Good afternoon everyone. Welcome to week 6 of our virtual annual conference and I would like to say things have been going swimmingly over the last five or six weeks. Lynn our operations manager may beg to differ with me because I know it has been challenging in many respects and I'm sure it mirrors some of the experiences you are having in your own organisations over a period of time.

Hopefully you are in the right place for the right thing and I would like to firstly welcome our speakers today and I say speakers because we have a prerecorded video but they are here live and in person so we have Karl Nightingale, Vikki Anderson and Sue Onens from the University of Birmingham, welcome.

We have got a video. The video is about three quarters of an hour in terms of length and we will have a short amount of time in order to answer any questions that you may have. What I would add is at the bottom of the screens is a chat window so feel free to chat with each other and introduce yourselves and say hello, be appropriate, and all of those things is about you connecting and also there's a Q and A tab at the bottom as well. If you have any questions for the three of us
speakers at any point during the video or following, feel free to post your questions in the Q and A tab and Helen who is on the board of directors will be answered those during the video and some after the video itself.

Some housekeeping, this is in the virtue sense, I didn't even realise there was housekeeping virtually until I started hosting this conference. We are using a series of caption options. So for some of you who have been to our webinars we have used different platforms and this week we are using captions from Caption.Ed. It is a novel new solution developed in collaboration with UK universities. It was worth us trying all the software and technology that's out there and as practitioners it gives you a understanding of what is out there and what the strengths and limitations might be for what you might be working on.

So just to make sure we are in the right place. The session today is titled Audio Feedback. A useful approach for the inclusive curriculum? so if you are not in the right space I would say stick around anyway, because you are here and you have your brew in your hand and we are not going to let you go. I'll pass you over to Jo our administrator who will start playing the video.
As I mentioned before, do post any questions that you might have throughout.

So first I should say thank you very much to the NADP for inviting us to give this online webinar. What we are going to be talking about is a study we have done over the last three years to evaluate audio feedback with a particular slant on looking at whether it's an inclusive approach.

So first I would like to introduce myself and my co-presenters. I'm Karl Nightingale and I'm an academic. I teach on lots of programs, mostly in the biological sciences programs like medicine and biomedical sciences and pharmacy and dentistry. So I'm a sort of scientist, but I'm also interested in educational interest and I also work with these two other people. So maybe, Vikki, can you introduce yourself.

Yes. Hi, I'm Vikki Anderson, learning support advisor with the Student Disability Service at the University of Birmingham, supporting a whole range of students throughout the cohort with a range of disabilities.

And Sue Onens.

Hi, I'm Sue Onens. I'm inclusivity advisor at the University of Birmingham, a fairly new role, but
interested in teaching and learning and the wider student experience.

>> So that's a sort of introduction to us and I think what we'd like to say is that this is going to be about 40 minutes long and one way you can ask questions is by using the chat function. But because a lot of people use the chat function to make comments, could you introduce or start off any questions with a Q. So Q and then your question and then it's sort of a signal for us to pay attention and we'll get to all your questions at the end of the recording.

So I think that's everything. Are we all ready to go over? Right, so I'm sharing my screen and hopefully you can all see the presentation. Can you see it, you two? Very good.

This is our presentation and it's all about audio feedback and our study which is over the last three years to evaluate how audio feedback actually works in diverse undergraduate programmes and particularly in the context of the NADP we are going to be looking at how specific groups of students, those disclosing a whole range of disabilities, perceive and make use of this type of feedback.

As we have said we are from the
University of Birmingham in the UK and the last thing I have here is my contact details so please send me any questions you think of later or maybe you have got an idea and you think you would like to do a study with us, we'd be very interested to talk to you about your ideas.

I think the first thing is to talk about what actually the context of this study. So all of us know that assessment and feedback is a problematic area in higher education. In the UK, we have this thing called the National Student Survey. So what this tells us is how undergraduates perceive their programme. Every year assessment and feedback is one of the areas where it's clear the students are less satisfied than other aspects of their courses. This has been a focus in the UK for a long time. But clearly it's an important area internationally.

Why do students have problems with assessment and feedback? A part of it might be because it's simply just different from what they experienced in school. If you think about our assessment methods in higher education, they tend to be one way. So what does that mean? It means an assessor, someone like me, is telling a student what they have done right and what
they have done wrong and there's not very much opportunity for the student to actually come back and actually talk to me to define their ideas. It tends to be one way, I deliver it, they receive.

