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Freire (1970; Freire, 1997, 1998a) argued that education should awaken our awareness of the world and our place in it. He called this alertness to our environment and who we are conscientização or conscientization as it involves both independent thought and considered interaction with others particularly with respect to issues of social justice (Freire, 1970). Teaching and learning underpin our conscientização. And the essence of teaching and learning is the use of language and literacy to mediate dynamic, uniquely human personal encounters (Freire, 1983, 1998b). This dialogue or considered conversation or ‘dialogism’ (to use Freire’s term) is used as a method or tool to nurture our natural curiosity to interrogate the meaning, or sensibility, or value or beauty or usefulness of what arouses our spontaneous or unguarded curiosity. Refinement of natural curiosity Freire called ‘epistemological curiosity’ (Freire, 1997, 1998a) or what is now called critical inquiry/thinking.

My quest as a teacher in tertiary education has been, and still is, a struggle to find ways of teaching that evoke vigorous dialogue—vibrant written and oral conversation—that sharpens our ‘epistemological curiosity’. In other words a process of ‘conscientization’ or critical inquiry/thinking that enables students and myself to become enthusiastically engaged in the intellectual work of trying to make useful sense of our perceptions, experiences, feelings and actions as we wrestle with concepts, ideas and actions that structure human knowledge.

Thus, for me critical thinking from a Freirean perspective is the dynamic process that occurs when learning is useful in the sense that it promotes understanding and skills that guide our collective and individual actions in the here and now; actions that awaken our unique human consciousness to the diversity, fragility and interdependence of all life. A process that celebrates and interrogates human culture through the creative and performing arts, challenges dogma and superstition with ongoing conversations informed by science, philosophy, literature and traditional wisdom. Critical thinking, I believe, is one of the tools that can facilitate our collective and individual struggle for a humane humanity.
Such idealism is much easier to describe than to practice. Much of schooling today is judged by behavioural objectives that fail to acknowledge let alone assess conscientização or critical thinking. Yet ‘critical thinking’ is enshrined as an aim for senior physical education in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 2007) and seen as an essential aspect of the pedagogy of sport and physical education by academics (Kirk, 2006; Wright, Macdonald, & Burrows, 2004). Epistemological curiosity and its associated conscientização is not a behaviour but an unsettled state of mind, a way of thinking, a consciousness, that cannot be assessed by examinations or achievement standards.

So how do we evaluate the quality of Freirean dialogic education? How do we measure the rigor of our conversations and their effectiveness in enriching our collective and individual humanity? How do we monitor progress in our ability to make sense of the world and the lives we live?

The intent of my on-going project as a teacher educator is to try to find a way of documenting first year and fourth year physical education degree student responses to courses that I teach using my interpretation of Freire’s pedagogy. My goal is to find out if these young people actually ‘think critically’ or use epistemological curiosity to make personal useful sense of concepts and ideas related to the meaning and practice of secondary school physical education? In other words does my teaching approach foster critical inquiry?

Ever since reading Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in 1971 (Freire, 1970) I have struggled with mixed success to implement what I would call a Freirean method of teaching (Ross, 1993). In 1993, after years of experimenting with student peer marking of exams, achievement criteria of various ilks, self-directed project work, discussion and tutorial groups rather than lectures I trialed aspects of Boud’s (1989; 1991) work to structure a fourth year physical education paper around student self-assessment (Ross, 2002). This approach to assessment coupled with a deliberate Socratic teaching format using class, group and web based discussions plus a few formal lectures seemed to work for both students and myself. It did seem to promote considered conversations related to personal meanings about the concepts and practices associated with physical education (Ross, 2002).

However I am still faced with the difficulty of demonstrating the effectiveness of my approach to teaching. Colleagues tend to be suspicious of student self-assessment
particularly as students’ self-assessed grades are often higher than in those obtained from typical norm-referenced exams and assignments. This suspicion is difficult to counter as examinations and assignments dominate assessment in tertiary education so are seen as valid objective measures of learning even though examinations and quizzes tend to assess memory and rote technical competence rather than a critical thinking process. Formal assignments and laboratory reports often rephrase information rather than documenting independent thought. Also student perspective surveys often reflect lecturer popularity based on the superficial management aspects of teaching along with the accessibility of the lecturer’s notes as useable information dumps rather than as measures of the quality or usefulness of the thinking required to construct useful meanings from and for information.

