

We need to question the words we use within the marking criteria// learning outcomes
HOWEVER this may not benefit a capitalistic society - an attack on every single area or
academia - thinking about intrinsic motivations here I don't know if I want to benefit a capitalist
society!

Looking at different ways of marking i.e pass/ fail system can reduce the anxiety around grades
but some students REALLY hate it/ hate not knowing where they fall

Toolkit > Course vision and values

- Bringing in your sense of identity and belonging
- Compassionate pedagogy - feeling like you are part of the institution by encouraging them to bring your identity and experiences into the space

We want to validate learning as a University, but as Davies says, a lot of the terminology we
have adopted doesn't make sense in a creative context.

Limitations of trying to create a curriculum and learning outcomes to fit all students, who have
come through different learning routes.

Its like Toby said "How do you treat the students equally when they aren't equal// have different
privileges"

How can universities answer all the problems students have? Its job is to equip students with a
degree of logic to make them efficient workers within their respective industry.

It's important that lecturers understand that their knowledge and understanding of
society/humanity is not alien to the students, the same issue they experience in the classroom
may mirror the same issues lecturers experience within the work-team/force e.g. racial
sensitivities, economic disparity etc.

Course a Fennella mentioned should be simply put, with wording made more recognisable for
the students

What is the relationship you have with your students? It is usually tutors that are familiar with
your work or students you have worked with who do the marking which means you may have a
different or more nuanced understanding of their development and work BUT still need to mark
it as if you've never seen it before?

How can students show their work in a way that others or new people can understand?

*Davies - "Terminology, such as 'good', 'very good', 'excellent' and often 'outstanding', were, and
still are, used to differentiate levels of competence"* - these terms can seem quite vague, open
to interpretation and hard to define but this can also mean it is flexible to adapt to based on the
students and quality of work produced the it comes to things like standardisations

Sometimes feels like false grading as it has to fit with the framework.

The learning toolkit itself could be much more user-friendly. Separate pdf downloads is not easy
to look at as a whole - why not make it all available online and easier to navigate between
sections?