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This article argues that the mechanisms and research culture that support university academics when writing articles for publication in an iterative feedback cycle, and which are within the tenets of good pedagogic principles of formative assessment and feedback (Sadler, 1989), are often missing to support undergraduate students in their learning. The reasons for this are mainly historical. Generally, this process is only available in universities at postgraduate level, as undergraduates tend not to be included in this type of learning culture. This is exacerbated because of the exclusion of undergraduates from assessment processes, which would help them to understand and assimilate the feedback on their work. Data collected from validated documentation of undergraduate programmes at a new English university were used to attempt to quantify possible feedback available to students and their access to assessment.

Introduction

This paper examines how sociological and historical factors have created a situation where two anomalies are evident in the giving of feedback in Higher Education (HE): it is about revealing and challenging aspects of the intense socialisation to which we are all subjected (Talbot et al., 2003, p. 4). The current situation (Broadfoot, 1996; Biggs, 1999; Filer, 2000) disadvantages undergraduates who appear to be assessed, receive feedback and have the opportunity to use this feedback, particularly on complex multi-criterion written assignments, in a manner which is less supportive of learning than that of postgraduate students and academics carrying out research. This is the first anomaly, highlighted by Sadler (1989, pp. 119–121). It transpires that both the quantity and type of feedback which undergraduates normally receive or can be expected to receive during the production of assessed written work is minimal compared to that received by academics during the
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production of their articles. Academics are involved in an iterative cycle of learning which is denied undergraduates.

The feedback from formative assessment is the basic requisite for supporting efficient institutional learning; this is particularly important in building up expertise in complex, multi-criterion work such as essays and dissertations. Firstly, in universities there is a research culture among academics that includes a mechanism of peer feedback to support learning. This permits an effective and efficient cycle of drafting and redrafting which allows academics to produce articles of the required standard and form for publication. Socio-educational traditions at undergraduate level seem to have resulted in a situation where assessment is structured principally for selecting and placing students; this would appear to continue despite a sharp trend towards criterion-referencing of assessment. Thus, for example, with an essay, students are usually denied, by the same academics who benefit from expert iterative feedback, the possibility to update and improve their assignments by redrafting the work subsequent to tutor feedback. Perhaps, more importantly, they are denied the intensive learning that results from the process.

The second anomaly is that undergraduate students (UGs) appear to lack opportunities to develop concepts of standards and criteria. These concepts are required to enable them to make judgements which are necessary to improve their work in progress and thus use formative feedback. Being generally excluded from the assessment process (either through peer or self-assessment), the anomaly arises that students tend only to develop these skills indirectly through tutors’ editing of the students’ work. In order to conform to Sadler’s formative assessment (FA), students require both direct experience of assessment and the possibility of integrating formative feedback in an iterative cycle.

Initially, a theoretical framework of formative assessment and feedback will be presented. Subsequently, these two anomalies in assessment practice between staff and students will be examined. Data collected from validated documentation supporting undergraduate (UG) programmes at a new English university were analysed in order to ascertain if the anomalies noted have support and basis in practice. This information was used both to attempt to quantify possible FA feedback to undergraduates and also to quantify student access to assessment. It does this by examining different aspects of assessment: numbers of assignments, assessment methods, types and repetitions of similar assessment types which would encourage an iterative feedback cycle and use of the innovative forms of assessment that are inclusive of students and would therefore allow them to develop concepts of standards and criteria.

One premise of this article is that theories of adult learning should be capable of encompassing all learning in all contexts. This should be both within the classroom as outside it, and in an informal as well as a formal educational context. More particularly that they should be applicable to all learners, be they students or staff. Hodkinson also describes researchers as a community of learners (Hodkinson, 2004, p. 12). This presumes that the process of learning is essentially the same, although the context will influence the efficiency, focus and quality (Sadler, 1989).
Background to topic of investigation

Formative assessment and feedback theory

The work of Sadler (1989) and that of Wiliam and Black (1996) illustrate admirably some recent developments in theoretical issues of formative assessment. To summarise Sadler’s definition (1989, p. 120), formative assessment, to be effective, requires the active engagement and participation of the learner with the feedback, rather than merely and primarily with the mark or grade awarded. In addition, the feedback must be incorporated into the learner’s subsequent work (Ramaprasad, 1983). This implies a learner actively engaged with the feedback (Wiliam & Black, 1996, pp. 543–544). It is thus through active consideration of pertinent feedback that formative assessment promotes the expediency and the efficiency of learning. Furthermore, the ability to assimilate feedback formatively requires students to possess most of the same types of skills as the tutor and, in addition and more importantly, be able to use them while producing and especially while refining work.