Consequently, I use a combination of direct and indirect approaches to obtain information that perhaps provides a window on the development of the epistemological curiosity and conscientização of students engaged in my courses at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland (formerly Auckland College of Education). The indirect project involved the professional video recording of students reading their self-assessment statements between three and six months after they had presented these statements along with their dossier evidence to justify their course grade. Students then edited these recordings to present what they felt accurately reflected their learning as well as what they did to accomplish the learning for these particular papers. In addition I survey student responses with a work load, difficulty and satisfaction questionnaire, keep notes of informal end-of-year course evaluation discussions as well as student and colleague comments made during the formal self-assessment interviews.

**Self-assessment structure and process**

The self-grading used in these courses is based on the self-assessment schedule devised by Boud (1992) in that I provide students with guides to writing a *self-assessment statement* (Appendix 1) and the compilation of a personal *dossier* (Appendix 2) containing evidence of their own reading, personal or group discussions, engagement with various media and written accounts of relevant experiences and personal independent thinking. The self-assessment statement and dossier guides are discussed in detail at the first lecture. I emphasize throughout the course that they should keep in their dossiers anything that they think could be used
as evidence of the quality and quantity of learning that has occurred for them in response to these courses. At the same time I make it clear that students must grade themselves for this course by writing a self-assessment statement to determine their mark, and that they can only write an accurate self-assessment statement if they have evidence in their dossier. Also I stress that the grade that they determine from writing their self-assessment statement should represent what they have done to make sense of the ideas and information addressed in lectures as well as the personal usefulness and meaningfulness the course.

Students are required to complete a self-assessment statement for each course. This is a formal document with a set submission date. One week after submission of the self-assessment statements each student meets formally with me and uses their dossier to provide evidence that supports their self-assessment statement and grade. The interview is not an examination but an opportunity for students to explain the judgments that they have made about their learning achievements.

A mid-year practice interview with first year students meeting with me in pairs enables students to experience and understand the process, discover the vital role played by the dossier and know that the interview is not a test of their memory or ability to recycle ideas from texts, my lectures or the net. Rather it is an opportunity to show what they have done to engage with the ideas central to these courses.

Central to the interview process is accepting students’ grades. Although I gather information about what reading students access and their discussions on the university intranet as well as their participation in class I do not grade student work. In the interviews I ask questions like “Show me the evidence of work that you have done that supports a B grade.” Or “Why is this evidence indicative of a B rather than a B’ or B’+?” Overall this seems to produce grades that are confirmed by external moderation. However, some students do change their grade during the interview.

---

1 In the eight years that the self-grading has been used in these courses the external moderator has requested the consideration of only one grade and that was to increase the mark.

2 In the first-year course 2008 6 students increased their grade by one level (e.g. B-B’), 1 student increased grade by full grade (B-A), 4 students decreased their grade by one level and 2 by a full grade.
Teaching methods

Teaching in these classes involved a mixture of formal lectures and interactive discussions, group work involving discussing and reviewing readings in class, group presentations on set topics, formal debates, and in pairs making a short iMovie TV advertisement. In addition discussion groups were set up on the University intranet and students were encouraged to collate these in their dossiers.

Crucial to the self-assessment process is the optional learning tasks set during the year. Several short individual or group learning tasks are set during the year. These vary from year to year and course to course but include tasks such as writing short essays, descriptions or definitions on suggested topics, a photo essay to illustrate personal physical education history, commentaries on recommended readings, locating readings in library, reviewing a film or TV programme, and the making of a 30 second TV advertisement. These are clearly prescribed and called learning tasks because they are optional and not formally graded. Students are free to submit these completed tasks by a set date for their group members and me to read and return with comments. Students are encouraged to use these comments to aid their self-assessment.

Documenting critical thinking

Indirect method

Between 1999 and 2001 students from the two-first year bachelor of physical education papers that I teach formally consented to the professional videotaping of them reading their self-assessment statements three months after the completion of these courses. Students were then encouraged to cooperate with me in editing these tapes to provide a public perspective of the learning, thinking and consciousness that they felt developed from the teaching and assessment in the two courses.

