Corrigendum: Transparency Isn't Spoon-Feeding: How a Transformative Approach to the Use of Explicit Assessment Criteria Can Support Student Self-Regulation

Kieran Balloo [1]*, Carol Evans [2], Annie Hughes [3], Xiaotong Zhu [2] and Naomi Winstone [1]

[1] *Department of Higher Education, University of Surrey, Guildford, United Kingdom,* [2] *Southampton Education School, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom,* [3] *Learning and Teaching Enhancement Centre, Directorate for Student Achievement, Kingston University, Kingston upon Thames, United Kingdom*

A Corrigendum on

Transparency Isn't Spoon-Feeding: How a Transformative Approach to the Use of Explicit Assessment Criteria Can Support Student Self-Regulation
by Balloo, K., Evans, C., Hughes, A., Zhu, X., and Winstone, N. (2018). Front. Educ. 3:69. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2018.00069

In the original article, we use the phrase "criteria compliance" without citing Torrance (2007). Citations have now been added to the relevant sections and the updated paragraphs appear below.

ABSTRACT

If little care is taken when establishing clear assessment requirements, there is the potential for spoon-feeding. However, in this conceptual article we argue that transparency in assessment is essential to providing equality of opportunity and promoting students' self-regulatory capacity. We begin by showing how a research-informed inclusive pedagogy, the *EAT Framework*, can be used to improve assessment practices to ensure that the purposes, processes, and requirements of assessment are clear and explicit to students. The *EAT Framework* foregrounds how students' and teachers' conceptions of learning (i.e., whether one has a transactional or transformative conception of learning within a specific context) impact assessment practices. In this article, we highlight the importance of being explicit in promoting access to learning, and in referencing the *EAT Framework*, the importance of developing transformative rather than transactional approaches to being explicit. Firstly, we discuss how transparency in the assessment process could lead to "criteria compliance" (Torrance, 2007, p. 282) and learner instrumentalism if a transactional approach to transparency, involving high external regulation, is used. Importantly, we highlight how explicit assessment criteria can hinder learner autonomy if paired with an overreliance on criteria-focused 'coaching' from teachers. We then address how 'being explicit with

assessment' does not constitute spoon-feeding when used to promote understanding of assessment practices, and the application of deeper approaches to learning as an integral component of an inclusive learning environment. We then provide evidence on how explicit assessment criteria allow students to self-assess as part of self-regulation, noting that explicit criteria may be more effective when drawing on a transformative approach to transparency, which acknowledges the importance of transparent and mutual student-teacher communications about assessment requirements. We conclude by providing recommendations to teachers and students about how explicit assessment criteria can be used to improve students' learning. Through an emphasis on transparency of process, clarity of roles, and explication of what constitutes quality within a specific discipline, underpinned by a transformative approach, students and teachers should be better equipped to self-manage their own learning and teaching.

INTRODUCTION, Paragraph 2

If little care is taken when establishing clear assessment requirements, there is the potential for "spoon-feeding," yet the move toward transparency in assessment in higher education has largely been positively received (Carless, 2015), since explicit requirements are likely to facilitate fairness in marking practices by enhancing markers' abilities to be consistent in making accurate judgments of student work (Broadbent et al., 2018) and communicating reasons for a particular judgment (Sadler, 2005). Explicit assessment criteria can support students to consider what they are aiming for and how this can be achieved from the perspective of a marker (Nicol and MacFarlane-Dick, 2006), so their learning outcomes move beyond a purely cognitive product, to the development of metacognition (Frederiksen and

Collins, 1989; Shephard, 2000; Swaffield, 2011) and assessment literacy (Price et al., 2012). In this article, we present a conceptual analysis of the value of explicit assessment criteria; we highlight the potential risk of spoon-feeding in promoting "criteria compliance" (Torrance, 2007, p. 282), and then we present approaches demonstrating that a careful use of transparency through explicit assessment criteria is crucial to promoting equality of opportunity and students' self-regulation.

AT RISK OF SPOON-FEEDING? A TRANSACTIONAL APPROACH TO TRANSPARENCY IN ASSESSMENT PRACTICES, Paragraph 5

In the context of assessment, spoon-feeding may involve explicitly telling students *what* they need to do for an assignment, and *how* to meet the assessment criteria, without leaving it up to them to ascertain this for themselves. Addressing task criteria in the absence of understanding the domain being assessed has been termed by Torrance (2007) as "criteria compliance" (p. 282). Some students may use explicit criteria to focus on exactly what needs to be done to reach a desired level of achievement, rather than actually learning material fully (Panadero and Jonsson, 2013). Students' and teachers' conceptions of learning play a role in this; if teachers simply supply assessment requirements to students in a transactional manner, so they can passively "check boxes," it is unlikely that students will engage with the criteria in a way that will develop their learning and self-regulation.

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the conceptual analysis or conclusions presented in the article in any way.

The original article has been updated.

REFERENCES

Broadbent, J., Panadero, E., and Boud, D. (2018). Implementing summative assessment with a formative flavour: a case study in a large class. *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* 43, 307–322. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2017.1343455

Carless, D. (2015). Exploring learning-oriented assessment processes. *High. Educ.* 69, 963–976. doi: 10.1007/s10734-014-9816-z

Frederiksen, J. R., and Collins, A. (1989). A systems approach to educational testing. *Educ. Res.* 18, 27–32. doi: 10.3102/0013189X018009027

Nicol, D., and MacFarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Stud. High. Educ.* 31, 199–218. doi: 10.1080/03075070600572090

Panadero, E., and Jonsson, A. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: a review. *Educ. Res. Rev.* 9, 129–144. doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.002

Price, M., Rust, C., O'Donovan, B., Handley, K., and Bryant, R. (2012). *Assessment Literacy: The Foundation for Improving Student Learning*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Sadler, D. R. (2005). Interpretations of criteria-based assessment and grading in higher education. *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.* 30, 175–194. doi: 10.1080/0260293042000264262

Shephard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educ. Res.* 29, 4–14. doi: 10.3102/0013189X029007004

Swaffield, S. (2011). Getting to the heart of authentic assessment for learning. *Assess. Educ. Princ. Policy Pract.* 18, 433–449. doi: 10.1080/0969594X.2011.582838

Torrance, H. (2007). Assessment as learning? How the use of explicit learning objectives, assessment criteria and feedback in post-secondary education and training can come to dominate learning. *Assess. Educ. Princ. Policy Pract.* 14, 281–294. doi: 10.1080/09695940701591867