

The IMAP team



Left to right: **Maria Paterok**, Roger Smith award recipient; **Kendra Wells**, project manager and lead research assistant; **Adam Beeby**, secondary research assistant; **Lia Daniels, PhD**, professor and project lead

SUPPORTING STUDENT WELLBEING IN ASSESSMENT

MENTAL HEALTH IN CRISIS

58.1% (almost 3 out of 5) Canadian university students identified academic stress as being difficult to handle.

ASSESSMENT

is one of the largest contributors to poor mental health with **OVER HALF** of students reporting above average to tremendous stress levels.

BASIC PSYCHOLOGICAL NEEDS

For wellbeing to occur, everyone needs three basic psychological needs (BPN) met: autonomy, competence, and relatedness.

BPN + ASSESSMENT

When instructors support BPN in the planning, format, scoring, and feedback stages of assessments, students are likely to experience improved wellbeing.

REFERENCES

Daniels, L., Wells, K. (n.d.) Self-Determination Theory as a Framework for Student Assessment Well-being. Handbook on Equity in Assessment.
Linden, B., Grey, S., Stuart, M. (2018) National Standard for the Psychological Health and Safety of Post-Secondary Students – Phase 2: Scoping Literature Review. Athabasca University. https://www.athabasca.ca/academic-services/documents/psys-wellness-report-cop-standards_students.pdf

Intrinsically Motivating Assessment Practices: Expanding Knowledge on Student Wellbeing Through Assessment



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Major Roger Smith Tasks

1.Literature Search on High-Quality Rubrics

USE Learner Outcomes TO DETERMINE CRITERIA
<input type="checkbox"/> Select the relevant learner outcomes to score
<input type="checkbox"/> Turn each learner outcome into one rubric criterion
<input type="checkbox"/> Place criteria in a logical order
<input type="checkbox"/> Keep criteria separate to avoid double penalties/rewards
<input type="checkbox"/> Avoid over-controlling aspects of the assignment that are not linked to an LO
<input type="checkbox"/> Aim for 4-6 criteria in total
DESCRIBE DIFFERENT LEVELS
<input type="checkbox"/> Determine how many levels of performance exist for a criterion
<input type="checkbox"/> Describe what the quality of performance looks like at each level of the criterion
<input type="checkbox"/> Avoid counting as an indicator of performance e.g., includes 3 examples
<input type="checkbox"/> Keep length of all descriptions about equal
<input type="checkbox"/> Avoid words like not, no, never, always, completely, absolutely
<input type="checkbox"/> Avoid biased language
<input type="checkbox"/> Use an appropriate reading level
<input type="checkbox"/> Proofread
Student Input on the Rubric
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide students with the rubric before they do the assessment
<input type="checkbox"/> Ensure students understand the criteria and performance levels
<input type="checkbox"/> Explain when/how they will get their scores and feedback
<input type="checkbox"/> Make adjustments to the rubric based on student input before scoring begins
Scoring and Feedback
<input type="checkbox"/> Consider scoring by criterion rather than by full assessment.
<input type="checkbox"/> Do not let scores on earlier criteria influence later.
<input type="checkbox"/> If there are multiple scores, look at examples together and calibrate scores.
<input type="checkbox"/> Provide personalized feedback in addition to the rubric criteria they achieved
<input type="checkbox"/> Offer students an opportunity to comment on the assessment

2. Co-authoring a Conference Submission

Students' Emotions in Multiple Choice Exams: An Experimental Study

Objectives or Purposes

In this paper, we used control-value theory (CVT) to examine how experimentally manipulating the degree of quality and autonomy-support in a multiple-choice question (MCQ) exam impacts students' exam performance and three indicators of subjective well-being in assessment: control, value, and emotions.

Theoretical Framework

Assessment in Higher Education

3. Qualitative and Quantitative Data Analysis in JASP

Frequencies for DEDUCTIVE

group	DEDUCTIVE	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1	poorly worded, confusing	8	11.94%	44.44%	44.44%
	right answer, question unclear	5	7.46%	27.78%	72.22%
	all options	4	5.93%	22.22%	94.44%
	poorly worded, confusing	1	1.49%	5.56%	100.00%
	correct, straightforward	0	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	biased important words	0	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	all options	0	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	organization	0	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	task	0	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
	misleading	49	73.33%	7.63%	84.61%
2	poorly worded, confusing	8	9.09%	9.09%	9.09%
	right answer, question unclear	6	6.98%	6.98%	16.07%
	all options	0	0.00%	0.00%	16.07%
	correct, straightforward	4	4.55%	4.55%	20.63%
	biased important words	1	1.14%	1.14%	21.77%
	all options	2	2.27%	2.27%	24.05%
	organization	0	0.00%	0.00%	24.05%
	task	0	0.00%	0.00%	24.05%
	misleading	36	40.91%	40.91%	64.96%
	Total	49	100.00%		
3	poorly worded, confusing	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

ANOVA - quality

	Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
group	3	3.892	2	1.946	3.268	0.039
Residuals		228.039	383	0.595		
Total		231.931	385			

Note: Type III Sum of Squares

Assumption Checks

Test for Equality of Variances (Levene's)

	F	df1	df2	p
quality	1.816	2	383	0.161

Post Hoc Tests

Standard (LSD)

Post Hoc Comparisons - group

	Mean Difference	SE	t	Cohen's d	Phi	
1	2	-0.116	0.096	-1.210	-0.151	0.448
3	3	-0.246	0.096	-2.555	-0.319	0.030
2	3	-0.130	0.096	-1.348	-0.168	0.370

Note: P-value adjusted for comparing a family of 3