Students were also interviewed after the editing process to explain their editing choices. Finally I made notes of the student comments made by the 2002 class during a group discussion round where each student was asked to say what happened for them in terms of their learning in the two first year courses now that they had completed their self-assessment statements. Note this group session was with a cohort of students (2002 class) who did not participate in the video recording.
Direct method

Since 2003 it has been impossible to continue with the video-recording of students reading their self-assessment statements (large classes and limited access to professional recording studio) so I have continued with a simple questionnaire on the workload and difficulty and satisfaction student survey (WANDS) to monitor student perceptions of the first year and fourth year papers (Appendix 3). The survey was administered anonymously after students have received their course grade. Also I have collated notes that I compile during the self-assessment interviews.

Results

Video-recordings

Twenty-eight of the 62 students who formally consented to participate in this project turned up for the professional video-recording of their personal self-assessment statements. I was not present during any of the video recording. Time-coded VHS tapes were produced for collective editing by the students. The collective editing required selection of the recorded readings that the students felt could be shown publicly to demonstrate the ‘consciousness’ or learning that they felt took place in response to these courses.

The editing proved a nightmare. It was impossible to get the groups of students together at any one time to edit the tapes. So I ended up editing each tape and giving them back to the students to independently view along with the original recording. I encouraged each student to suggest how the tape could be further edited to ensure it fairly represented his or her perspectives of the two courses. All but 2 of the 28 students accepted my edited version and gave consent for the recordings to be presented publicly. Both students who did not accept my editing refused to allow their tapes to be shown publicly because they felt that they looked bad on TV and made it clear that they felt the other student recordings expressed their responses to the two-first year papers better than their own recordings.

Twelve of the 28 students talked to me about their reasons for not re-editing the video-recordings. Four of these said that they did not have time and trusted my selection. The other 10 students felt that the tapes did show what they felt was important about the course and that when they tried to edit the tapes they were editing for aesthetic reasons not the content. So they decided not to further edit the
tapes. They also felt that I had edited out all the boring and embarrassing bits. It is worth noting that 6 of the students viewed the tapes together and 4 students viewed them individually. I don’t know how 2 students viewed the tapes.

All but one of the edited video-recordings highlighted the way that the content and discussion aspect of these courses encouraged them to think for themselves. It seems that the questioning of taken-for-granted assumptions and beliefs was a novel experience and influenced their approach to other courses in the faculty. The general theme of the edited video-recordings is that these courses helped them learn to think and to question common concepts and practices of physical educators. The self-assessment statements vary in length, style and presentation format but the following quotes transcribed from these video-recordings echo the sentiments of the edited tapes:

“Yes, but what do you mean?” Simple questions and we spat out simple answers. “Yes, but what do you mean?” We had never been questioned like this before. For most of us questions and answers were shallow places without much real thought, only spoon-feeding without much real thought. This was the beginning of the critical thinking impressed upon us. Part of this process was the understanding of hegemony and hegemonic process. For myself this was the most valuable thing I have learnt from this paper.

…”Yes but what do you mean?” A way of thinking, a way of learning.

…”This has crossed over into other lectures. No longer do I accept information that is given to us at face value and unquestioning. How do I evaluate what I have learned when the process is not black and white? I cannot put this on paper. I do not know where it will lead or how much further there is to go in this journey.  RB 2001

When I began this course I was not confident in questioning that which I haven’t questioned before.

I am beginning to question what I have until now been taught as the truth. It is a big move to make, as it is easier to accept norms and values that surround us. This course has constantly challenge me to make that break through with my thinking. Sometimes this was very hard to do as it is so much easier to accept what we have been influenced into believing...

…”This course has challenged me to be more individual in my thinking; to be able to be more confident in my own ideas and to be able to articulate them and not be afraid of criticism but instead be prepared to justify myself.