It's usually high stakes or summative, it nearly always contributes to the students' final mark. Particularly in the UK we talk quite a lot about formative assessment, so stuff that does not contribute to your mark, and it it is not maybe as large a component as it should be.

The other thing that's also a problem, perhaps other than this entire context, is that assessors don't seem to be doing as good a job as students actually want them to do. Often if you ask students what do they think about their feedback they are often saying it's too general or vague, it uses unfamiliar terms, it's not feeding forward and helping them to do better next time.

This inability to feed forward is a really big problem because if the feedback is not helping them to get better, why would you engage with this? This is part of the issue. So there's now literature that showed that students often don't address the areas raised in feedback, perhaps because they don't understand it or
they don't understand what to do to make it better.

Another aspect about students is that they can't look at their own work and give it a mark that is close to what an assessor gives. So they can't judge whether their mark is high quality or low quality and they don't get better at this as they go through programmes.

The last thing to think about is recently it has been recognised that students emotions are clearly a really important part of the feedback process. If you think about the last time someone assessed you, it feels like they are assessing you as a person. So the work that you put in is being judged good or bad.

Obviously, this is an emotional response, it's a judgment on you and your work. Clearly, that can be a big barrier to students to engage. If you are being told your work is rubbish, you feel rubbish, and this is a really big issue in actually engaging with that work and/or that feedback.

So these are some of the issues that are present in higher education. What about audio feedback? When we are talking about audio feedback in this study, we are talking about the online delivery of an audio recording. The students send over a piece of work online and the assessor makes a recording and actually
this is delivered back online through a virtual learning environment to the student.

So this sort of approach has been around for many years, particularly in language teaching, and there's quite a large literature. The literature on this is very encouraging. So compared with written feedback, audio feedback is more engaging, students think it's more convenient, more detailed, it's more encouraging and more directed. Lots and lots of positive things about audio feedback.

To me, this makes a lot of sense simply because I as an assessor can say an awful lot more in five minutes than I can write in five minutes. So naturally, if I give the same amount of time, the feedback is going to be more detailed and it's going to be more helpful to the student.

Another thing that might be very important is the fact that when you are actually watching or listening to an assessor, there's more information in that than in a written feedback. So what you can hear is you can hear intonation and the assessor's immediate response and how they might change their mind as they are working through the feedback. So it's this idea that the recipient student can actually get into the mind of the
assessor and partially understand why the assessor is thinking the way they are.

That might be also be an important part of why audio feedback is useful.

So what did our study actually aim to do? What we did is we are comparing two individual types of feedback. On one hand we are using written feedback, which is the standard way of giving feedback on two different programmes. The programmes we are looking at are biomedical sciences, a year one programme with 150 students and the second programme is pharmacy which is a smaller cohort with 50 students. So we are looking at written feedback in one example and then we are going to look at how that compares with audio feedback. So two different types of feedback we compare and contrast.

What are we going to do? Both of these types of feedback are going to be submitted and generated online and assessors mark them using SpeedGrader which is a standard tool on our canvass VLE. In both cases we are using a range of assessors and different sorts of approaches to audio feedback. So we are trying to work out what is best practice and what is it about audio feedback on its own, rather than
an individual assessor's approach.

We use two different questionnaires, one asking students about written feedback and one about audio feedback. In both cases, we invited students to focus groups. Then because we wanted to understand what audio feedback how it was being received by the entire cohort, in our case we also asked students to disclose a number of characteristics. So some we asked to disclose for example whether they had a wide range of disabilities and/or specific learning difficulties. We asked them to identify their ethnicity and we asked students that were international or non-english-speaking backgrounds to also identify.

What this means is that we can hone in on these students and their perceptions as well as looking at the general cohort.

Let's go into the data. I think the first thing is to look at how written feedback is actually being perceived on number of different programmes. What we have here is two different programmes in this case it's a postgraduate programme and in the lower case what we are looking at is year two pharmacy and we are looking at students' comments at different stages of the feedback process.
So the very first column here is did the students read the assessment guidelines. If they said yes, it's a green tic, if they said no, it's an orange cross. Then we asked were they satisfied with their mark. Did they engage with the feedback, so did they read it fully and think about it, and did they reread it prior to the next similar assessment, so are they using it in the long-term.

What you can see is as you go through this feedback process in both programmes, what you start off with is a high level of engagement, in this case 95 per cent of people are looking at the assessment guidelines. But once you give them their feedback, you start to get a significant percentage of the cohort are not happy or they are not satisfied.