Stated explicitly, therefore, the learner has to a) possess a concept of the standard (or goal, or reference level) being aimed for, b) compare the actual (or current) level of performance with the standard, and c) engage in appropriate action which leads to some closure of the gap. (These) ... are necessary conditions which must be satisfied simultaneously rather than as sequential steps. (Sadler, 1989, p.121; italics in original)

From this definition of formative feedback, it can be argued that ‘learning’ for students involves developing essentially the same assessment skills as for the tutors, that is, all of Sadler’s three skills, whereas the third is not a requisite for tutors when they are assessing student work (see Taras, 2001 for further discussion of this argument).

Rationale for the study

This section looks at formative assessment and feedback theory, and anomalies between expectations for staff and students. Sadler’s definition of feedback is a useful vantage point from which to compare the differences in assessment practices considered acceptable to the main groups of protagonists in HE. In the socio-educational context, publishing articles can be considered one of many required milestones in an academic career (Hodkinson, 2004). This is important for promotion prospects, and academics have been demoted for not publishing within time limits (I know one personally). There are equivalent career implications for students obtaining a degree and a good classification.

When producing articles, university academics normally ask colleagues for comments at the draft stage from which they take feedback. The aspects of feedback that are considered pertinent for improvement would subsequently be taken into account in the drafting of the final version. If sent to a journal, the work is further refereed (this time formally, usually by two people). Referees may make suggestions for improvement, or set conditions upon acceptance for publication. In such cases the academic is given the opportunity to revise to the editor’s satisfaction. A final decision by a refereed journal to publish a paper sent by an academic can be considered comparable to academics
carrying out summative assessment on students’ work. Before the work is finally published, it can thus have received and responded to feedback from a number of peer sources. Academics, in their writing, can expect, as a general minimum, to work their way through three iterative cycles involving formative comment before achieving the final outcome on which they will be judged within their profession. This process seems to acknowledge both that academics are learning beings (Burton, 2004), and the value of, if not the necessity for, formative feedback at this level. Without any reference to Sadler, Hodkinson describes learning of researchers in identical terms to those inherent in Sadler’s theory of FA (Hodkinson, 2004, pp. 11–14).

Compared to academics, undergraduates normally operate within a much narrower, and significantly less iterative, framework. Apart from final year dissertations, it is rare for undergraduates to be offered constructive comment before submission of work for assessment. Drafting and redrafting after feedback from the tutor is not normally acceptable for student work, and may even be forbidden, except for dissertations and work at postgraduate level. It could even be argued that the benefit of formative tutor feedback is not normally given to improve work, since there is often little chance of it being used with direct effect.

Why is it that while tutors, who are considered the intellectual cream of academia, are recognised to benefit from expert support and feedback to their work, and undergraduates, who are expected to be on a steep learning curve, are denied expert iterative feedback? One would expect undergraduate work to call for more formative feedback than the work of academics, not less.

\textit{Data showing current assessment practice in one HE institution}

Given the variety of assessment practice in any HE framework, and to ensure that changes in practice have not been superseded unnoticed, data were collected from six UG programmes (letters A to I) across three schools or faculties, which comprised 166 modules (or courses) and 426 different assessments. Modules are usually 15-week courses that are accredited towards an UG degree. The relationship between subjects, e.g. subject A, and the modules (16) is that this subject offers 16 courses in that subject area. These can be used in a specialist degree which is subject related or as ancillary modules to complement related programme subjects. Subject C has a large course base of related modules (67 modules), whereas subject H has relatively few at six modules.

This information was collected from documentation that has been validated within the last four years. In HE in England, no changes to assessment practice may be made without prior approval by boards of studies and quality assurance boards, and usually with support from the external examiners. Therefore, all assessment processes were a reflection of practice at the time of writing this paper.

It is pertinent to provide some background on this university. A polytechnic receiving university status in 1992, it has been at the forefront of development and innovation. Within the past five years it has received the accolade of ‘Best University for Learning and Teaching’ and ‘Best New University for Research’.

The data has been tabulated as follows:
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Data collected from official accredited UG documentation

Analysis and discussion of data

Analysis of Table 1

Table 1 shows, for six anonymised subjects, the number of modules, assessments, types of assessments, the possible repetition of the same assessment type within one module, and the use of peer assessment. Two figures stand out: firstly, the fact that in only one subject is there any repetition of the same assessment type within any one module which would permit the use of an iterative feedback cycle. Therefore, out of 166 modules and 426 different assignments, there are only five modules that permit the use of an iterative feedback cycle.

Secondly, out of 166 modules there are only seven (or 4%) that use peer feedback. None carry out student self-assessment of any type.

