

Towards Electronic Management Assessment in the Spanish Section¹

Marking and giving written feedback with iPads² and
Annotating Applications on written work

¹ The term electronic management of assessment (EMA) is increasingly being used to describe the way in which technology is used across the assessment lifecycle to support the electronic submission of assignments, as well as marking and feedback. <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/electronic-assessment-management>

² The project started with the title “with iPad and stylus”. The three participants tested some stylus with their iPad and they found that they did not reproduce accurately hand writing. The three participants stopped using the stylus very early in the project. They used their fingers and/or keyboard.

Participants and courses where the project was implemented	p. 3
Background: marking and feedback in the language classroom	p. 3
The project	p. 4
Why iPads?	p. 5
Aims of the project	p. 5
Stages of the project	p. 5
Applications' features and impact in marking/feedback systems of participants	p. 5
Applications' features and impact in returning feedback to students	p. 7
Using iPad and applications:	
• Shared advantages for the three participants	p. 7
• Shared drawbacks for the three participants	p. 8
Number of hours to become familiar with iPad and applications	p. 8
Students	
• Summary of questionnaire results	p. 9
Suggestions: Issues to be considered for EMA in the Spanish section	p. 14
Conclusions and future plans	p. 15
Bibliography	
Annex 1: Analysis of applications	p. 16
Annex 2: Beyond the project	p. 20
• Knowledge transfer to another project at the Language Centre	
• Exam marking	

Participants and courses where the project was implemented

- Mercedes Coca (MC), Spanish Coordinator/2 Degree courses
- Rocío Díaz (RD), Language Teacher / 5 Certificate courses and 1-2-1 tuition
- Lourdes Hernández Martín (LHM), Spanish Project Coordinator / 3 Degree courses and one Certificate course

Background: marking and feedback in the language classroom

A great body of research has been conducted in the last years looking into teacher's written marking and feedback. Those studies suggest that marking and feedback plays a pivotal role in helping language students to improve the quality of their writing.

In formative assessment, the aim of marking and feedback giving is to evaluate students' progress in language learning and (mainly) to encourage students to do substantial revision of the pieces they produce.

To mark written work and give feedback on it, the teacher can make use of a variety of methods including focus on weaknesses versus focus on strength –Table 1-, direct versus indirect correction, coded versus uncoded feedback, and marginal versus end comments –Table 2-.

Depth	Focus on weakness	Focus on strength	Depth
Error identified only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Manos blancgs</i> ▪ <i>???</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Good work</i> ▪ <i>✓</i> 	Strength identified only
Error categorised, but not corrected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Manos blancgs → Agreement</i> ▪ <i>No critical evaluation</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>You use a wide range of language structures</i> ▪ <i>You identified the most relevant key issues</i> 	Strength categorised or described as per marking criteria
Error corrected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Manos blancgs → blancas</i> ▪ <i>...for example you could have mentioned that globalisation has many detractors</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>No digo que quieran... → Good use of the subjunctive</i> ▪ <i>Your comparison to Colombia is particularly sound</i> 	Illustrated with specific example from student's performance
Explanation given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Although it ends in O, 'mano' is a feminine noun.</i> ▪ <i>You need to show that you can look at the facts from different perspectives</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>This connector makes it very clear that a new section is starting here.</i> ▪ <i>This reference would enable any reader to find your original source easily.</i> 	Explanation given
Explicit advice given for future performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Revise section 6.1 of your grammar book</i> ▪ <i>Get into the habit of analysing the question word by word, this will help you ensure that your answer is relevant.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Keep using this approach as it is very effective</i> ▪ <i>You may also find it interesting to look up the following reference...</i> 	Explicit advice given for future performance (not "you could/should have", but "try also...")

Table 1. Analysing assignment feedback from M. Fernandez and C. Furnborough, (2013)

Direct Correct forms are provided above or near the incorrect ones	Indirect Correct forms are not provided, but errors are indicated by codes (VF for Verb Form, T for Tense, etc) and by underlying or circling.
Coded An error is located and marked by T for tense, VF for verb form, etc.	Uncoded An error is indicated or circled for students to think and correct the error on their own.
Marginal comments Correct forms are provided along the margin of the paper or above/near the incorrect forms	End comments Error and weaknesses are put into groups with overall comments provided

Table 2. Criteria suggested by K. Leaph (2011)

At the Spanish section of the Language Centre (LC), the three participants have tested and chosen different methods of marking and feedback (Table 3) students written essays.