So you can see the postgraduates it's about 20 per cent, in year two pharmacy it's around 30 per cent are not satisfied with their mark. What this tends to mean is that those students do not engage fully with their feedback. So we have a higher percentage of students that are not engaging with that feedback.

Then later on when it comes to a later assessment, ideally this feedback would feed forward, they are stating or a significant percentage of the cohort are
stating they are not looking at it again and giving us reasons. Roughly 20 per cent in this case are saying the feedback was not to hand or they forgot to use it.

What is even more worrying is that a significant percentage of these students are saying the feedback was of no use or relevance. Basically they are dismissing it, they are saying it's of no use to them.

Clearly, we have got problems in these two programmes in the level of satisfaction and engagement with feedback. These are fairly typical, we see this in quite a few different programmes, even in postgraduates that you would expect to be a little bit more academically literate. So there are clearly barriers with written feedback.

Let's try and understand what those barriers are. The first thing is students, why are you dissatisfied with your mark. We have a set statement "I was satisfied with my mark" and we are looking at biomedical cohorts, 350 students. When we asked were you satisfied with your mark, 30 per cent of the students say no, they were not. Why were they not happy with their mark? They offered a range of different reasons. The majority said the mark was lower than they expected or it did not recognise the work they put in or it did not
recognise the quality of their work. Some students, 7 per cent, said the assessor was biased against them as an individual.

There's also this issue here, this about consistency. This reflects the biomedical science, what happens is the marks are split between the assessors, so they are worried that the marks from one assessor is more lenient from one assessor compared to other. So this is a problem when you have multiple assessors in a large cohort. So this is a range of reasons why students were not happy or dissatisfied with their mark. I hope you will recognise that a lot of these are to do with the emotional responses, disappointed with the mark. It's not anything that the assessors are doing, except possibly not explaining why the mark is low. So this is about an emotional reaction in this case.

What else? We also looked at other reasons why the students were unhappy. Here is a second question. It's about whether they engaged with their feedback. The question was "I read the feedback thoroughly, I thought about what I would do differently next time."

In this case again biomedical science 350 students, three cohorts for three years, 30 per cent of the students disagreed with this statement. Why are they
disagreeing? Well, these are the reasons which we are all familiar with. The comments were too brief. It was not clear what I had to do to improve. The comments are too general or not specific. And the mark was sufficient feedback.

What is interesting is all of these are reasons we have heard over and over again in the literature and it's suggesting that for whatever reason assessors are unable or unwilling to give feedback that satisfies students' feed forward needs.

I think we now understand what the issues are with written feedback. What about audio feedback? So what we have here is an overview of the assessment process in year two pharmacy and this is the summation of two academic cohorts, we have either done written feedback and asked a questionnaire or we have done audio feedback and had a similar questionnaire.

So what we are looking at here is the summation or an overview of what the students think. We have already seen this data. This is saying the written feedback is actually not very -- the students on the whole are not as happy as they maybe should be. 30 to 40 per cent are dissatisfied with their mark, 30 to 40 per cent are not engaging with their feedback even at
a later point. So something is not right here.

What about audio feedback, is it better? The answer is yes, but not really massively different. What is going on here. So if you still ask about the mark and satisfaction with the mark, clearly a larger percentage of the students are happier with their mark. We justify that or think about that in that the assessors are giving more explanation. So they are explaining maybe why their mark is disappointed.

What is important here, I think, is the percentage of students who are stating they are engaging with their feedback. What we have here is 30 or 40 per cent of the students are not engaging, here we are getting down to the 10s and 20s. We have a significant percentage of more students that are stating they are engaging with their feedback.

Then the interesting thing in this programme is we asked whether the students actually looked at their feedback prior to the next assessment. Whereas in the first, the written feedback, a significant percentage of students are saying it's of no use or relevance to me, in the second, in audio feedback, what they are saying is that they forgot to use it, but they are not saying that it's of no relevance.
So they recognise its value, but they are forgetting to use it. Interestingly, what we also were able to do here is to actually look at the downloads. So the number or the percentage of students that actually accessed this on the VLE. Interestingly, the level of engagement is reasonably similar. Audio feedback per se is not more engaging. The students say they are engaging with it more and probably these students are, but as an entire cohort, the level of engagement is still relatively disappointing.

Let's go in and work out why there are differences between written and audio feedback. This is perhaps the most interesting slide. So this is we asked "I prefer audio feedback to written feedback" and we have done this now in six or seven cohorts on lots of different disciplines. You always get the same sort of response. 70 to 80 per cent of the students agree that they would rather have audio feedback. Why is that?