One likely reason for the lack of repetition of types of assessment is in part due to the institutional advice given to all academics developing new programmes for approval. This states:

Learning Teaching and Assessment Strategies
Mechanisms for feedback to students on the quality of their work.
Please map the learning and assessment methods across the programme to ensure that students are experiencing a suitable range and that there is not excessive duplication. (from document 2b(i) 2.4.6)

Therefore, the emphasis is, at least in theory, on developing a range of skills through different methods of assessment rather than developing them in depth through repetition.

Analysis of Table 2

In Table 2, perhaps the most surprising result is the predominance of traditional assessment types, such as essays and exams/Time Constrained Tests that make up
Table 2. Assessment number, variety, type and use of peer assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>No. of assessments</th>
<th>Essay type</th>
<th>Exam or TCT</th>
<th>Essay +Exam or TCT</th>
<th>Oral P</th>
<th>K Test</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Port Folio W</th>
<th>MCQ</th>
<th>% of modules with peer assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>53 100%</td>
<td>19 36%</td>
<td>14 26%</td>
<td>33 62%</td>
<td>8 15%</td>
<td>5 9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>171 100%</td>
<td>52 30%</td>
<td>40 23%</td>
<td>92 54%</td>
<td>17 10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>71 100%</td>
<td>33 46%</td>
<td>13 18%</td>
<td>46 65%</td>
<td>23 32%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>67 100%</td>
<td>33 49%</td>
<td>22 33%</td>
<td>55 82%</td>
<td>5 7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>9 100%</td>
<td>4 44%</td>
<td>2 22%</td>
<td>6 66%</td>
<td>2 22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 11%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>55 100%</td>
<td>16 29%</td>
<td>18 33%</td>
<td>34 62%</td>
<td>5 9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
<td>5 9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCT = Time Constrained Test
Oral P = Oral presentation or participation
MCQ = Multiple choice questions
Portfolio W = Portfolio or workbook
K Test = Knowledge Test

Assessment types comprising 4% or less have not been included in the tables. These are: web-based test, book review, website, poster presentation and diaries. Therefore the totals do not add up to 100%.
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between 54% and 82% of all the assessments. Assessment of oral presentations/participation is relatively low per subject area.

A list of other assessment types is as follows: web-based test, book review, website, poster presentation and diaries. These were not tabulated since the frequency of use was always either 4% or below of an assessment type used.

Analysis of Table 3

This table shows more clearly the predominance of traditional assessment formats (62% being essays and exams/TCTs) and the dearth of innovative forms of assessment that are inclusive of students, of which apparently oral presentation and/or participation is one (13%). Involvement of students in assessment (in the form of peer assessment) is very low at 4% of modules.

To sum up, from analysing the data collected on six UG programmes, it would appear that little has changed; this reflects the lack of progress on this front. Out of 166 modules and 426 different assignments, there are only five modules that permit

Table 3. Assessment number, variety, type and use of peer assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of modules</th>
<th>166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of assessments</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of essay types</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Exams + TCTs</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay + Exams/TCTs</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral + Participation</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number + % of modules using peer assessment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCT = Time Constrained Test.

Table 4. All subjects showing number of assignments per module per UG year (NB total modules = 166. 164 modules represented = 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assignments</th>
<th>Year 1 modules</th>
<th>Year 2 modules</th>
<th>Year 3 modules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Two modules negotiated number of assessments with students and therefore these are not included.
the use of an iterative feedback cycle. The first anomaly signalled by Sadler 15 years ago would appear to be still true today at least at this university.

The second is that, out of 166 modules there are only seven (or 4%) that use peer feedback. None carry out student self-assessment of any type. Again, this signals a lack of real progress in including students in the assessment process. Therefore, as already noted, students can only really develop concepts of standards and criteria indirectly through tutor editing of students’ work.

As noted in Table 2, assessment is predominantly through essays and exams, so innovation on types of assessment is also in short supply.

Analysis of Table 4

The average number of assignments per module seems to fall within the expected range of two to three. Less expected is the fact that 7% of modules have only one assessment in a final year module, particularly since the majority of the assessments are not a final-year dissertation. This would have a very negative impact on final degree classifications if students were to have problems with this single assignment.

Points of interest relating to assessment

Subject A as a group was commended at the last Quality Assurance Assessment, a national agency that monitors and compares quality across HE institutions nationally, for providing feedback from exams and placing it on the web for students to access. This feedback was generic and anonymised. (This is both exceptional and innovative: exam feedback is generally not permitted on individual work, but generically it is acceptable.) Also in subject C, in one first-year module and in one second-year module, the assessments are negotiated and decided between the tutors and students.