…”There has been a definite change in my thinking since I began this course. I now often stop and think just why I acted in a certain way… In questioning myself I am finding that the influences of our surroundings have on us is so great that it actually shapes who we are.  MT 2000
In coming to the conclusion of this course the tasks of reading and writing that we do to confirm our understanding of this topic is useless unless our understanding can be conveyed in conversation. Therefore the most beneficial forms of learning that I have participated in this year were the discussion part of the lectures. Being able to voice and challenge opinions is the only way you really know if you know something.

...What I have ultimately learnt is a new way to think which is by no means perfected or even completely understood but I am now aware of it. AR 2001

I appreciated the way it [the course] was presented to us in an unstructured way but I would have liked more study to follow after we got to hegemony.

...If it was any other paper I wouldn’t have done any additional study. I would have learnt what we had been told and read what we were told to read. I wouldn’t have been extending my thinking, only learning what is necessary. Since I have been to the library and read about different issues and researched and in doing so developed my own personal opinions it has even tempted me to do my own research. JM 2001

At the end of each self-assessment interview, after student grades have been established I ask each student if they felt that the self-grading process is fair. Of the 236 students who have assessed themselves between 1999 and 2007, 225 said yes the process was fair. Seven students qualified this by saying that they felt that one or two students, not them, might have conned me into accepting higher grade than they deserved. Four students were not sure that the process was fair and felt that the interview process was coloured by my feelings about individual students. Interestingly these three students were students who, in my view, could not provide evidence for the high A grade they gave themselves. Although these findings are likely to be biased because students were questioned at the end of their self-assessment interview the workload and satisfaction surveys consistently rate the assessment as fair.

After the self-assessment interview process had been completed for the 2002 class I coordinated a discussion session with 19 of the 24 students. I began the session by having a discussion round where each person was asked to comment on the culture of the 2002 class based on the meanings for culture that they had come to understand during the year. And then they were asked to summarize what had happened for them as a result of the Socio-cultural and Professional Teacher classes in 2002. I did not tape record this session but took notes with the class permission.

The students were overwhelmingly positive. They were articulate about how much they had learned; how much they had changed the way they think about the world; recognized that they can think for themselves and question what they have taken-
for-granted. They love the richness of ‘hegemony’ as a concept. They also pointed out that they felt that they had become too questioning so that they developed a tendency to become totally cynical and believe in nothing. It was interesting in the discussion to hear how they were aware that this nihilism is part of the process of ‘waking up’ realizing that everything is not simple and straightforward, that there are shades of gray and that each person has to work out for themselves what is important.

Another strong thread in the discussion round was the difficulty is coming to terms with ‘facts’ and when to question or know how those ‘facts’ have been established. They sense that as far as my teaching of physiology is concerned that I did not give them enough facts to begin the process of questioning for understanding.

It became obvious that the writing of the self-assessment statement has been crucial in informing the comments they made. Many students said such things as:

The first term seemed like a total waste of time. But when I looked back at my few notes and the stuff in my dossier (even though it wasn’t much) I realized how much I had thought about and talked to my friends and family about.

RS 2002

Nothing happened or rather we didn’t have any formal lectures just talked about stupid stuff in the first term. You pissed me off heaps, Bruce, because you let us give our opinions and then kept asking us ‘why do you think that?’ I wanted to learn stuff not argue. So when I came to write my SAS I thought I would have nothing to say but hey I’ve changed. I now like the way you teach.

JL 2002

I was frustrated by all the arguments and strong opinions of other students. I wanted you to tell us what we had to know. I always thought that people who argue about this stuff were just wankers. But now I find that I am having interesting talks with my flat mates. My SAS really made me realize how much I have changed this year.

AJ 2002

I came from an all boys’ school and was used to hearing the opinions of teachers. I loved this class because I came to realize that everyone is entitled to my opinion! I’ve got great stuff in my dossier and hey man I love that word hegemony.

DT 2002

Work load & difficulty & satisfaction survey

Figure 1 presents the results of the workload and difficulty and satisfaction survey of 42 students who completed the first semester first year paper in 2007. It follows the pattern of the results obtained for both first year and fourth year courses since 2002. Median ratings of teaching effectiveness, fairness of self-grading and satisfaction
with the course have consistently rated 4 out of 5 while the median hours of study outside of formal classes has fluctuated between 2 and 3 hours per week.

