending to do anyway).

For the scored components of the questionnaire (that is, the numerically based indicators of preference), there were two key elements, Q2 (beliefs about assessment and feedback) and Q4 (elements of feedback). Q2 asked them for their general beliefs about assessment feedback, including the extent to which they used and understood it, and whether they understood how and why they were assessed. The numerical scores were as follows:

- I use feedback to improve the quality of my future essays (3.95; between “neutral” and “agree”).
- I understand the comments that tutors make about my essays (3.89; between “neutral” and “agree”).
- I understand HOW I am being assessed by tutors (3.63; between “neutral” and “agree”).
- I understand WHY I am being assessed by tutors (4; “agree”).

Although the scores for their understanding of the rationale for assessment were the widest ranging, the sampled students clearly felt that they understood “why” they were assessed, although the lowest score, for the “how,” clearly indicated that they were not so sure of the mechanism. I was quite disappointed in the score for students’ use of feedback also, with the group not quite managing to “agree” with this statement,
but there is clearly a corollary between not understanding comments, which also fell short of “agree,” and their usefulness for future assignments. Q4 asked students about the individual elements of feedback, asking them to consider which they felt to be most useful. The results were as follows:

- Achievement of learning outcomes (3.94).
- Suggestions for further reading (4).
- Appropriateness of secondary sources (3.83).
- How to improve the assignment in the future (4.83).
- Analysis of primary materials (4.17).
- Use of secondary materials (4).
- Ability to construct an argument (4.5).
- Understanding of contextual and theoretical materials (4.5).
- Structure (4.61).
- Quality of expression & presentation (4.56).
- Bibliography & referencing (4.06).

These results clearly indicate the inflection that students placed on their desired assessment feedback. The most important (general) element stated was formative feedback on how to improve the assignment (although it must also be noted that these are summatively-assessed assignments, and so cannot be re-submitted). The next most important factors were practically focused on the structure of the assignment and the students’ level of expression and presentation, closely followed by the desire to gain feedback on the core skills of constructing an argument and understanding materials. The least required components of feedback were stated as the achievement of learning outcomes and the appropriateness of secondary sources, neither of which reached “agree.” Given the department’s need to demonstrate how students have achieved a particular mark or grade as both internal justification (to student) and for external validation (by second markers and external examiners), there thus seems to be a divide between students’ preferences, and institutional administrative and quality-assurance procedures, in terms of assessment feedback. As I obviously had to provide such comments, this is one element of the feedback that could not be changed.

Upon submission of the assignments, I followed the preferences of the democratic majority of those sampled (anonymous marking procedures preclude a more individual response to student’s preferences) and provided a forum in which students could discuss the first assignment and the feedback on that assignment. Sample (anonymised) discursive cover sheets are attached so that you can see the type of written feedback I provided. These sheets were intended to achieve the following goals:

- Provide summative evaluation in terms of what the student did in the assignment and the assessment criteria.
- Provide formative advice on areas that need improvement so that the student can identify their strengths and weaknesses, and approach their next assignment accordingly.
- Provide a measure of intellectual challenge in the form of suggested further primary or theoretical reading, thus showing them an intellectual horizon that can encourage them to move onto further study.
- Summarise, to a degree, the information contained in the annotations to the assignment.
- Balance between positive marking (what the student did, and did well) and negative marking (what the student failed to do, either by omission or lack of success).
- Engage, on a personal level, with the students’ work so they felt that their essay and argument had been read and thought about, rather than just “tick-box” against the assessment criteria.

Obviously, not all comments sheets cover all of these and, in the space available, is more often than not impossible to do. I am no longer so naïve as to believe that there is such a thing as a perfect comments sheet (in much the same way as there is no such thing as a perfect teaching session), but my aim was to incorporate as many aspects of these as I could.

The oral discussion took the form of three “office hours” in 10-minute slots that students signed up for (twelve students chose to attend such meetings). The discussions took the following form:

1. Asking how the student was feeling—normally “very nervous”;
2. Asking what the student’s expectations were in terms of mark, and finding out the mark they usually received;
3. Student receiving essay and reading comments sheet;
4. Asking if the student understood the comments, clarifying any elements that were not understood;
5. Explaining why the essay received the mark it did;
6. Asking them about their feelings about the module so far;
7. Discussing the to-be-produced second piece of submitted work and what they could do to address the areas in need of improvement;
8. Telling them that if they needed any assistance with planning, that they should contact me, and that I was looking forward to reading their next assignment.

This structure utilises and modifies the structure I was taught for all research supervisions at the CPD session, “Supervising Research Students”: in essence, “past,” “present,” “future.” “Past” (steps 2-4) refers to feedback on work submitted to date to ensure that students understand what they have done; “present” (steps 5 and 6) refers to discussion of what they are currently thinking about and gaining more general feedback from them on their progress; “future” refers to the need to think about the kind of topic they should go onto next and agreeing how they can move on or otherwise improve (step 7). Steps 1 and 8 introduce and conclude the session.