RD	<p>Focus on weakness: identification of errors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linguistic errors directly corrected above/next to the incorrect ones • Structural and content errors indicated and corrected (above/next to the incorrect ones), as well as explained in the final comments if necessary <p>Focus on weakness and strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of emoticons (smiley faces) and different colours (red / green) • Marginal comments used to provide specific explanations, examples and advise on specific points • End comments to provide general comments on the text and advice for future performance • A mark will be given together with the end comment
MC	<p>Focus on weakness: identification of errors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linguistic, content and structural errors indirectly corrected above the incorrect ones. Using codes such as Vf for Verb Form, Ort. For orthography, etc. <p>Focus on weakness and strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginal comments used to provide specific explanations, samples and advise on specific points • All students were expected to review the essays and find the right alternatives. Students showing significant issues in the understanding of the topic/point were expected to rewrite the essays back to the teacher for second marking and/or visit the teacher during the office hour to discuss the alternatives. • End comments to provide general comments on the text and advice for future performance. • A mark will be given together with the end comment
LHM	<p>Focus on weakness: identification of errors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linguistic, structural and content errors indirectly corrected above the incorrect ones. Using numbers (1, 2, 3...). Students are provided (in Study Pack, in Moodle, in the form where they need to present their essays) with a guide to understand their meaning. <p>Focus on weakness and strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginal comments used to provide specific explanations and advise on specific points • End comments to provide general comments on the text and advice for future performance • Students are asked to revisit the essays: counting the errors, finding the right answers and then giving essays back to the teacher for second marking. • A mark will be given together with the end comment

Table 3. Marking system of the three participants at the beginning of the project

The project

In the last years, the Spanish section at LSE has been increasingly using the electronic assignments submission tool provided by LSE Moodle. This tool is highly effective as a repository of students' written work and a good help to students to comply with deadlines. However, most of the Spanish tutors printed the documents submitted in Moodle and then marked them as a paper version.

With our project, we wanted to explore the use of technology all through the assessment lifecycle of written work. We wanted to see whether “technology can enable different, new and more immediate methods of assessment, helping to reduce staff workloads whilst improving the quality of assessment and feedback for students”³.

We chose iPads and annotating applications to mark and to give students feedback electronically.

Why iPads?

- Portability of this device
- Staff wishing to retain a degree of parity over traditional marking practice and electronic marking practices (i.e. being able to mark in a cafe, in the train)
- Staff wishing to replicate their existent marking and feedback systems
- Staff wishing to avoid the physical demands of on-screen marking (i.e. back, wrist and neck strain) experienced already by the participants
- Staff wishing to make the marking process more efficient

Aims of the project

- To explore the benefits and drawbacks for teachers (time involved, technology needed, management of the marking process, etc.)
- To explore the benefits and drawbacks for students (time involved to submit documents in PDF or electronically, clarity of marking notes, perceptions vis-a-vis traditional marking, etc.)

Stages of the project

Stage 1:

- 1) The participants chose different applications and they assessed their suitability for their marking systems. October-November 2014
- 2) The participants filled a grid with comments on the different characteristics of the applications, indicating advantages and disadvantages for the different applications. Michaelmas Term
- 3) The participants exposed students to different ways of marking/feedback (traditional and with iPad + application) during Michaelmas Term

Stage 2:

- 4) An evaluation questionnaire was designed to gain feedback from the students. Lent Term

Applications' features and impact in marking/feedback systems

The three participants tested different applications. They were looking for one which could replicate their marking/feedback systems or/and add other useful features such as tags. Six applications were analysed on that base: Notability, i-Annotate, GoodNotes, Turnitin, PDF- Notes, Annotate PDF in Moodle (See Annex 1, Features).

The participants also assessed those applications regarding issues such as storage and compatibility with Moodle to return feedback (See Annex 1, Storage and Return Feedback).

After assessing and evaluating the applications, each of the participants chose the application which they found easier to use.

³ <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/improving-student-assessment>

RD	She has marked mainly with Notability.
MC	She has marked mainly with PDF Notes
LHM	She has marked mainly with iAnnotate

The use of the applications and the shared information among the three participants has had an impact in their marking/feedback systems (changes underlined).

