Bond University

Legal Education Review

Volume 36 Issue 2

2026

Supporting Teachers in a Crowded Curriculum: The Value of Video Self-Reflections on Class Participation

Leah Williams
Faculty of Law and Justice, University of New South Wales, Sydney

Althea Gibson
Faculty of Law and Justice, University of New South Wales, Sydney

Follow this and additional works at: https://ler.scholasticahq.com/



© Copyright the authors.
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivative 4.0 International Licence.

SUPPORTING TEACHERS IN A CROWDED CURRICULUM: THE VALUE OF VIDEO SELF-REFLECTIONS ON CLASS PARTICIPATION

LEAH WILLIAMS* AND ALTHEA GIBSON**

The assessment of class participation (CP) in legal education has long raised concerns about fairness, subjectivity and equity. Despite this, there is limited research into strategies to support teachers in facilitating and assessing CP. This study explored the challenges that teachers experience when evaluating CP and the extent to which formative student video self-reflections on CP could help to address these challenges. Drawing on interviews with nine teachers of two core law courses at the University of New South Wales, the study found that formative video self-reflections on CP were a valuable supplement to the record-keeping strategies employed by teachers, enhancing their confidence in assessing CP. The video self-reflections also provided teachers with insights into students' experiences of the learning environment, enabling them to adopt more informed and effective approaches to facilitating CP and helping to promote inclusivity within increasingly diverse student cohorts. These findings suggest that, in the context of a 'crowded curriculum', video self-reflections can support teachers to manage the multitude of demands associated with facilitating and assessing CP.

I INTRODUCTION

Assessment is a key pressure point for both students and teachers in the 'crowded curriculum', requiring careful consideration of the rationale for, and workload implications of, both formative and summative tasks. Although class participation (CP) is widely used in legal education, its pedagogical value can be undermined by the

* Dr Leah Williams, Faculty of Law and Justice, University of New South Wales
** Dr Althea Gibson, Faculty of Law and Justice, University of New South Wales
The authors thank Ruchira Abeyratna for his research assistance and Associate Professor Chantal Bostock and Dr Emma Buxton-Namisnyk for providing feedback on drafts of this paper. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their feedback on the article.
This study was approved by the University of New South Wales Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number iRECS5693) and was supported by a $2,800 internal Learning and Teaching Grant from the UNSW Faculty of Law and Justice.
No Generative AI tools were knowingly used in preparing for or drafting this article.

'haphazard' or 'hodge podge' way in which it is assessed in practice.[1] While a substantial body of literature has examined the debates surrounding the assessment of CP,[2] there is considerably less research on how teachers can be better supported to facilitate and assess it in practice. Addressing this gap is increasingly important given current concerns about academic workload pressures[3] and their impact on the psychosocial wellbeing of academic staff.[4] It is also timely given that in-class interactions with students are likely to become increasingly prominent in assessment, at least in New South Wales (NSW), following the Legal Profession Admission Board's requirement for 50% of assessment in Priestley 11 courses to be invigilated.[5] Further, teachers may increasingly rely on in-class assessment to respond to concerns about the impact of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools on academic integrity and student learning.[6]

Against this backdrop, this study investigated whether an innovative adaptation of an optional, formative reflective task could support teachers in evaluating CP. In 2024, students who completed one of two core law courses at the University of New South Wales (UNSW) Faculty of Law and Justice were asked to submit a self-reflection on their CP performance in either written or video format. Drawing upon semi-structured interviews with nine teachers who viewed the video

---

1 Yueting Xu and Xuyan Qiu, 'Necessary but Problematic: Chinese University English Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of Assessing Class Participation' (2022) 27(7) *Teaching in Higher Education* 841, 842; Alex Steel, Julian Laurens and Anna Huggins, 'Class Participation as a Learning and Assessment Strategy in Law: Facilitating Students' Engagement, Skills Development and Deep Learning' (2013) 36(1) *University of New South Wales Law Journal* 30.