Why these anomalies exist

These anomalies that exist between the practices and support available to, and used by, staff and students should and could helpfully be resolved, since they contribute to putting into perspective the expectations we have of students and how these can be more realistically brought to fruition. The concept of constructive alignment is relevant to this (Biggs, 1999, pp. 18–24). Biggs’ idea is based on the premise that processes, aims and products should all support each other and fit logically into a coherent interactive framework. While conforming to this, and supporting such a framework, each entity should also have internal logic. This is similar to the advice given by Atkins et al. (1993, p. 69), who suggest that at department level there should be assurance that assessment methods are ‘congruent’ with learning outcomes at both course and programme level.

Similarly, Heywood has said that: ‘Assessment is therefore an integral part of curriculum and instructional design …’ (2000, p. 62). He reminds us that Loacker
Equity in feedback for undergraduates

and her Alverno colleagues pertinently pointed out the etymology of the word ‘assessment’ from the Latin *ad* and *sedere*, meaning sitting beside or together. This meaning was also the one used in the seventeenth century. Therefore, the idea of sitting with students to help them is inherent in the word ‘assessment’ itself and should be part of what we do in the assessment process (Heywood, 2000, p. 32).

Many factors impinge on procedures, not least of which are the historical, sociological, political and institutional factors. Historically, Biggs (1999, p. 146) notes that many discrepancies in assessment practice are in fact a hangover from the days when norm-referencing was dominant and when assessment was primarily used to select the able, potential postgraduates. Although nowadays most assessment is not purely devised as norm-referencing, it is often still used that way, particularly for deciding final degree classifications (Atkins *et al.*, 1993). sociologically, students are but a single piece in a complex puzzle, where learning factors seem to be subsumed and often submerged by the dominant discourse that prioritises ‘benchmarking’ and ‘threshold standards’ in an attempt to restore confidence among the stakeholders (James, 2000, p. 165). This is in line with the political and institutional discourse on both quality for learning and teaching and for research on both sides of the Atlantic (Hodkinson, 2004, p. 17). Whatever the reasons, there appear to be different rules applying to the different protagonists in the arena of student learning.

If there is one rule for the goose and one for the gander, as there appears to be between undergraduates, and staff and postgraduates in this case, then educationally, this is untenable. Biggs’ warning of non-alignment reflecting ‘inconsistencies, unmet expectations, and practices that contradict what we preach’ (1999, p. 25) is as relevant for assessment as a single entity, as it is for learning and teaching as a whole. Having a two-tier system of feedback promotes injustices, especially if one tier promotes learning while the other acts as a covert selection procedure. In addition, this statement is surely also true of the coherence between belief and practice in teaching, and also of the coherence of the relationship between practices affecting students and tutors.

Importantly, without the possibility of revising and resubmitting, the assessment is uniquely summative, and any comments are limited to being explanatory because the possibility of reworking does not exist. Furthermore, as the data so clearly illustrates, not only is formative use of feedback impossible for each assignment, it is also very rarely possible across assignments within any one module. Consequently, it should not surprise tutors that during the course of their undergraduate programmes students do not seem to improve and take on board tutor feedback (Sadler, 1989, p. 138); quite simply, they do not have the possibility of doing so, since the result of the assessment is final and possibilities for the future integration of feedback is not available.

Boud mentions the discrepancy between assessment in HE and that considered the norm in the workplace:

> The process of self-assessment and peer review with cycles of feedback and reworking until a satisfactory piece of work is produced is very different from the process by which we normally assess the work of students in undergraduate courses … The present gap between
standards of behaviour in the two contexts has a potentially debilitating influence on academic and professional practice. (Boud, 1990, p. 106)

This is also true of most administrative contexts, including those in HE. Our assessment processes, as they stand, clearly do not prepare our students for the processes necessary for and available within lifelong learning, or even within postgraduate study for a research degree. James (2000, pp. 151–153) finds that students are often quite clear on what they want and need in matters of feedback because they have prior experience in different contexts which provide a precedent. Fazey (1993, p. 197) points out that students have reported on being less autonomous after their first year at university than before; James (2000) finds that students lose self-confidence during the same period.

**Confronting inconsistency**

These inconsistencies show a lack of equity towards undergraduate students. What does this situation say about us as teachers and the way we view and treat our students? The issue might be seen as one of equality, or rather inequality, but also, it may usefully be considered in terms of parity or equivalence. If postgraduate students (particularly PhD students) are rightly treated in a comparable way to tutors, then it can be assumed that they are seen as potentially equivalent in the ways in which they will learn and develop, as they are accepted into the same academic culture. However, if the converse holds, as seems to be the case with undergraduates, then that situation is less favourable.