They tell us that the feedback is more detailed. They tell us the feedback is more personal and bespoke by which we understand that it is more personal and bespoke to their work. It's not about the interpersonal interaction as much as it's clearly about their work and their errors or what they have done well.
The feedback is more understandable and the feedback is clear. So, clearly, a large percentage of the cohort is preferring audio feedback because of the level of detail we can give them.

What is also important is that it isn't suiting everyone. So what we have seen here is that 21 per cent are either neutral or disagree that audio feedback is preferable. Why is that? Well roughly 6 per cent of the cohort say there's no difference between audio feedback and written feedback. There's no difference.

Then, interestingly, it's always the same, 10 to 15 per cent say that they would rather have a paper copy and that they can reflect more easily on written materials and this is what they are not getting when you get a recording online.

The worrying thing in the context of the NADP, of course, is who are these students. Could it be that these students are the ones that are disclosing SpLDs or are we solving one problem and creating another problem for another group of students.

That's what we focused in on. We have done a lot of focus groups to try and understand why is it that audio feedback is better. What if audio feedback is
worse than written feedback. These are the main things that came back. The first one is the audio feedback is more detailed and specific. That seems to make sense. I can say a lot more in five minutes than I can write.

The second one is also more interesting in some ways. The fact that a recorded voice actually carries intonation, it carries stresses, it's a more informal sort of language. There's more communication in an audio recording than there is in written recording. Here is a nice example. Here is a student that clearly has engaged with something in an audio recording. One thing you definitely get from audio feedback that you don't get from writing is that you can tell from their tone and that does contribute. So if they are like yes, it's really good then you feel good, then if it was like mine, it was like whoah it had its effect and I was like right I better try and sort that out for the next one.

So this is the feeling, that there is a communication or emotional element of audio feedback that actually really does impact on students and gets them to engage with what they are doing well and what they are doing badly. The third one is that the technology is convenient, that this is the same now
for written and audio feedback. Both are delivered online via the same platform.

What is maybe not so good about audio feedback? I think the first thing is that audio feedback can be less structured. Typically if you talk to many students, they think that assessors narrative approach to the assessment in audio feedback, so they start at the start of a piece of work and they work their way through it. This is less structured than not often where they are doing in written feedback, where often the comments are put in in criteria under boxes which allow the students to understand what their priorities are and what maybe the take home message from the assessment is.

So this idea that audio feedback can be less structured is maybe important. The other thing that comes up sometimes is that the equivalent of annotation is not so obvious in audio feedback. So contextualising what you are talking about in what part of the essay or the work is actually more difficult and the assessor has to be more aware that they have to put markers or highlights or somehow think about how the student is going to understand what they are talking about, when they are talking about it.
Then I think the third thing that may explain some of our feed forward activate is when you talk to many students they have the value or the impression made from an audio recording is not as convenient or useful or as impactful as a piece of paper with a summary on. So this may well explain why it's audio feedback is not being used later on when you come to the next assessment. Maybe because an audio recording is a more transient or it's a more difficult thing to access and to accommodate into your work.

So that's me talking about the general cohort. Now I'm going to hand over to Vikki who is going to talk about the qualitative focus groups we did with students disclosing disabilities.

>> It's interesting to give you a flavour of the student advice and what our students disclosing disabilities said about the experience of having audio feedback. All of the focus group members talked about the lack of detail or the amount of detail in their feedback and also the importance of contextualised feedback.

It was interesting to see a comment from a student disclosing mental health difficulties where they said sometimes I'd write something and it would be
good, but they tend to expand more on the bad points. I need to know why it's good so I can apply it next time.

Some commented, several students commented in these focus groups that written feedback can be impersonal and that they often felt that the same statements could be made to multiple students.

Some of our students commented that audio feedback was an improvement because of the specificity and because of the use of examples that gave them clear points as to where their work could be improved.

Students that we spoke to who disclosed dyslexia referred to the information processing working memory side of things. So comments such as they preferred to work through the auditory channel when they heard something they could understand it more, they could process the information more easily. So in my head I'm more likely to remember somebody talking, it sticks more with voice. I forget what I have read easily.

They also commented on the fact that it was good to be able to go back to listen to it again and again to reinforce the points that were made.

However, some students with dyslexia commented that they needed a visual example and a concrete reference to go back to because they didn't remember
everything that had been said.

Next one, please.