RD	<p>Focus on weakness and strengths: identification of errors and strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linguistic errors directly corrected above/next to the incorrect ones • Structural and content errors indicated and corrected (above/next to the incorrect ones), as well as explained in the final comments if necessary • Using tags⁴ such as “concordancia (género)” for gender agreement or “ortografía” for orthography, etc. instead of providing the corrected version. <p>Focus on weakness and strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of emoticons (smiley faces) and different colours (red / green) • Marginal comments used to provide specific explanations, examples and advise on specific points • Comments within text • End comments to provide general comments on the text and advice for future performance • A mark will be given together with the end comment
MC	<p>Focus on weakness: identification of errors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linguistic, structural and content errors indirectly corrected above the incorrect ones. Using numbers (1, 2, 3...). Students are provided (in Study Pack, in Moodle, in the form where they need to present their essays) with a guide to understand their meaning. <p>Focus on weakness and strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginal comments used to provide specific explanations, samples and advise on specific points • Comments within text • All students are expected to review the essays: counting the errors and finding the right alternatives. Students showing significant issues in the understanding of the topic/point are expected to give the essays back to the teacher for second marking and/or visit the teacher during the office hour to discuss the changes. • End comments to provide general comments on the text and advice for future performance. • A mark will be given together with the end comment

⁴ Thanks to the option “stamps” provided by iAnnotate. However, using text stamps is difficult because the size of the text in the stamp changes depending on the zooming of the screen, regardless of the text size selected for your stamp, or of the text size in the assignment. It is complicated to adapt the size of the stamp. For this reason, after exploring this option RD has not really adopted it and she would like to explore Turnitin, which has a similar feature (bank of comments).

LHM	<p>Focus on weakness: identification of errors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linguistic, structural and content errors indirectly corrected above the incorrect ones. Using numbers (1, 2, 3...). Students are provided (in Study Pack, in Moodle, in the form where they need to present their essays) with a guide to understand their meaning. <p>Focus on weakness and strength</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marginal comments used to provide specific explanations and advise on specific points Comments within text End comments to provide general comments on the text and advice for future performance. The end comments have become more detailed. Students are asked to revisit the essays: counting the errors, finding the right answers and then giving essays back to the teacher for second marking. A mark will be given together with the end comment
------------	---

Applications' features and impact in returning feedback to students

Another feature, tried by RD, was the uploading of a zip folder on Moodle containing all students' feedback files for a specific assignment, which highly increased the speed of the process, avoiding possible problems returning the wrong feedback file to a student.

However, there are still two issues remaining. First, part of this process requires the use of the computer, as it is not possible to create a zip folder on the iPad and second, in order to register the grades in Moodle it is necessary to have an online connection, which might be incompatible while marking offline with the iPad.

Using iPad and applications:

Shared advantages for the three participants

Device	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Portability None or reduced physical strain wrists, arms and back Paperless The security of having the mark pieces backed up on an online system Marking process speed for some participants (RD)
Application	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Possibility to include comments not only in the margins or at the end but within text Encourage creation of rubrics and therefore, reusing common comments Marking offline Different writing tools

Process of marking and feedback	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applications used are suitable and adaptable for participants' marking style 2. Encourage reflection on marking and feedback 3. Improvements in feedback: clarity and more detailed 4. Opportunities to improve student understanding by extracting and analysing data held
---------------------------------	---

Shared drawbacks for the three participants

Device	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity of the device does not allow to keep all students' files 2. Non acceptance of external input 3. Use of cloud needed 4. Cloud security issues 5. One of the three teachers needed a keyboard
Application	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of information on applications tools 2. Time needed to get familiar with application tools 3. Time needed to replicate the marking/feedback systems 4. Time needed to get familiar with storage and return of feedback
Marking and feedback process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase administrative burden. Extra time spent on managing files 2. Chasing up students who do not submit files into the right format (double spaced, PDF) 3. Using personal storage space in the cloud

Average of hours to become familiar with iPad and applications for LHM and MC⁵

- Open iTunes account: 30 minutes
- Get familiar with iPad: 2 hours
- Try more than one application to get familiar with annotating applications and choose the one which suits your marking system: 4 hours
- Getting familiar with application and adapting application to marking system: 10 hours (includes creation of stamps and naming stamps)
- Storing and file management issues: 1 hour
- Returning work issues: 1 hour

Students

At the beginning of the academic year, students from three Degree courses and five Certificate courses were made aware of the project and its aims. They were also told that they would be exposed to marking/feedback on paper and with iPads and applications.