2 See, eg,: Steel, Laurens and Huggins (n 1); Patricia D Simon, Juming Jiang and Luke K Fryer, 'Assessment of Class Participation in Online and Offline Learning Environments: A Qualitative Investigation of Teachers' Best Practices and Challenges' (2025) 44(5) *Higher Education Research & Development* 1191.

3 Megan Lee et al, 'Occupational Stress in University Academics in Australia and New Zealand' (2022) 44(1) *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 57.

4 Daniel Neser et al, *Australian University Staff 2020-2023 Work, Digital Stress and Wellbeing Survey Overall Report* (Psychosocial Safety Climate Global Observatory, University of South Australia, 2023); John Kenny and Andrew Edward Fluck, 'Life at the Academic Coalface: Validation of a Holistic Academic Workload Estimation Tool' (2023) 86 *Higher Education* 507, 508. See also Natalie Skead and Shane L Rogers, 'Sessional Law Teacher Well-Being: An Empirical Australian Study' in Caroline Strevens and Emma Jones (eds), *Wellbeing and the Legal Academy* (Springer, 2023).

5 This requirement was introduced in 2022: Legal Profession Admission Board (NSW), *Annual Report 2022–2023* (30 October 2023), 5 <https://lpab.nsw.gov.au/documents/annual-reports/Annual-Report-2022-2023.pdf>.

6 Benjamin Luke Moorhouse, Marie Alina Yeo and Yuwei Wan, 'Generative AI Tools and Assessment: Guidelines of the World's Top Ranking Universities' (2023) 5 *Computers and Education* 100; Qi Xia et al, 'A Scoping Review on How Generative Artificial Intelligence Transforms Assessment in Higher Education' (2024) 21(40) *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education* 40; Cari Hyde-Vaamonde and Anat Keller, 'Testing the Frontier: Generative AI in Legal Education and Beyond' (2025) 7(3) *Law, Technology and Humans* 52; Nachman Gutowski and Jeremy W Hurley, 'Forging Ahead or Proceeding with Caution; Developing Policy for Generative Artificial Intelligence in Legal Education' (2025) 63(3) *University of Louisville Law Review* 581.

self-reflections, the study explored teacher perceptions of the value of video self-reflections in addressing the challenges of evaluating CP. In doing so, it contributes to the literature on CP by examining how formative activities may support teachers who are required to make evaluative judgments about CP in a changing and increasingly demanding legal education landscape.

II CHALLENGES IN ASSESSING CLASS PARTICIPATION

Steel et al define assessable CP as 'an active learning technique, based on social learning theory principles, which seeks to promote students' learning and understanding through interactions with their peers'.[7] CP is primarily assessed through oral contributions to classroom discussions,[8] although in online environments it may also involve student engagement with activities such as polls and forum posts.[9] The assessment of CP is typically less concerned with students' mastery of content than other assessment tasks, instead placing greater emphasis on students' development of critical thinking skills, reflexivity, and awareness of their contribution to the collective learning environment.[10] In legal education, CP also assists students to develop essential lawyering skills, such as the ability to 'identify and articulate legal issues'[11] and to 'communicate in ways that are effective, appropriate and persuasive for legal and non-legal audiences'.[12]

The summative assessment of CP sits in tension with its formative objectives and pedagogy, requiring teachers to quantify a student's participation against set marking criteria. While some students derive motivation from summative assessment, it may present practical challenges for teachers.[13] Factors that may contribute to difficulties in assessing CP include inconsistencies in approaches to the evaluation of student contributions to discussions across courses; the absence of tangible artefacts demonstrating the quality and quantity of students'

---

7 Steel, Laurens and Huggins (n 1) 32.

8 Ibid 35.

9 Simon, Jiang and Fryer (n 2) 1194.

10 Steel, Laurens and Huggins (n 1) 30–33, 35–37.

11 Sally Kift, Mark Israel and Rachael Field, 'Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project: Bachelor of Laws Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Statement December 2010' (Report, Australian Learning and Teaching Council, 11 February 2011), Threshold Learning Outcome 3; See also JD TLO Sub-Committee of the Law Associate Deans' Network, *Juris Doctor Threshold Learning Outcomes* (2012), 4 Threshold Learning Outcome 3.