A comment from a student disclosing mental health difficulties was that when they had received written feedback, they found it a bit anxiety making to go and approach the lecturer later and say can you expand on this point that you have made, and they commented that because the audio feedback was more detailed, because the points had already been expanded on in the audio feedback, they didn't need to worry about arranging to see the lecturer or communicating with the lecturer and asking them to expand in that way. So it reduced the feelings of nervousness because they knew it was all there and they could relisten to it in their own time.

Again, being able to listen again and the contextualised nature of the feedback was regarded as being a benefit by some students. However, some students disclosing dyslexia commented on how difficult they found it to process verbal content and when they were just listening to somebody it wasn't enough for them.

So various pros and cons were voiced by our students declaring disabilities. The comments from
students with dyspraxia were particularly interesting. They tended to resolve around structure. So, for example, a student said when somebody talks they are not using bullet points and when I hear it, it's all a bit more jumbled, they needed that structure that the written feedback could give them.

I think it's worth reading out that the whole of the next quote "structure is incredibly good for anybody with dyspraxia, we need a framework to work with, you can't just have somebody rambling on a tape. When you read something off a computer screen you have no intonation on the other hand and for some students with dyspraxia the intonation gave them cues and enabled them to get far more back from the feedback and through the structure that was given in the audio feedback.

There was one student Karl has mentioned the emotional response and how it can be more impactful. A student with dyspraxia said that although it might be a bit unnerving to register a critical tone, they would rather that happened so that it would alert them to somebody that they needed to pay attention to as they put it, a red flag that might be glaringly obvious to other people but not for them, and that's something they
found the verbal feedback gave them a much better idea of.

One of the dyslexic students we talked to, interestingly, said that they listened to the audio feedback, typed out what had been said and then had it in written format for the next time they were preparing an essay. So in actual fact for them it ended up being written feedback. Some students with specific learning difficulties said they might benefit from having a combination of audio and written feedback given that there were positive and negative aspects to each.

Some commented on the benefits of being able to see the essay actually being -- or the work being marked up as the audio feedback was being given.

I'm going to hand over to Karl now to sum up some of our findings.

>> I think the last thing to do is to talk about how audio and written feedback compare when we're thinking about student satisfaction and how much students actually engage with the feedback. What we have on this graph is an indication of how this is perceived and the differences between different components of our diverse cohorts. What you can see here on the right is we have different categories of
students that they have either disclosed or identified as. There are different ethnicities here but also we have students that are identifying as either international students or they are disclosing a wide range of SpLDs or disabilities.

So I guess in this context we are going to be talking about these students, the red dots. If we look at it here, what we have on the left is we have student satisfaction with their mark with either written or audio feedback and their stated level of engagement with that feedback, again either with written or audio feedback.

The way to look at this is to see how disparate they are with the students in the different cohorts. What we have is a large group of students saying well 70 to 75 per cent of white and Asian students are saying that they are happy with their mark. What is also clear is that we have a number of categories of students here that are clearly not happy with their mark, much lower percentages of satisfaction with their mark. These include red dots, the students disclosing SpLDs or disabilities.

What we have here is a real marked difference between perceptions with feedback in different parts of the cohort. Again, this is written feedback, but when
we go to audio feedback you can see the whole level of all these students are on the whole much happier with their mark and we are seeing marked increases in satisfaction with their mark.

How can we justify that? I think this must be to do with the explanation, the level of explanation that the assessor is giving in audio feedback.

What about the level of engagement? Again, what we have in written feedback is a range of levels of engagement depending on different categories of students and what they are disclosing. But, again, you can see the red dots, the students that are disclosing a wide range of disabilities, are towards the bottom end of the cohort. They are not engaging as much as other students. Again, when we go to audio feedback we are seeing a marked increase in engagement, but clearly there's still an issue here. Students disclosing SpLDs are not engaging as much as the rest of the students in the cohort.

What we have here is a marked increase in satisfaction with their marks for all students, but markedly so for students disclosing SpLDs or disabilities and also an increase in engagement with their feedback, but, again, we are not addressing all of the issues for
these students.

I'm going to hand over -- no, we have one more slide which are basically the take homes from this study. These are the general take homes that we think are appropriate for this study. The first thing is that audio feedback is very well received. That seems to be generally accepted by almost everyone in the cohort. Everyone is telling us there's a high level of engagement with their feedback and it seems to be highly valued. That seems to reflect the level of detail that's actually coming in the feedback.

As an academic, I feel that it's distinct from written feedback. It's a different sort of thing. It's more informal, more detailed and there's also a level of interpersonal or emotional relevance to audio feedback that you don't give in written feedback. I think that's important for some students and it might have the different effect, it might be that it's more immediate, it makes student reflect more.