⁵ RD already had an iTunes account and was familiar with the use of iPad.

A questionnaire was designed in Lent term. Students were asked to answer questions on the writing process, submission and feedback return, marking and feedback comments, storage and reviewing essays.

Students were also asked about the marking/feedback system used by the participants. Those answers are not included in this document.

The questionnaire was answered by 81 students.

Summary of questionnaire results

Section 1: Please tell us where you come from...

1. Are you an/a...			
LSE undergraduate student:		63.0%	51
LSE taught masters student:		22.2%	18
LSE research student (Phd/MPhil/MRes):		1.2%	1
LSE staff member (Academic/Teaching/Research):		2.5%	2
LSE staff member (Support/Administrative):		1.2%	1
LSE alumni:		2.5%	2
University of London student:		1.2%	1
University of London staff:		0.0%	0
University of London alumni:		1.2%	1
Other (<i>please specify</i>):		4.9%	4
View All Responses - There are too many responses to display on this page and so all the responses to this question are available on a separate page.			

Section 2: Please tell us which course you are taking with us?

2. Please select your course...

LN122 Spanish Language and Society 2 (Intermediate):		13.6%	11
LN120 Spanish Language and Society 3 (Advanced):		16.0%	13
LN220 Spanish Language and Society 4 (Proficiency):		14.8%	12
LN778 SPANISH: LEVEL ONE (STANDARD):		14.8%	12
LN779 SPANISH: LEVEL ONE (FAST TRACK):		17.3%	14
LN780 SPANISH: LEVEL TWO (STANDARD):		8.6%	7
LN781 SPANISH: LEVEL TWO (FAST TRACK):		8.6%	7
LN805 SPANISH: LEVEL ONE (STANDARD FOR SPEAKERS OF NON-INDO EUROPEAN LANGUAGES):		6.2%	5

4: Marking process

4. Writing process			
4.a. I prefer to write by hand -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		4.9%	4
I disagree:		16.0%	13
I am neutral:		43.2%	35
I agree:		28.4%	23
I totally agree:		7.4%	6
4.b. I prefer to type -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		1.2%	1
I disagree:		7.4%	6
I am neutral:		48.1%	39
I agree:		24.7%	20

I totally agree:		18.5%	15
------------------	---	-------	----

5. Handing essay to teacher

5.a. I prefer to hand in essays in class -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.

I totally disagree:		16.0%	13
I disagree:		32.1%	26
I am neutral:		34.6%	28
I agree:		12.3%	10
I totally agree:		4.9%	4

5.b. I prefer to hand in essays via Moodle -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.

I totally disagree:		0.0%	0
I disagree:		6.2%	5
I am neutral:		17.3%	14
I agree:		43.2%	35
I totally agree:		33.3%	27

6. Returning essays (also consider confidentiality)

6.a. I prefer my essays to be returned in the classroom -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.

I totally disagree:		6.2%	5
I disagree:		14.8%	12
I am neutral:		42.0%	34
I agree:		19.8%	16
I totally agree:		17.3%	14

6.b. I prefer my essays to be returned via Moodle -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is

no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		6.2%	5
I disagree:		11.1%	9
I am neutral:		33.3%	27
I agree:		25.9%	21
I totally agree:		23.5%	19

7. Feedback comments			
7.a. I prefer my feedback comments in hand writing -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		6.2%	5
I disagree:		21.0%	17
I am neutral:		45.7%	37
I agree:		14.8%	12
I totally agree:		12.3%	10
7.b. I prefer my feedback comments typed -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		8.6%	7
I disagree:		2.5%	2
I am neutral:		42.0%	34
I agree:		25.9%	21
I totally agree:		21.0%	17

8. Archiving essays			
8.a. I prefer to archive my essays in hard copies -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		16.0%	13

I disagree:		21.0%	17
I am neutral:		27.2%	22
I agree:		22.2%	18
I totally agree:		13.6%	11
8.b. I prefer to archive my essays digitally -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		1.2%	1
I disagree:		11.1%	9
I am neutral:		30.9%	25
I agree:		28.4%	23
I totally agree:		28.4%	23

9. Reviewing essays			
9.a. If I am asked to review my essays, I do not mind to print them -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		9.9%	8
I disagree:		30.9%	25
I am neutral:		24.7%	20
I agree:		24.7%	20
I totally agree:		9.9%	8
9.b. If I am asked to review my essays, I would prefer to do it without printing them -- Please select the most appropriate option for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.			
I totally disagree:		0.0%	0
I disagree:		13.6%	11
I am neutral:		29.6%	24
I agree:		34.6%	28
I totally agree:		22.2%	18

The test was followed by some focus groups in the taught groups.

