Pilots Completion Report

Document details

Document owner	Jennifer Rose, Jen McBride, Louise Walker
Document author	Jennifer Rose, Jen McBride, Louise Walker
Current version	V1
Issue date	29th August 2025

Version control

Date	Version	Change details

Title of the Pilot	Active Self-Feedback
Pilot ID Number	ID-27

Pilot Completion Report Template

Report Category	Report Requirement
Overall Rating (Fully Delivered, Partially Delivered, Not Delivered)	
Summary	*Project Aims:* 1. Provide workshops and support lecturers to enable them to design classroom interventions to test and explore the practical application of active feedback in their own practice. Fully delivered 2. Create associated resources to assist with implementation of active feedback and collect case studies to share across the university (and beyond). Fully delivered 3. Understand current formative feedback practices for non-standard learners and how this intervention to be targeted to students with different protected characteristics. Partially delivered
Deliverables	*Workshop materials, case studies, RISE training resource, Assessment Toolkit entry*
Relevance	*Has the pilot topic and its activities met the information/experience needs of the intended stakeholder groups? To what extent are the completed pilot outcomes still in line with the needs and priorities of the Flexible Learning Programme?* We have supported colleagues and developed 18 case studies in 15 disciplines across all three faculties. Together with the workshop and RISE resources these provide support for academics across the institution to introduce active self-feedback into their teaching. We are also producing a student guide.
Efficiency	*To what extent did the methods/approaches used in this pilot lead to improvements in efficiency (financial/staffing/resourcing etc)? What other approaches could be considered in light of the pilot - would these be more or less efficient?* Active self-feedback provides an efficient way to increase formative feedback opportunities without a large staff time commitment. The interventions are low cost and can be integrated into existing course units, as shown in our case studies.
Effectiveness	*To what extent did the methods/approaches used in this pilot lead to improvements in effectiveness (learning/outcomes/experience/flexibility etc)? What other approaches could be considered in light of the pilot - would these be more or less effective?* Based on staff survey feedback, the academic participants reported that interventions generally worked well to support students' learning and develop independent learning skills.
Outcome	*To what extent was the pilot able to meet/exceed its objectives? To what extent has the pilot led to improved outcomes or behaviours in the stakeholder groups? Were there any other unintended positive or negative outcomes from the pilot?*

	Pilot Objectives/Outcomes 1. Successfully deliver small group workshops which enable lecturers to apply the theory of inner feedback to their teaching in order to get students to write feedback for themselves. Workshops to be presented between March and July 2024 Met 2. Collate case study examples of good practice and an indication of the reach of the project between July 2024 and February 2025 Met 3. Share findings across the university and beyond between February 2025 and July 2025 Met Dissemination details: • International Assessment in HE Conference, June 2025, mini-keynote (https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.29926454) • CETL-MSOR Conference, September 2025, keynote • Talk at the T-FUN Festival (https://t-fun.co.uk/), September 2025 Additionally Jen McBride ran final year projects with Psychology students to examine the efficacy of different comparators used in active self-feedback.
Sustainability	*To what extent has the pilot identified the potential for its activity to lead to the long-term behaviour/operational change? What would need to happen to make these changes happen?* The case studies span a range of disciplines across all three faculties and have shown that active self-feedback can work successfully for diverse subjects, learning activities and levels of study. There is potential for active self-feedback to be adopted across the university. For this to happen we would require other disciplines to engage. To aid dissemination, the training could be offered through the faculty NAP schemes (it is already part of the FHums NAP). To embed these changes sustainably, the following would be needed: • Institutional endorsement of active feedback as a recommended practice. • Integration into curriculum design guidance. • Ongoing staff development and peer support to maintain momentum. • Monitoring of impact across diverse learner groups to refine and scale the approach.
Financial	*See separate report but use this space for any financial narrative that needs to accompany the report.*

Lessons Identified / Learned	*Please Consider enabler and inhibitors in the following areas:*
	    • *Systems and process*
	    • *Incentives and capacity*
	    • *Policy and strategy*

	- *Student experience* - *Physical Estate* - *Culture* - Systems & Process – Microsoft Co-pilot enabled efficient resource creation, but embedding active feedback into standard workflows needs clearer guidance. - Incentives & Capacity - Staff were enthusiastic, especially with scholarly outputs, but time constraints limited broader engagement. - Policy & Strategy - Strong alignment with FLP and TEF goals, but formal policy support is needed to drive consistent uptake. - Student Experience - Students gained agency and improved outcomes, though some needed more scaffolding early on. - Physical Estate - Not relevant - Culture - The pilot improved collaboration and reflection, but traditional feedback norms remain a barrier in some areas.
Materials or publications	*Please list all the materials/publication against this evaluation report* RISE resource staff guide https://assets.manchester.ac.uk/staffnet/files/itl/active-self-feedback-for-staff/#/ Case studies https://assets.manchester.ac.uk/staffnet/files/itl/active-self-feedback-for-staff/#/lessons/6D1yRuMTFKVBxtU8G8YQIWMIz8PrOdzX Self-feedback resources. National Teaching Repository. Collection. https://doi.org/10.25416/NTR.c.7749929.v1 Nicol, D., and Rose, J. (2025) Promoting learner self-regulation: Is it better to give students exemplars before or after producing work? Journal: Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. Doi: 10.1080/02602938.2025.2534870 **In preparation:** Final year project reports (journal paper) Student guide (in preparation)
Report approval and comments	*To be completed by a delegated person agreed by the workstream governance group.*

Cost Type	Description	Costs and Total
Staff	*Insert staff name and grade, post, FTE in the quarter in this quarter and the post.*	*Please add the cost of each post and the total claim for staff, this can then be added to the retrospective costs in the forecast form.*
Non-Staff	*Please add in any actuals (received and receipted paid in the quarter).* *Non staff can include any other approved cost category including:* • *Goods* • *Services (inc. Consultancy)* • *Travel* • *Fees*	*Please add the cost of each post and the total claim for staff, this can then be added to the actuals in the forecast sheet.*
Adjustments	*Please add any adjustments from previous quarters. This will be added or subtracted from your quarterly request for payment.* *Please give details of the original cost and the reason for the adjustment.*	*Please give the adjustment amount.*
Final reconciliation	*Please calculate the total costs of the pilot and the total income to ensure the claim has covered all eligible costs.*	
Request for payment	*The payment in the next box should include all staff costs, non-staff costs and adjustments total.* *By submitting this form, you are a confirming that the figures are correct to the best of your knowledge and the correct processes for recruitment procurement and selection have been followed.*	*Please provide:* • *total staff costs* • *total non-staff costs* • *total adjustments* • *final reconciliation* • *Total request for payment*