Despite the fact that we are dealing with intelligent adults, a large number of whom are mature students, according to current assessment procedures they are not being viewed as equally responsible adult learners. Many issues relate directly to this discussion that cannot be dealt with here, not least issues of power.

**Resolving these anomalies**

Without expecting an overnight overhaul of the university system, there are a number of ways of resolving these anomalies, and these can be integrated into the current system.

The use of iterative feedback in the updating and editing of written (or other) work could very usefully be considered for UGs in a number of contexts. One possibility is to provide a mock assignment that is similar to the assessed assignment. They would receive formative feedback which can then be integrated into the assessed assignment (Taras, 2003, found that students were more than willing to put in the extra work in order to receive feedback, and staff can integrate this extra work with little or no extra time if they work within a framework of minimal feedback, which she suggests).

Another possibility, which could be carried out within current constraints, is to provide students with the opportunity to update and integrate tutor feedback into assignments that do not contribute to the final degree classification. In some universities, like my own, most first-year assignments and some second-year assignment
marks do not contribute to the final degree classification. Allowing low-grade work
and/or failed work to be resubmitted after updating would, in both the short and long
term, be as efficient if not more so as the current system. For example, failed work
often involves a new piece of work being submitted by the student. Since the subject
is changed, this often does not allow students to use the feedback that they are given
on their failed work. Furthermore, if the failed work is an exam, then the students are
unlikely to receive any specific feedback on their work, making the resit exam even
more difficult.

However, allowing updating and resubmission of weak or failed work would permit
direct use of the feedback and would support learning; furthermore, this would serve
to initiate students to the university assessment cultures and counteract the trends
signalled earlier, which would indicate that first-year students lose both confidence
and a degree of autonomy.

Appropriately structured peer and especially, student self-assessment contribute
significantly to resolving the second anomaly, as this represents a willingness to
include students in assessment directly. Self-assessment may take a number of forms.
Boud (1995) is a summation of the extensive work he has done on self-assessment;
his version(s) is (are) a formative exercise that helps students to reflect on the quality
of their work. Taras’ work provides students with more direct access to assessment
(2002) also use ‘Triadic assessment’ for greater transparency and for including
students in assessment practices. All forms of peer and self-assessment should allow
students to develop skills in assessing which are comparable to that of the tutor
(Sadler, 1989). By assessing both their peers and themselves, they acquire the expe-
rience and expertise which allows them to be cognisant with assessment protocols,
understand criteria and so learn to appreciate the standard required of them. Neither
learning nor assessing should be haphazard and ad hoc when it takes place within an
institutional framework.

The dearth of self-assessment is an important indicator of this exclusion of students
from access to a power which for some learners can not only enhance but also trans-
form learning (Boyd & Cowan, 1985; Boud, 1995; Somervell, 1993; Stefani, 1998;
Stokking et al., 2004). Peer assessment, which acknowledges equality between
students but still allows the tutor unchallenged supremacy, is much more frequent
(Hounsell et al., 1996; Falchikov, 1997; Glasner, 1999).

**Conclusion**

Despite considerable changes in the field of Learning and Teaching in HE in the last
15 years, it appears that innovations in assessment have in general been specific and
individualised. These are reflected in the research literature: this has focused both on
improving feedback and formative assessment to students on the one hand and
increasing student access to assessment on the other. Change that begins in the class-
room cannot hope to be a medium- or long-term solution unless it has institutional
support (Atkins, 1993; Dearing, 1997). However, the institutional panorama of
assessment appears to have changed little on issues of feedback and student participation in assessment. Assessment as primarily a selection procedure seems still to be the dominant philosophy. This has been summarised by Boston (the then head of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority) who is quoted as saying when talking of England:

A big thing the country has to sort out is the purpose of education. Is it a ‘winnowing’ device to sort the wheat from the chaff, or is it a process that works towards every young person reaching their maximum potential, for the greater good of the nation? (Boston, 2003)

At present this is a rhetorical question, and until the decision is made at the highest policy level, we shall continue to work inefficiently within the status quo. This both wastes tutor time and effort spent on providing feedback which students do not have the opportunity to use, and also wastes the potential for providing assessment for learning so that students can be helped and encouraged to reach their maximum potential. It also leaves us with the ironic situation where the ‘learners’ in HE are the only ones who cannot use assessment feedback for learning.

There’s still a strong current that to have winners you’ve got to have losers. So for young people to really excel, you’ve got to have perhaps a majority of young people who fail. That’s a confusion that really needs to be sorted out. (Boston, 2003)
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