In the penultimate week of the module, I distributed a second questionnaire alongside module evaluation forms (only twelve students were present) to establish what they had felt was useful and what was unnecessary in terms of feedback. These formed the basis, alongside statistical analysis of the first and second assignment marks, of the evaluation of, and subsequent reflection on, the cycle.

Reflections on the Cycle
To begin with the second set of questionnaires (a summary is attached), the numerical scores for the statements after the cycle were as follows:
- I use feedback to improve the quality of my future essays (4.25; between “agree” and “strongly agree”).
- I understand the comments that tutors make about my essays (4.58; between “agree” and “strongly agree”).
- I understand HOW I am being assessed by tutors (4; “agree”).
- I understand WHY I am being assessed by tutors (4.17; between “agree” and “strongly agree”).

These marks, albeit within a smaller sample size (and possibly self-selecting by this point in the module), show a marked improvement in attitude toward assessment and assessment feedback. The most marked improvement was in students’ level of understanding of the comments tutors make about essays, perhaps the most important in many respects as understanding the feedback is the first step to acting upon it (which was the second highest increase). Narrative responses also indicated a measure of success in conveying the way in which different forms of assessment feedback could be utilised. Annotations were highlighted as being most useful for identifying key areas of the assignments (both positive and negative) that should be looked at; comments sheets were most useful for summarising the annotations and suggesting areas that could be improved in the future; oral discussions were most useful for clarifying particular feedback points with the tutor and, again, reinforcing areas to address in future work.

Although, as stated above, this sample may be skewed because of the method of data-gathering, a statistical analysis of the students (moderated) marks from the module also reveals signs of improvement. The x-axis indicates the percentage mark for the first assignment; the y-axis indicates the percentage mark for the second assignment. Assuming no improvement between essays, students’ marks would follow the control line on the following graph (the blue line):
In comparison, we can see quite a fluctuation in the actual marks for the second assignment (the larger data entries in the graph). The average for the first assignment was 63.56% whereas the average for the second assignment was 64.11%. This suggests some minor level of improvement between the assignments, possibly as a result of increased attention to the means and manner of feedback. Furthermore, as is evident from the graph, the “line of best fit” (the purple line) demonstrates a tendency towards improvement, at least for the higher performing students (which you would expect given their tendency to engage at a deeper level than students who do not perform as well or, conversely, the tendency of students who engage at a deeper level to perform better than those who do not). The intercept point between the two lines is 53.69%, so based upon this small sample of eighteen students, those students who would expect to achieve a mid-2ii or above could be argued to have benefited from the assessment feedback (in actual fact, eleven of the students show an improvement between first and second assignments).

Note that this graph does not, in itself, mean that my actual assessment feedback on their assignments was useful. Merely the act of thinking about assessment and assessment feedback encourages students to think more about what they are doing. Thus, the very act of just performing the survey may have caused some benefits, without any other components of the cycle being necessarily present. Thus, despite this being a cycle run on a third-year option module, the implication is that just by having different forms of assessment feedback being discussed and trialled with them, students will be much more aware of the ways in which different assessment feedback methods can be used. This, in a slightly modified form, is the “stability” element of standards-based assessment (see Biggs 2003: 163-165), where students perform better after teaching; however, rather than perform better at assessment tasks because of increased understanding of the subject, this improvement is maintained through increased understanding of the form of assessment itself (they have, in essence, learnt about assessment).

Works Cited in this Cycle
Contents
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Initial Student Assessment Questionnaire (Collated)

Please take the time to fill in this questionnaire on assessment and assessment feedback. It will be used to survey those elements that students feel are most useful when receiving feedback and will be used as the basis of an examination of the most effective means of providing feedback.

1. Which of the following forms of assessment have you undergone? *(Tick all that apply)*
   - Portfolio Assessment 17
   - Traditional Essay 19
   - Oral Assessment 10

   a. Which form of assessment do you most LIKE and why?
   - Portfolio (8) because a) the workload is more manageable, b) there is more freedom to explore and express ideas, c) it minimises weaknesses, and d) it assesses different areas at once.
   - Essay (10) because of it allows a) greater depth of analysis and ease of focus, b) more formality in approach, c) consistency with what is expected, d) more time to prepare.
   - Oral (2) because it is a) more informal, b) less stressful.
   - 1 response blank.

b. Which form of assessment do you most DISLIKE and why?
   - Portfolio (6) because of a) has a restrictive word limit b) promotes procrastination about completion, c) is far less tolerant of weakness because of the breadth of areas it assesses.
   - Essay (1) because it is too specifically focused on critical interpretation and secondary reading.
   - Oral (8) because a) it is intimidating, b) easier to “mess up on,” c) difficult to organise the assessment, d) too “performative.”
   - Examination (3) because it a) it doesn’t take into account your strengths, b) stress.
   - 1 response blank.

2. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on feedback? *(Rate all from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1))*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use feedback to improve the quality of my future essays</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the comments that tutors make about my essays</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand how I am being assessed by tutors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand why I am being assessed by tutors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Which form of assessment feedback do you find most useful? *(Tick one)*
   - Essay Annotations 8
   - Essay Cover Sheets 4
   - Oral Discussion 11

3a. What do you find most useful about your chosen form of feedback?

**Annotations:** Allows comments on structure, grammatical errors, and theory; easier to remember because written down; highlights specific problem areas of assessment, both good and bad.

**Cover Sheets:** Generally more honest than oral feedback; summarises annotations effectively, and provides greater detail.

**Oral Discussion:** Interactive process that allows more flexibility; easier to remember feedback; opportunity to ask (and re-ask) questions about what might have been done differently in order to improve; better than cover sheets because less chance of ambiguity.
1. How important do you find particular elements of feedback? (Rate all from most important (5) to least important (1))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL ELEMENTS</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of learning outcomes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for further reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of secondary sources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to improve the assignment in the future</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of primary materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of secondary materials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to construct an argument</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of contextual and theoretical materials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICAL ELEMENTS OF THE ASSESSMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Expression &amp; Presentation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography &amp; Referencing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What kind of feedback do you think you would find most useful? (Tick one)

- Narrative response [ ]
- Criteria response [ ]
- Grid response [ ]

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. A summary will be available on Blackboard when the results have been collated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Reference No.</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module No. and Short Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Tutor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>blank blank blank blank blank blank blank blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Marker

Second Marker

Final Agreed Mark

2008 - SLOCOMBE, W. - TC1 - Assessment Feedback for UG Students
### Comment Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Reference No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module No. and Short Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Tutor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:-**

- **Knowledge**
- **Argument**
- **Relevance**
- **Terminology**
- **Expression**
- **Presentation**

**First Marker**

**Second Marker**

**Final Agreed Mark**
## ASSESSMENT CRITERIA – YEAR THREE ESSAYS – ENGLISH AND AMERICAN STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>ARGUMENT</th>
<th>RELEVANCE</th>
<th>TERMINOGRAPHY</th>
<th>EXPRESSION</th>
<th>PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>Demonstrates very detailed textual knowledge of primary and secondary texts, special initiative, or independent investigation</td>
<td>Offers a sophisticated and/or subtle argument, clearly and cogently structured, and well supported. Shows a very clear sense of methodology and methodological issues</td>
<td>Maintains a sharp focus on the text(s) and topic/task, with an excellent grasp of related issues and their nuances</td>
<td>Demonstrates a well-informed and perceptive understanding of appropriate critical terminology and its significance</td>
<td>Shows an excellent command of the English language, and the ability to use a wide vocabulary with great fluency, clarity and accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>Demonstrates substantial knowledge of primary and secondary texts, with some evidence of independent investigation</td>
<td>Offers an assured argument, clearly structured and developed, and well supported. Shows some understanding of methodology and methodological issues</td>
<td>Maintains a clear focus on the text(s) and topic/task, with a good grasp of related issues and their nuances</td>
<td>Demonstrates a mainly accurate understanding of appropriate critical terminology and its significance</td>
<td>Uses the English language with fluency, clarity and accuracy. May contain some minor errors which do not impair communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Demonstrates reasonable knowledge of primary and secondary texts, although little investigative initiative</td>
<td>Offers a reasonably coherent argument, with some support and development</td>
<td>Has a reasonably clear (though not always sustained) focus on the text(s) and topic/task, and shows some awareness of the issues they raise</td>
<td>Demonstrates an acceptable understanding of appropriate critical terminology and its significance</td>
<td>Uses the English language competently, but may contain a significant number of errors, which impair communication to some degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited but reasonably accurate knowledge of appropriate texts.</td>
<td>Offers some elements of appropriate argument, with some limited support and development</td>
<td>Demonstrates some attempt to relate the text(s) to the topic/task, and some limited awareness of the issues raised by the topic/task</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited accuracy and understanding of appropriate critical terminology and its significance</td>
<td>Lacks fluency and accuracy in the use of the English language, and numerous errors impair communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-39</td>
<td>Demonstrates very limited knowledge of appropriate texts.</td>
<td>Offers a few elements of an appropriate argument, with very little support and development</td>
<td>Demonstrates a very limited attempt to relate the text(s) to the topic/task</td>
<td>Demonstrates very limited accuracy and understanding of appropriate critical terminology and its significance</td>
<td>Lacks fluency and accuracy in the use of the English language, and persistent errors seriously impair communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

blah blah blah
**COMMENT SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>MARCH 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Reference No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module No. and Short Title</td>
<td>EN33730 - Postmodern Fictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay Subject</td>
<td>Auster, New York Trilogy &amp; Invention of Solitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Tutor</td>
<td>WJ Slocombe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

