

## Assessment Case Study

**Providing asynchronous feedback in a synchronised way, using Screen cast-o-matic video capture and editing software**

**Practitioner:** Christopher Haycock, [aa0401@coventry.ac.uk](mailto:aa0401@coventry.ac.uk) (formerly leader of the modules below– now Associate Head of School, Enterprise and Innovation, School of Psychology, Social and Behavioural Science)

**Modules:** 4005FIS, M04FIM

**Course:** BSc (Hons) Forensic Investigations (FIS) (Level 4) and MSc Fraud Investigation Management (Level 7)



### AN EXAMPLE OF ASSESSMENT THAT IS...

- Authentic
- Inclusive
- Diagnostic
- Promoting assessment *as* learning

### AN EXAMPLE OF FEEDBACK THAT IS...

- Generic
- Provided via audio/video

### OVERVIEW

For over 14 years students on the BSc (Hons) FIS course have been trained in **forensic interview skills** with a final assessment comprising a 30 minute video recorded interview with a role player. More recently a similar mode of assessment was made a part of the MSc course.

For both modules, video assessments are combined with **video facilitated feedback** to ensure comments and observations are linked directly to the behaviour which is being commented on. Providing feedback in this way encourages students to review their performance, and thereby witness the behaviour that is being critiqued. This helps them to **understand the feedback, develop practice** for the future, and recognise behaviours which could have implications in other areas of development.

### AIMS

Assessing practice with interviews is a very immediate “win or lose” situation for students, whereby skilled and accurate feedback is required to help them develop as practitioners. An interview is a relatively stressful task, and in some cases, students exhibit subtle mannerisms which they are unconscious of. By enabling students to witness their interview, and to see the comments superimposed on the screen, their learning is reinforced, and their **development as an interviewer** can continue after the assessment has finished.

It was hoped that students would read their feedback as they considered their video footage, which would help them to **recognise good practice**, and to take on board the methods and suggestions for how further development could be brought about.

### ACTIONS

In previous years, paper based feedback was provided,

designed to be read in conjunction with a review of the video. Providing such feedback was time consuming and often failed to engage the students. In the meantime, student numbers have also increased. Therefore, a more effective means of providing feedback was sought. The lecturer began using **Screen cast-o-matic** in order to synchronise the feedback with the behaviour of note demonstrated in the video recording.

The resulting individual audio files are quite sizable, but it is possible to convert them to MP4 and then save them to CU’s OneDrive before **sharing with the relevant student**. This maintains confidentiality of grades and gives the student access to the file complete with feedback.

### IMPACT AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

Students acknowledged that this is a **realistic assessment** of their skills. Anecdotally, it seems that that not having staff in the room is a good thing for minimising students’ nerves and increasing authenticity.

- “When I did this the first time I was shaking, it was so scary but when I came out it was really good to know I’ve **done it for real.**”
- “I wanted to be a good role player because I know that is really important... I could use the information to make up my own story. **That will help me** when I plan an interview.”



*Image: Samantha Borges, unsplash.com*

### SUSTAINABLE, SCALEBLE OR TRANSFERABLE?

One limiting factor is the **time taken** to review each video and write the feedback. Students were asked to produce a 30 minute video due to the nature of the exercise and the skills required. (*continued on next page*)

## Assessment Case Study

### Providing asynchronous feedback in a synchronised way, using Screen cast-o-matic video capture and editing software (continued)

If the task could be demonstrated in less time, then this method of recording and marking could be applied to **any skills based assessment**.

For both modules, this method is used for a summative assessment, but the provision of detailed feedback lends itself to **formative tasks**. This would be potentially very useful to larger teaching teams, as the videos can be re-played in tutor meetings etc. and tutors will see exactly which behaviour prompted the feedback, if marked by another member of staff.

#### REFLECTIONS ON THE PROCESS

The lecturer comments: "I have learned that providing good quality feedback on skills assessment is a challenging process. Feedback requires a keen eye, mastery of the subject matter and a view on how much to include and what to leave out. Above all else **balance is essential**: one cannot be too critical, all feedback must be just sufficient for that stage of the student's skills development. Too much or too little and the required impact will be lost."

The lecturer continues: "Developing innovative practices takes time, some **trial and error** and constant advice and discussions with various people with the knowledge and skills I do not possess; notably, in this case, learning technologists."



Image: Steve Halama, unsplash.com

#### TOP TIPS

- For this process to work convincingly and authentically, **choosing the correct role players** is critical. Previous students are a favoured choice as they are familiar with the detail of the case used for the interview scenario. For this type of assessment, finding role players who were confident and or skilled enough to "wing it" can be difficult, and poses a potential risk to the authenticity of the assessment.
- While students have tended to be quite nervous before the role play interview, they are given a **briefing** to explain that the role player is not there

to trip them up. In fact, as the "role playing" students have been through the process before, often they help the assessed student out. While this is collegiate, it does pose a slight problem of parity with the other students who do not get such help. Therefore, **clear instructions** to the role players are needed.