Many students did not show any preference.

Some argued in favour of hand written submissions because “exams are hand written”.

Students who emphasised their support for EMA gave the following reasons:

- Moodle submission due to the deadlines and improved clarity about turnaround times for marking
- Confidence of knowing work is backed up
- Many students report that feedback in electronic form is easier to use and therefore more likely they will revisit it at a later date.
- Improved clarity and understanding of feedback (not least as a result of not having to decipher handwriting)

Some students who need to revisit compulsorily their essays asked for a way to do it electronically.

Suggestions: Issues to be considered for EMA in the Spanish section

Storage:

- Concerns with storage space.
- Need for a LSE cloud system to transfer documents safely.
- Or, at least, clear guidelines are needed from LSE on stored data in Dropbox and other cloud systems

Implementing EMA:

- E-marking and e-feedback cannot be suitable for all teachers
- Teachers need time to get familiar with tools and to adapt them to their marking/feedback system
- Time to mark and give feedback can increase notably depending on the marking/feedback system
- Clear communication with students is essential.

LSE e-strategy:

- Where this project sits within a wider LSE strategy on e- issues?

Conclusions and future plans

Despite initial problems to become familiar with the applications and the time needed to adjust the applications to the marking and feedback system, the three teachers who participated in the project are very satisfied with the use of iPad and applications to mark students' work. Moreover, some of the issues presented by some of the applications⁶ and their incompatibility with Moodle have been resolved thanks continuous improvements in both the applications themselves and LSE Moodle.

The three participants would like to continue

- to explore other options of e-marking to enhance students' performance, taking into account the feedback provided in the questionnaires and the focus group
- to improve the methods applied to e-mark and e-feedback written essays (i.e. methods/applications needed to rework essays after teachers' marking, exploring Turnitin as a purpose-built marking tool with relevant features such as a bank of comments, which might be created in collaboration and easily retrieved and copied in the students' assignments)
- to explore the use of iPads in other areas related to the interaction with Moodle feedback tools (i.e. audio/video feedback, PDF marking and quizzes)
- to bring the use of this device to the classrooms (i.e. to provide written feedback for students' oral presentations, to make/annotate suggestions for changes in Study Packs, etc.)
- to improve the integration of the annotating applications in LSE Moodle, including a better organisation of files within folders and avoiding the use of personal online storage

With reference to returning feedback files and recording grades in Moodle⁷, the participants would like to investigate/request the following options:

- 1) creating zip folders using the iPad or replacing this option by a similar one that allows to upload a single folder in order to return feedback to all the students in one go;
- 2) adding grades to the feedback filenames, so they are automatically registered in Moodle.

These would make the marking process even more efficient in terms of time management and would allow the use of the iPad only (avoiding the additional use of computers).

Bibliography

- Cassany, D. (2009) *Reparar la escritura. Didáctica de la corrección de lo escrito*. Barcelona, Biblioteca Aula
- Fernandez, M and Furnborough, C. (2013) "Feedback on feedback: eliciting learners' responses to written feedback through student generated screencasts", Open University. <http://oro.open.ac.uk/40205/>
- Leaph, K (2011). *Using Oral and Written Feedback to Improve Student Writing: An Investigation from Cambodian University Students' Perspectives*. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing

⁶ Please see annex 1 for more detail.

⁷ In connection with the issues explained above, under the section: Applications' features and impact in returning feedback to students.

Annex 1: Applications

Apps		Notability	i-Annotate	GoodNotes	Turnitin	PDF-NOTES	Annotate within Moodle
					Need to be explored more		Need to be explored more
Cost		£1.99	£8	£7	free	free	free
Features	Type of file	Accepts PDF, Word. Not .odt, .jpeg, Pages	Accepts PDF, Word, .odt, .jpeg. Not Pages			pdf	PDF
	Voice comment	Yes	Yes. It works in Windows 8, Mack, i-Pad. Not very much used.	No	Yes	No	No
	Handwriting	Yes, very god quality	Yes	Yes, quite precise because it is possible to open a bid box to write by hand	No	Yes	Yes but very basic
	Hand palm	No palm rejection initially(feature has now been	Good, there is a feature to cover screen when writing	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	No