I think the last thing is to point out that it does seem to have inclusive elements. But this obviously needs -- we need to think very carefully about what best practice actually means for students across the cohort. So we raised the idea that some students particularly
need an explicit structure or a balance of positive and negative comments and this is maybe something to focus on in audio feedback.

I also think that one trick maybe to think about is to encourage students to reflect on the audio feedback. Maybe they need another activity for them to identify what the main take homes are, for them to reflect and add structure to what is perhaps a less structured form of feedback.

The other thing people have talked about is there are different softwares that allow assessors to actually simultaneously markup the script as they are talking to it. So you have a simultaneous video and audio recording and this may well help a large percentage of students understand or take home the message from this feedback.

I think the last thing is to hand over to Sue Onens for her general thoughts on what this study shows.

>> Thank you very much, Karl. Hopefully this presentation has given you more -- some food for thought and raised some interesting questions, probably a range of questions that you can reflect on.

Building on what Karl and Vikki have spoken about, I'd like to discuss the broader considerations about
feedback. It's clear from our research that students seem to value the personal touch which audio feedback could provide. This is particularly important now creating a sense of belonging and being part of a community and now with the uncertainty of COVID.

Audio feedback has the potential to make the academic and student more connected, especially where physical presence may be limited and I think that's a really important thing to consider.

In our study the markers commented that they were able to provide more detailed explicit and contextualised audio feedback in the same time allocated for written feedback and the quality of the feedback was echoed by many of the students. I think that's a theme that comes through.

So whatever form of feedback is used, whether it's written, audio or video needs to be accessible to a diverse range of students, particularly those with disabilities and international students. We need to be mindful of the difficulties with multitasking and potential cognitive overload. For some students with dyspraxia as Vikki mentioned switching from audio to the electronic copy can be problematic when trying to follow feedback.
In addition, I think we have all experienced Zoom fatigue recently and it is likely our students will be no different. It's important to strike a balance of accessible, relevance, personalised feedback that is detailed, feeds forward but is not too overwhelming and getting that balance is right. So sufficient detail to feed forward but not too much.

Vikki spoke about students preferring a combination of audio and written feedback. Again, this is something that should be achievable given the pace of technology particularly since COVID. As Karl just mentioned, he has used Voice Spread, again which students and staff found positive. So it's thinking about the future, thinking about how we can take the key messages from the study forward into our own institutions.

Karl, if we could have the next slide, please.

So this is the last slide and I think it's important to remember that things in the context now, things that would be deemed too difficult or difficult to implement in the past have now become possible or at least come to the fore in discussions. Perhaps student choice in the form of assessment may be a real consideration in the near future. We are all on a learning journey at the
moment and it's important to seek feedback from students on a number of issues, for example how are they finding interacting and engaging with their course, tutors and each other. What are their concerns and whether they feel connected and where are the gaps.

In the new normal, feedback in its widest sense is going to take centre stage. The last question which I'm posing is somewhat contentious and brings us back to the study. How do we ensure that students see the value of feedback, engage with it and use it to feed forward, whatever the form it is provided in. I have raised the question about actually the separation of marks from the feedback, just to pose that question to think about the value that students place on the feedback and are they too interested on looking at the mark and discounting the feedback.

So hopefully this brings together all the research and some general considerations and thank you for your attention.

>> Maybe the last thing I'd like to say is to thank the people that actually were also involved in this study as well. We have done an awful lot of studies in a lot of different contexts here in Birmingham and I'm not presenting all of these data. So I'd like to thank Adina
Pirtea and Shazad Khan who have looked at audio feedback in the context of international foundation year students. We presented some data from Andrew Soundy. This is a postgraduate physiotherapy process. There's Chris Tselepis, who is one of our audio assessors on biomedical sciences and Keith Grain is another. Marie-Christine Jones was an assessor on pharmacy. So the pharmacy data was generated by her. And some data that we haven't talked about was generated by Amelia Swift and Chris Wagstaff in nursing and they were the ones that used Voice Spread and the students were really happy with the Voice Spread approach.

So, I think, that's time for us to wrap up. Obviously we are very happy to answer any questions.

>> Firstly just to say thanks so much Karl, Sue and Vikki, that was a very fascinating presentation. We have some questions, some have been answered. I'll start with the open once and we can recap on the once you have given answers to in the chat as well.

Karl, how do you cater for students are hearing impairments who would not be able to access audio feedback.