- Once the assessment is completed, **students rarely return** to their feedback and from the OneDrive folder. In fact, only around 30% of students access the video file within the following 3-4 months. This is currently one of the areas which the lecturer would like to improve. If students do return to the recording at a later stage, the nature of the video file with the **intrinsic feedback** means they will still get value from it, unlike a written feedback sheet.

#### EXTRACT FROM ASSESSMENT BRIEF

The next page includes an extract from the **assessment brief** and associated criteria.



Image: Jess Bailey, unsplash.com

This assessment is one of two pieces of coursework on the undergraduate course and one of three on the postgraduate course. Coursework 1 (CW1) at both levels (4 and 7) is the preparation of an **interview plan**. This document is designed to encourage students to prepare their thinking and practice for the interview itself. Once marked, it is used in workshops to develop their thinking and practice in order to enhance their performance in the recorded interview.

This process eases the students into the interview process: by the time they are assessed on their interview skills, students have had around 40 – 50 hours of supported interview practice with tutor and peer feedback.

## EXTRACT FROM ASSESSMENT BRIEF

*Providing asynchronous feedback in a synchronised way, using Screen cast-o-matic video capture and editing software*

### 104/4005FIS Investigative Interviewing (Level 4)

#### **Course work (CW) 2 briefing: How to conduct a forensic interview**

The Planning and Preparation that you completed for CW 1 will help you identify all of the potential offences for which you might need to interview. This is dependent on the information that the interviewee gives to you on the day of CW2 and also whether their story is credible, so you must pay strict attention to what your interviewee says to you.

This new information which you gather from the interviewee is called "Live Data" and you must be alert to this and factor this into your questioning strategy as you move through the interview model.

Once you have an idea of the offences for which you intend to interview you can then focus on the specific points to prove for that or those offences. Do not forget that offences are partnered by defences so think about how you will deal with these if they are relevant or raised by the Interviewee.

Understand your statements' strengths and weaknesses and create a mental time line of what happened and fit in the live data where you think relevant. This will potentially change but certainly develop and grow your understanding of what the full story is likely to be. Remember you are unlikely to know the truth, you need to focus on what is demonstrable through evidence. Be aware of alternative interpretations of the facts, you are working with possibilities until you have proof otherwise.

Your assessed interview will be graded on how well you follow the PEACE model, beginning with Engage and Explain, Account and Close.

---

#### **Assessment criteria – abbreviated / Adapted version**

**90–100%** This will be a near or an actually perfect interview. The candidate will be prepared for each of the 4 strategies the interviewee could adopt and uses the PEACE structure and TED and WH questions appropriately. All legal requirements are met and the tone is relaxed and conversational. Good quality probing leading to sensible challenges. A clear strategy is executed around points to prove and S36-38 CJPO Act issues and special warnings. An exemplary interview that would pose no issues under cross examination.

**80–89%** In addition to the criteria for 72 - 78% there is clear evidence of challenges made which were set up through questioning as part of a questioning strategy.

**70–79%** A well-executed interview. In addition to a good use of the model and of the 2nd interviewer this interview will be more personable and less task driven. A good conversational style. Consistent use of TED and WH questions with some probing and at least one challenge made. The interview is effective in gaining a tested account. There may be some areas which have been neglected, and control of the interviewee may not be comprehensive. This will be a competent product for a criminal case.

**60 - 69%** A well-executed interview. Good use made of the model and of the 2nd interviewer. Consistent use of TED and WH questions with some probing and at least one challenge made. The interview is effective in gaining a tested account. There may be some areas which have been neglected, and control of the interviewee may not be comprehensive. This will be a competent product for a criminal case.

**50 to 59%** An clear understanding of the requirements of the PEACE model demonstrated. With good practice in either Engage and Explain or account this work will be suitable to form part of a criminal case file. There may still be errors. Slightly improved questioning but poor probing. Challenge present but possibly weak. A better use of scenario material is made. This category will be a competently executed interview with little if any irrelevant questioning.

**40 to 49%** Basic understanding of the interview process is demonstrated. The PEACE model is discernible from the structure and the correct and timely use of 2nd interviewer. Understanding of interview process, linguistic effect of questions and TED, WH cycle will be poor with little evidence of holistic perspective on the live data and witness statements. Much of the questioning may not be relevant to the facts but correct questioning process used. Overall the basic interview product could be used.

**Below 39%** Failure to gain as complete account as possible under the circumstances of that interview. No probing and no discernible questioning strategy. Little or no evidence of correct questioning styles. Unlawful interview practice in at least two places. Weakness in execution of the model.