

Can using technology encourage student's engagement with feedback? Listening to pharmacy students' voice.

S. Amadesi¹, N. M. Brook². ¹School of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacology, University of Reading, Reading, UNITED KINGDOM, ²Centre For Quality Support and Development, University of Reading, Reading, UNITED KINGDOM

Background and Aims. Feedback influences learning and academic performance¹. Increasingly web-based marking tools are employed in assessment practices to ensure provision of timely, clear, consistent, accessible and effective feedback^{1,2}. However, students' engagement with feedback is often disappointing¹ and we noticed that for UG pharmacy student correlates to performance. As students' attitudes and engagement with a course are predictors for academic achievement², promoting students' participation in their own education is paramount. This study aims to evaluate pharmacy students' preferences and views of feedback, with a focus on electronic written (E_w)-feedback. Understanding the factors that motivate pharmacy students to read, understand and act upon feedback will help develop an effective learning environment.

Summary of work and outcomes. A survey was distributed to level 5 UG pharmacy students after releasing results and E_w-feedback (using Turnitin's rubric) for an E-submitted summatively assessed written coursework. 31 students (28%) completed the anonymous questionnaire and also reported their coursework grade. The results (analysed with a five-level Likert scale, with 5=strongly agree/like) suggest that students prefer receiving E_w to written, oral or video feedback. No significant correlation was observed between achievement and views on '*types*', and perception of the '*general purposes*' of feedback. However, appreciation of the individual E_w-feedback received changed significantly in relation to achievement. Students awarded higher marks (≥70-100%) agreed that the E_w-feedback helped '*identifying weaknesses and strengths*' (average score (AS): 4.57) and '*understand assessment criteria and marks received*' (AS: 4.14, 4.00). Students awarded lower marks (≤59%), ranked these aspects lower (AS: 3.30, 3.20, 2.9) and stated that feedback did not boost confidence.

Discussion. This study indicates that level 5 pharmacy students like E_w-feedback and it is perceived as '*supportive tool*' by those achieving higher grades. Students' additional comments suggest that a '*tutor-to-student one-way flow of information*' and limited computer skills may have prevented appreciation of the E_w-feedback³. The use of tutorials/interactive workshops to provide a more interpersonal dimension to feedback and facilitate reflection on/understanding of feedback should be considered^{4,5}.

Conclusion. E_w-feedback alone is insufficient to promote student's experience and learning. Developing tools that promote students' engagement with their feedback should be a priority as this will benefit students that require additional support and encouragement with their learning^{4,5}.

References 1.McCarthy J (2015). *Issues in Educational Research* 25:153-169. 2.Stone A (2014). *The Clinician Teacher* 4:284-289. 3.Link TM and Marz R (2006). *BMC Medical Education* 6:34. 4.Mubuuke AG (2016). *BMC Med Educ.*16:6. 5.Higher Education Academy (2016). https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/the_developing_engagement_with_feedback_to_olkit_defft.pdf