Median ratings of the difficulty of the course material have ranged between 2 and 4 while the usefulness of the intranet as a study and learning tool has a consistent median rating of 3 out of 5.

Figure 1
Median Ratings Work Load & Difficulty & Satisfaction
2007 First Year BPE Course (n=42)

Discussion

Overall the indirect evidence from video-recordings and direct evidence from self-assessment interviews, group discussions and student surveys presented in this paper shows that physical education students respond positively to self-grading. These qualitative data generally support my sense that students in these courses begin to develop a form of ‘critical inquiry/thinking’. It is obvious that the students appear to engage with various ideas about physical education as they were keen to argue about them in class in ways that were often noisy and heated. The absence of teacher-graded assessment tasks also seemed to enable students to disagree with me in class without feeling they would be penalized in their marks. It seems that the
comments without grades on the optional learning tasks encouraged the students to write their own opinions and respond positively to my input.

Other educators comment on the effectiveness of self-assessment as a catalyst for ‘critical consciousness’. Thus it seems a pity that self-grading is not commonly used in higher education (Boud, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992; Boud et al., 1999; Dochy, Segers, & Sluijsmans, 1999; Orsmond et al., 2000; Taras, 2002).

An important and liberating aspect of my approach to these courses has been the removal of the burden of grading student work. Without the obligation to grade each essay I am free to comment on student work so that my response can help them make judgments about how well they have done. Thus I concentrate on making constructive critical comments on student work without thinking about whether this student has done this particular task better than another student. As my comments are not grade driven students use my comments to recognize how well they have grasped an idea, made sense of particular information, understood the establishment of ‘facts’ or related ideas or theory to their own lives and/or professional practice. It is noteworthy that both Boud (1990) and Taras (2001) argue that commenting on student work without disclosing grades seems to facilitate effective student learning or ‘critical consciousness’. However I disagree with Taras (2001) in that I do not think teachers should grade student work in the ranking sense when students are responsible for grading themselves. Rather it should be like a critical review of a paper where the reviewers comments are crucial feedback for the judgments that writer makes about their own work (Boud, 1990). Students need quality input to help them make sensible judgments about their own work as Taras (2001) makes clear but that critical feedback, in my view, should not be generated by teacher constructed ranked grades.

Conclusion

Despite presenting evidence that supports my hope that I teach critical inquiry/thinking I am uneasy about concluding that student self-assessment coupled with my teaching approach fosters critical thinking in physical education students. I realize that what I value most about my own thinking and learning has been largely self-directed and that much of my success in formal education at school and university depended upon me finding out what was required to pass the course with a good grade. Only occasionally did my strategies to pass develop what Freire would
call conscientization. Rarely did I think for myself as I constantly referred to and reiterated the thinking of others. Not that this is bad in itself, as I couldn’t discover for myself the Krebs cycle or the Hodgkin and Katz equations for the resting membrane potential. However, after years of teaching undergraduates and graduates I am acutely aware that students today are more skilled than I at finding out what is required to pass a course. So I suspect that students in my courses, to some extent, adopt the rhetoric and strategies that produce good self-assessment statements without thinking for themselves.

My disquiet about the effectiveness of my teaching approach is heightened by my reading Bowers & Apffel-Marglin’s (2005) critique of Freire’s work which suggests to me that student self-assessment is another technique of reifying abstract concepts rather than useful skills and communal wisdom. Perhaps it is just another way of colonizing students to think my thoughts. I don’t know if I can or do, teach critical inquiry/thinking in my physical education courses as most of my students when I visit them on teaching practicum seem to teach uncritically the ingrained myths about exercise and health, sport and character, teamwork and good citizenship (Kirk, 2006). My experience to date makes me wonder what physical education ideas can teacher educators use to prompt critical thinking about the function and purpose of school physical education. Should our abstract notions of ‘critical inquiry/thinking’ be central to the focus of school physical education? Frankly I have my doubts but thinking about meaning for school physical education was not the intent of this paper. What I do worry about is the usefulness, meaning and purpose of university physical education given that university teaching is now largely a secondary chore after research production. However, despite my reservations about the effectiveness of my teaching critical thinking/inquiry and my hesitancy about the role of critical thinking in school physical education I think that my use of student self-assessment has helped me to lecture less, to engage in dialogism with students, and perhaps teach keeping in mind Whitehead’s (1950) idea of a university.