		updated)	by hand				
	Pen precision	Good, although writing with fingers preferred	Enough for short messages. Otherwise, too trembling, inaccurate	Good for short writing	Not applicable	good	Very poor
	Colour	Different colours, line thickness, highlighting	Yes, different colours, thickness, highlighting	Yes	Different colours for highlighting	Different colours for writing, highlighting, posts or text.	Different colours for writing, highlighting,
	Typing	Yes, but always starts from the left of each line (feature updated: allows to open a text box anywhere on the text)	Yes, there is a text box.	Yes, there is a text box	Very easy and fast for inline comments	Yes via textbox and post it.	Very limited via textbox.
	Notes	Yes	Yes via text box	Yes via text box	Comments (typing)	yes	No
	Stamps/Tags/Rubrics	No	Yes, you can create your own rubrics. Problem: they need to be named and	No	Yes, bank of tags. Can you create yours? Yes	no	Yes but very limited

			they organize alphabetically. You cannot group them into files				
	Grade offline	Yes	Yes, only PDF not Word document. Online is needed to convert word doc into PDF	Yes, when working from Dropbox	Yes	Yes	No
Storage	Dropbox	Possible, but slow sync and takes iPad storage (problem fixed: quick sync, takes little iPad storage)	Possible, quick sync iAnnotate allows to integrate Dropbox in the application	Possible, quick sync	Not sure about storage	Yes	No needed
	Google Drive	Possible				no	
	Other		Zip files You can download all assessment in a zip file into Dropbox. Open				

			in iAnnotate, mark them.				
Returning feedback	Dropbox sync + Moodle	No (request?) ⁸ Problem solved	Yes, quick and easy	I have not tried yet		Yes quite easy	No needed
	E-mail	Fast and easy, but less organized than by Moodle assignment	Fast, easy if online No more than 5 documents at once	Fast, easy if iPad sync with LSE account. online		Yes quite easy	
	Other		Zipped files download into Dropbox and marked can be then zipped in a computer and upload together into Moodle.		Returning feedback via Turnitin/ Moodle assignment ⁹		

⁸ LSE Moodle has an option for uploading files from Dropbox (consequently, it is possible to upload a file from Dropbox in iPad). Unfortunately, this option is not available for uploading a file from the feedback interface: would it be possible to add this feature to Moodle assignments?

⁹ Teachers and students need a Turnitin account, the teacher has to create a class. If Turnitin is integrated with Moodle in the future, returning feedback will be much easier (via Moodle assignment).

ANNEX 2

Our experience fed in other project within the LC

The experience in the iPad and applications project has fed already into another project at the Language Centre “From e-marking to e-feedback: training, applying and evaluating”, coordinated by LHM and Catherine Xiang

This project involved, among others, training in the use of iPads. The knowledge shared in the workshop with the Language Centre staff came from this project.

LHM produced a document on the use of iPads and iAnnotate which is now hosted with other resources in [LN eMarking](#)

Marking exams with iPad and iAnnotate

MC and LHM have marked the exams papers of four Degree courses using iPads and iAnnotate app.

Process

- Exams were scanned, filed in a USB
- Each exam was named with the student candidate number
- Files were sent via email to the LSE emails address of the participant who was acting as first marker.
- The participant downloaded the files into the iPad/iAnnotate

Second marking

- The first marker flattened the documents and send them to the second marker email address at LSE
- We did not use Dropbox because we do not have clear guidelines on how/when to use this storage space.

Comments on iAnnotate

- Some of the tools available with iAnnotate such as the highlighter¹⁰ did not work with the scanned documents. However, the pen, the typing, the comments worked
- Documents had to be flattened
- No more than 5 papers could be sent in each email. Otherwise iAnnotate took a lot of time to deliver the email or it did not deliver it at all.

Evaluation by participants

- Participants are very satisfied with the process. It avoids the risks of losing the marked copies of the exams (original exams are never taken out of LSE premises but we photocopied them to allow making outside LSE).
- Main concern: transfer of documents and storage. It would be better to have a storage space such as Dropbox.

Similarly, RD has marked (as a second marker) the essays and exam papers of the Linguistics module LN270 “Society and Language: Linguistics for Social Scientists”, using Notability.

¹⁰ On the other hand, it works with Notability (provided that the scanned documents have been transformed into a PDF file).