**Introduction**

Formative assessment - Generally defined as low-stake assignments designed to test and expand student understanding. “Assessment that is specifically intended to generate feedback on performance to improve and accelerate learning” (Sadler 1998, p.77).

**Teacher**

- Formative Assessment

**Performance**

- Student

**Methods**

**Classroom Analysis**

**Control Group**

- Instructor Hoepner
- 14 Preparatory assignments
- Graded on completion

**Test Group**

- Instructor Hoepner
- 14 Preparatory assignments
- Graded on completion

**Anonymous Survey**

- 117 UWEC Students; all studying Communication Sciences and Disorders
- 16 questions; either multiple choice or short answer
- Questions regarding student perceptions of feedback:
  - Timeliness
  - Value
  - Preferences

**Results**

**Classroom Analysis**

**Interpretation**

- Average word count did not significantly increase with individualized instructor feedback.
- This suggests that individualized instructor feedback does not affect quantitative performance.

**Anonymous Survey**

**Interpretation**

- In response to the question, “How often do you receive individualized feedback?” 38% of students reported receiving feedback half of the time, 27% of students received feedback most of the time, and 30% of students received feedback sometimes.

**Student Perceptions**

97% of students believe there is value in individualized feedback.

“This type of feedback feels personal it inherently drives motivation to grow and produce stronger work it helps promote areas of challenge and strength to a greater degree.”

“It also provides an opportunity for teachers to recommend additional resources or point out information that you may have not understood correctly of initially missed.”

“It makes me feel that the professor/II/TA took the time to give me something to improve on my future assignments.”

Students noted 4 benefits of individualized feedback:
- Improved professor-student relationships
- Improved motivation
- Informed future learning
- Indicated specific strengths and weaknesses with content

**Conclusion**

- Classroom analysis assignments varied in complexity, thus output naturally varied in quantity. Some assignments listed several intricate prompts, while others held fewer questions that demanded less explaining.
- Small population of communication sciences and disorders students is difficult to generalize.
- Researchers were unable to accurately determine if students read given feedback because of technological limitations.
- Terms ‘many’ and ‘minimal’ points were not objectively defined.

**Future Directions**

- Further analyze the data collected from the survey. Researchers may categorize responses by the mentions of improved professor relationships, increased motivation, and informed future work.
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