The university imparts information, but it imparts it imaginatively. At least, this is the function which it should perform for society. A university which fails in this respect has no reason for existence. This atmosphere of excitement, arising from imaginative consideration, transforms knowledge. A fact is no longer a bare fact: it is invested with all its possibilities. It is no longer a burden on the memory: it is energising as the poet of our dreams, and as the architect of our purposes. (Whitehead, 1950: 139)

In my own work at universities I have been much struck by the paralysis of thought induced in pupils by the aimless accumulation of precise knowledge, inert and unutilised. It should be the chief aim of a university professor to exhibit himself in his
own true character - that is, as an ignorant man thinking, actively utilising his small share of knowledge. (Whitehead, 1950: 58)
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1

Guidelines for Writing Self-Assessment Statements

**What are the Self-Assessment Statements?**

The Self-Assessment Statement is your formal description of what you have done to meet the requirements for the first semester of EDXX XXX. Your Self-assessment Statement is a formal summary of the learning that YOU think you accomplished during your study for this paper. In other words the Self-assessment Statement provides a formal written outline of what you think you have learned, what you did to understand the content of this paper and how you think your understanding of social and cultural aspects of physical education relate to your ideas about school physical education.

The Self-Assessment Statement also states the grade between A+ to C- that you think accurately reflects your learning for this paper.

**How is the Self-Assessment Statement used?**

Firstly the Self-assessment Statement summarizes your dossier or record of learning in this course and justifies the grade that you think accurately reflects the quality of your work.

Secondly the Self-assessment Statement becomes a formal record of your achievement that is evaluated by staff along with your dossier to determine your final grade (see page 3 and grading criteria on page 4). A copy of your final Self-assessment statement is filed for future reference so please keep a personal copy.

**Hints for writing Self-Assessment Statements**

1. Keep in mind that your Self-assessment Statement is a formal public document. Therefore present it so that someone with an understanding of physical education teaching can understand:
   - What you learned by participating in this course;
   - What you did to understand the concepts, ideas, theories and information that are relevant to this course;
   - What your learning has meant to you as a student teacher in physical education;
   - What you think you still need to learn to function as an effective physical education teacher;
   - The letter grade (A+ - C-) that reflects your learning for this course.
2 You must substantiate all statements about your learning with evidence collated in your Dossier. In other words your Dossier should contain comments and descriptions of what you learned and what you did to learn. Thus you should record and comment on those activities, experiences and ideas that have made you think. For example you could keep a record and comment on any of the following: the set learning tasks that you have completed, the readings that you have thought about, the notes you have taken, the videos that you have watched, the conversations that you have had and any experiences that have contributed to your understanding of the ideas and information linked to this course. The claims that you make about your learning in your Self-assessment Statement must be clearly linked to the evidence in your dossier (see Dossier Guidelines p. 3).

3 The form or appearance of your formal final Self-Assessment Statement is entirely up to you. Most people prefer to write a formal essay type of report but you may prefer to prepare a poster or poem but these must illustrate clearly the points listed above and be clearly linked to your dossier.

**Marking/Evaluation Criteria**

Self-Assessment means that you determine your own grade and support your grade with evidence in your dossier. You are the only person who really knows how much you learned in response to this course or how hard you worked to make sense of the course content. Therefore it is impossible to set evaluation criteria that measure or judge the quality and/or quality of learning that each person accomplishes while completing this particular course. Also the intent of self-assessment is to reflect your actual learning rather than your performance on a test or examination or your ranking in the class. Consequently you need to be clear about the criteria that you use to determine your grade for the course. Typical university grading systems are based on performance criteria that reflect accepted modes of scholarship and reporting. As these may help you reflect about your own grade for this course a general schema is attached but remember you are assessing the quality and quantity of your own learning not your performance compared to other students.
Appendix 2

Dossier Guidelines:

All students are expected to compile a dossier of evidence that is used to compile and support your description of what learning has occurred for you—your Self-assessment Statement.