>> The issue didn't arise. So we told the students this is what we were proposing and asked if
that would cause barriers for anyone and no one came forward. Obviously, if it had created barriers we would have done written feedback, I guess.

>> Yes. I think it has been touched on throughout the presentation, but I guess it's about finding that right balance for whoever is receiving the feedback.

Great, thank you. So somebody else has asked did you ask how those groups identities would overlap, in terms of disabilities and international students.

>> Yes, the answer is the numbers are so small. These are just very typical undergraduate programmes and bearing in mind that, you know, we are looking at the questionnaires that we get back. So on that slide where I'm showing the different categories of students, what we have got typically there is 200 white students on the top identify as white, 100 students that are identifying as Asian and then all the others are in groups of 30, so it's 30 students identifying as black, 30 as internationals, 30 identifying or disclosing disabilities and SpLDs.

So what it means is our numbers are actually pretty small. So what you have got, of course you are going to be intersectionality but it's literally at that sort
of numbers and that's what we get. That's the data. That's the cohort.

>> Great. Sue has asked -- I think it's a comment more than anything. I hadn't really thought about this before (inaudible) as a mentor Sue spends quite a lot of time going through feedback with students who haven't necessarily understood it and often feel personally criticised, which follows with your presentation findings and survey.

She said I think primarily autistic students would benefit from a combination of audio feedback and written feedback.

>> I think I'll hand that over to Vikki, I think she has more experience of talking to students.

>> I think now that as we have touched upon Sue as mentioning, I think now with the situation where a lot of people are becoming more sort of digitally literate with Zoom and so on then there's quite a lot of scope for expanding on this and taking this further and looking at how maybe feedback with audio and video might be useful. So there's various opportunities, really, to take it forward.

I will say that the students who did see the script being marked up, being highlighted, as the audio
feedback has been given found it highly beneficial.

  >> Can I come in and add that I think it's really important that we do work with students to get them to understand feedback and how they can take it forward. I think we make a lot of assumptions about students understanding the feedback and knowing how to act on feedback and I know at places like Sheffield they deliberately, you know, I suppose foster those skills with the students. Again, one of the questions that was asked, I think earlier on, was the fact that we also need to work with staff to give effective feedback because, you know, it's not just a matter of -- so I think some staff do need, you know, training or guidance about effective feedback. And we need to then triangulate that with students, do students understand the feedback that's being given, because sometimes we miss that key question out.

    So just, again, to add to that.

  >> Yes, and there was a question asked which was answered in the chat but that follows up which was around has it been considered that the potential issue is the training or experience of academic staff and how they give that constructive feedback. I don't know if Karl and Vikki also commented on that whether you
want to add anything further?

>>> To be honest, this -- of course it will be part of this will be. Of course it will be. This is an area that's not got any -- it has been raised by students for donkey's years and we know there are inabilities of academics to give good feedback and it's about academics valuing or having the time to give good feedback.

I'm not sure what the solution to that is. I'm afraid that sending folk off for training will not necessarily solve this as an issue. I think you will find that some academics will engage and some won't. This is a very difficult area about how academics perceive their role as well.

>>> Sue do you want -- sorry.

>>> Sue I was going to say do you want to make your point about the emotional aspect.

>>> I was just picking up the fact that with the audio feedback particularly, that kind of connection, that emotional and personal connection that I think goes two ways, from the tutor to the student and back to the tutor and I think there has been research now by Rassi and Dickson that looks at that kind of emotional connection and I think going forward with COVID and
the more moot online, I think it's really important that we look at the feedback in its widest sense and what audio feedback potentially can give to that kind of emotional, personal, connected feeling, yes.

>> Claire has written on the chat as a question about her experience at Leeds. She said that written feedback comprises of three parts, good things although that can be dealt with as praise and problems how to work on the problems identified and it says some feedback is recorded and tends to be more personable and generally longer. Generally her feeling is students amplify all the bad things in feedback and dismiss a lot of positive feedback. So to what affect is non-relevance or feedback to do with the fact that recommendation, so ie it won't really be relevant across tasks. She also says that written feedback can sometimes appear quite brutal but this can be to do can tutors typing and trying to be clear and succinct and avoiding waffle.

>> Yes, I understand all of that. In Birmingham we have the same sort of structure for written feedback, the three goods and the three bads. It's basically a form and you recognise three "good" and three "bad" things so it's very structured. Again, we find the same with -- so in the focus groups comments about
negativity in feedback was picked up by a lot of students, interestingly a lot more in the audio than in written. So it comes up sometimes in written, but it comes up a lot more in audio and I wonder if it's because of that emotional link.