This is an excellent essay on Auster & identity that deals well with the two selected texts, and also negotiates a number of tricky concepts. I did feel that you sometimes over-simplified certain issues, but this is a minor point given how much you have successfully achieved. By way of further reading, suggestions (if you are interested in the relationship between language, ontology and identity), I recommend Auster's *Travels in the Scriptorium* (2006) as another text worthy of study, alongside the obvious references to Derrida's writings. The reason why I say this is that aside from that problem of oversimplification and some problems with expression - "eachother" is not one word, don't "full-stop" before a quotation, slow down your pace when dealing with complex issues - this is a very strong piece that shows good evidence of independent study and thought. In future, my only recommendation (other than the above) are to not fall into the trap of littering your argument with critical references (make your own argument) and to be careful about bibliographic referencing.

**First Marker**

*clear 1 (92)*

**Second Marker**

**Final Agreed Mark**
**Module No. and Short Title:** EN33730 – Postmodern Fictions

**Essay Subject:** Auster, New York Trilogy & Carter, Passion of New Eve

**Seminar Tutor:** Will Slocombe

**Comments:**

You have successfully identified a number of valid points about the issues of subjectivity and identity in this essay, in relation to both texts. However, one of the central problems in this response is that it never integrates these two texts together. Your essay is structured as "Introduction+Auster → Carter+Conclusion," and this means that you are splitting your focus, your argument, and your analysis. Coupled with some quite generalised and vague points, this means that whilst your ideas in and of themselves are valid, you are never expressing them clearly enough or arguing with enough rigour. It would have helped if you had discussed critical/textual quotations in more depth, rather than just quoting them (as you often do), and had used such moments as a starting point in an analysis of both texts, "comparing & contrasting" between them. Overall, this is a reasonable essay, but you could have done much better.

**First Marker:**

borderline 2ii/2i

**Second Marker**


**Final Agreed Mark**


**Comments:**

You raise some pertinent points in relation to this question, but on the whole you seem to sidestep the central terms — "sublime" and "unrepresentability" — in favour of a more spiritual reading. This is not in itself incorrect, but needed much more introduction and justification. Furthermore, your points on language and later, darkness do indeed lead towards these issues but they are under-developed and not really explicitly related to either your argument or the question.

There was thus much promise in this, but it was never brought to fruition, especially as you never bring in key theorists (such as Lyotard or, for language, Saussure and Derrida) or secondary interpretations of the texts or themes. In terms of expression/presentation, there are also problems here. In that you use a referencing style really makes it difficult to follow the thread of what you are trying to say (check Harvard or MLA style for ways to improve this), and also inasmuch as you too often "hop" between texts rather than meshing them together under a particular point. I have only a few problems with the ideas themselves, but in future you MUST express and explain them more, and draw them together to form a coherent argument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Marker</th>
<th>Second Marker</th>
<th>Final Agreed Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low-to-mid 2ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Assessment Questionnaire (final)

Please take the time to fill in this questionnaire on assessment and assessment feedback. It will be used to survey those elements that students feel are most useful when receiving feedback and will be used as the basis of an examination of the most effective means of providing feedback.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements on feedback? (Rate all from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use feedback to improve the quality of my future essays</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the comments that tutors make about my essays</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand HOW I am being assessed by tutors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand WHY I am being assessed by tutors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which forms of feedback did you receive on your first EN33730 assignment?
- Essay Annotations & Cover Sheets [12]
- Oral Discussion with Tutor [5]

What did you find useful from your feedback on your first EN33730 assignment?

**Essay Annotations**
- Identifying grammatical and stylistic comments (4), incorrect uses of terminology (1), highlights where more argument or detail was required (3), highlights errors and mistakes that get summarised on the cover sheet (2)

**Essay Cover Sheets**
- General comments on theory (1) and use of text (1), and suggests methods of improvement (6), digestible summary of annotations (3), explanation of received mark (1)

**Oral Discussion with Tutor**
- Human contact (2) and "feedback on feedback" (2), suggests methods of improvement (3), reiterates major points of cover sheets (1)

NOTE: One student had not collected his/her essay feedback at this point.

What do you feel would have made feedback on your first EN33730 assignment more useful?

The only negative comment received (all others made positive comments, stated that they had unfortunately missed the oral discussions, or stated "n/a") outlined the need to explain how the grade was arrived at in terms of the assessment criteria. Note that this respondent did not attend the oral discussion with tutor.