The dossier is a compilation of the important things that you have done during the year to show your understanding of the concepts that underpin aspects of physical education. The dossier stands alongside your Self-assessment Statement and provides evidence of your competence in engaging with the concepts, ideas and theories that have been discussed in this course. In essence your dossier is your record of your achievement.

The dossier provides evidence to support your sense of the quality of the thinking that you have achieved about the social and cultural construction of health and physical education. By ‘quality of thinking’ we mean that the items chosen for your dossier should show the work that you have done to make sense of the concepts, ideas and information covered in class. The Dossier should also demonstrate how you relate these concepts to your daily experience and your understanding and practice of physical education and health teaching as it relates to New Zealand secondary schooling.

FORMAT OF DOSSIER

The format of your dossier is entirely up to you but it is important to keep a comment on why you have filed each item in your dossier. This way you can link your dossier items to your Self-assessment Statement. One way of doing this is to attach a cover sheet to each item you include in your dossier with a short statement on what the item is and why you have included it in your dossier.

A sample cover sheet is attached for you to copy. It is also helpful to page number each item for ease of reference to your self-assessment statement.

USE OF DOSSIER

You will refer to your dossier when you write your Self-assessment Statement—your explanation of what you have learned and what you want to do to continue your learning. As the dossier provides the evidence of your learning teaching staff appraise your dossier alongside your self-assessment statement to determine the accuracy of your grading assessment. When our assessment differs from your assessment teaching staff will independently reassess your work to determine the final grade and have both your grade and the staff grade independently monitored.

DOSSIER SUMMARY

The Dossier is a compilation of your achievements and activities that show what you have learned and how you have achieved this learning about the socio-cultural foundations of physical education.
The Dossier is a complete record and commentary of your learning that supports your Self-assessment Statement.

You have a free choice of what to include in your dossier and your dossier should accumulate evidence throughout the semester.

A dossier could have such items as the following: A list of books read, videos watched, articles reviewed, definitions, written statements, images that impress, or express, poems, songs, drawings, lecture notes, copies of annotated readings, stories, essays, summaries of events/ideas, descriptions of activities, lesson plans, teaching resources, records of conversations. But remember you must be able to justify or explain the function of each item in your dossier so include a comment with each item. The dossier is primarily to provide you with the evidence to outline the quality and quantity of what you have learned in this course in your Self-assessment Statement.

**NOTE:** YOUR DOSSIER is a PUBLIC DOCUMENT. A copy of all or part of your dossier along with your Self-assessment Statement will be kept for moderation by other staff.

So make sure that your dossier contains evidence to support the case you make for your final grade.

Your dossier will be returned to you after the final assessment and course moderation.

*If you have collected information that is private then keep it in a file labeled FOR MY EYES ONLY so that it is not included in your submitted dossier.*
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Appendix 3
WORK LOAD & DIFFICULTY & SATISFACTION Student Survey (WANDS)
Please complete the following survey to provide feedback about EDUC 142
A five point scale is used on this survey—1 the lowest rating and 5 the highest rating.
Circle the number that best reflects your response to each question.
Please write any comments you have about each question on the back of this sheet.

1. How much independent work did you do for this course?
1  2  3  4  5
1 hr/week or less  Approx 2 hr/wk  Approx 3 hr/wk  Approx 4 hr/w Approx 5 hr/wk

2. How difficult was the content of this course?
1  2  3  4  5
Easy  Very difficult

3. How effective for you was the teaching approach used in this course?
1  2  3  4  5
Not effective  Very effective

4. How useful was CECIL for this course?
1  2  3  4  5
Not Useful  Very Useful

5. How important was this course for your personal professional development as a physical educator?
1  2  3  4  5
Not Important  Essential

6. How relevant was this course for your general education?
1  2  3  4  5
Not Relevant  Extremely Relevant

7. How fair was the student self-assessment used in this course?
1  2  3  4  5
Unfair  Totally fair

8. Overall, how satisfied were you with this course?
1  2  3  4  5
Not Satisfied  Fully satisfied

This document was added to the Education-line database on 3 February 2009