You know, when you are saying something, it engages the students more than when you are writing. I don't know. Inappropriate referencing, it's not very good here, is it, so it's a different sort of message. So I can see how audio feedback can be perceived more as negative. What evidence? I can't remember what else she said?

>> I think you have covered it.

>> I think you have covered it, yes.

Can I say quickly there were some students in my focus groups that said with the written feedback they would get comments where it was good they would get comments like good, good point, but then they would get quite a lot of criticism when it wasn't such a good point. And they said I want to know why it's good. I do not want that it's good but why it's good. That came through more in the audio feedback because you can pack more into a short space of time.

>> I'm conscious of the time, so it has just come
to 3 o'clock. We have just a couple of questions. They have been answered on the chat. I understand if people are leaving the webinar that's fine. But how many academics were involved in your study and did you get any provision from about the audio and written feedback.

>>> Yes, in biomedical science it was three and in pharmacy it was two, so five people over three different years. But we have also done stuff in nursing and that was two or three people and done things in law and an international foundation, so a sort of pre-degree international cohort. So we have done a lot of this now.

What I would say is that once an academic starts doing audio feedback it's a one-way process, they don't go back. So there's a lot of advantages to it from an academics perspective because you save time, but also you have got happier students. So you can give more feedback in the same time and so you have got happier students so why wouldn't you do it. So there's clearly a barrier to getting to audio feedback. It's a bit of a hassle to start and work out what you want to do. You have to find a quiet room and turn your phone off. You know, it's a hassle. But once you have made that hassle, it's a one-way transition.
Thank you very much for that. I'll hand over to Brian quickly.

I think I have unmuted. You should be able to hear me now. Thank you ever so much Karl, Sue, Vikki. That was fabulous. I think the range of questions and also the chat clearly demonstrates the meaning of the content of your session altogether. That whole element where we're talking about verbal feedback, I have experience through teaching many years ago and I used to teach disaffected young people and we used to do classroom rules and when we used to do classroom rules a lot of young people would say what would we need to have and agree and they would say no swearing and I'd say well is it no swearing or is it that we are using appropriate language.

It's the reframing of how we do that. Because I do think verbal feedback if done in the right way is wholly positive but it's that ownership and awareness when communicating on that level. I found that session fascinating and I'm sure the range of delegates we have had on today have clearly done so and in terms of the questions they were totally engaged with the session.

So thank you so much to the three of you for that and thank you to Helen for keeping in touch with all the
questions as they were coming through and collating altogether and also to Jo for her technical expertise in making sure the video ran smoothly.

So thank you all for that. Before we close the session, I'd just like to remind all delegates of the feedback form that we have. It's on our main conference webpage. We are wanting as much feedback as we can. It's a virtue conference and time of pandemic and time of change. So if there's anything we can do to enhance a series of virtual sessions moving forward, then your feedback would be greatly appreciated.

Also this week there are a range of videos on the website. The first is around our professional accreditation scheme we are piloting successfully. Paddy Turner has posted a video which gives members a bit of an update on progress and also to celebrate the success of new accredited members on that pilot scheme.

What I would add to that and the names of all the members from NADP who have gone through that pilot are on the website. Who I have not mentioned is Carys Kennedy who is a senior accredited member is the only name omitted and our deepest apologies that has not
carried over into the video and an extra note will be put into the webpage alongside.

Another video is our disability professional report and hopefully it really demonstrates what we as practitioners in the sector have been experiencing in the various forms over the last few months and possibly longer. So do have a look at that and read through the report. Any feedback on those two pieces of work would be fabulous.

The last thing is we have bookings open for next week's webinar which is enabling student choice and voice. I'm not sure Patrick is a poet but it's quite poetic. Patrick McGrath is doing the session next week. Do book in when you are able to and hopefully you will be able to join us then.

Any further comments in the chat? Okay, bye John. From Harborson, there's a thank you, brilliant presentation to the speakers. So thank you very much. Without further ado, it's 3.10 pm we are slightly over but I think that was time well spent. Hopefully you have all got something from that to move forward. I noticed at the beginning of the chat Karl and I hope you don't mind but your email address was given out but you might be flooded as time goes on.
What was in the slide so I was just putting it in for --

Yes, it's fine.

I know, I'm not stirring.

Thank you so much for joining us everyone. Have a good rest of day and week and take care of yourselves and each other. Bye bye.