12 Kift, Israel and Field (n 11) Threshold Learning Outcome 5. See also JD TLO Sub-Committee of the Law Associate Deans' Network (n 11) Threshold Learning Outcome 3.

13 Clive Gilson, 'Of Dinosaurs and Sacred Cows: The Grading of Classroom Participation' (1994) 18 *Journal of Management Education* 227, 234; Steel, Laurens and Huggins (n 1) 40–41. On motivation for learning, see Alan Jenkins et al, *Reshaping Teaching in Higher Education: Linking Teaching with Research* (Kogan Page, 2003) 32. On 'shy learners', see Bruce Macfarlane, 'The Performative Turn in the Assessment of Student Learning: A Rights Perspective' (2016) 21(7) *Teaching in Higher Education* 839; Ugur Akpur, 'Does Class Participation Predict Academic Achievement? A Mixed-Method Study' (2021) 4(2) *English Language Teaching Educational Journal* 148.

oral contributions to classroom discussions; the need to implement reasonable adjustments to support students with equity needs; and the lack of clarity around the weight, if any, to be attributed to factors such as class attendance, active listening, and participation in small group activities.[14] These challenges may be compounded by the limited time that educators have to grade student assessments and growing class sizes,[15] as well as concerns that the assessment of CP is subjective, inequitable, and, more recently, that it is vulnerable to inappropriate student use of generative AI to formulate in-class contributions.[16]

A *Subjectivity and Fairness*

An enduring criticism of the assessment of CP is that it is vulnerable to undue subjectivity, particularly where there is 'no common standard for interpreting students' behaviour and responses'.[17] Further, the emphasis on oral participation means that there are often few, if any, artefacts of student performance.[18] Consequently, the assessment of CP relies heavily on the in-person observations of teachers.[19] While some teachers may take notes or develop a personal shorthand system to record the quantity and/or quality of students' participation,[20] the keeping of contemporaneous records can detract from the teacher's ability to be attentive and effective in the classroom.[21] For this reason, some teachers may rely on 'memory and feelings'[22] when allocating CP marks,[23] an approach that elevates the actual or perceived risk that

---

14 See, eg, Xu and Qiu (n 1).

15 Senate Education and Employment Legislation Committee, Parliament of Australia, *Inquiry into the Quality of Governance at Australian Higher Education Providers* (Final Report, December 2025) ch 5.

16 Steel, Laurens and Huggins (n 1) 31. See also Jeffrey A Mello, 'The Good, the Bad and the Controversial: The Practicalities and Pitfalls of the Grading of Class Participation' (2010) 14(1) *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal* 77, 78–80; Gilson (n 13); Javier Marquez et al, 'Class Participation and Feedback as Enablers of Student Academic Performance' (2023) 13(2) *SAGE Open*; Merilyn Armstrong and David Boud, 'Assessing Participation in Discussion: An Exploration of the Issues' (1983) 8(1) *Studies in Higher Education* 33; Patricia D Simon, Luke K Fryer and Kaori Nakao, 'Assessing Class Participation in Physical and Virtual Spaces: Current Approaches and Issues' (2024) 8 *Frontiers in Education* 1.

17 Quan Sheng Goh et al, 'Students' and Instructors' Perception on Graded Class Participation: A Multidisciplinary Perspective within a Comprehensive Research University' (2025) 12(1) *Cogent Education* 1.

18 For examples of how online contributions are considered in assessing CP, see MacFarlane (n 13) 840.

19 Lucy Cheser Jacobs and Clinton I Chase, *Developing and Using Tests Effectively: A Guide for Faculty* (Jossey-Bass Inc, 1992) 195.

20 Ibid; Simon, Fryer and Nakao (n 16); Xu and Qiu (n 1) 846-849.

21 Stewart L Arnold, 'Replacing "The Holy Grail": Use Peer Assessment Instead of Class Participation Grades' (2021) 19(3) *The International Journal of Management Education*, 2.

22 Simon, Jiang and Fryer (n 2) 1199.

23 Xu and Qiu (n 1) 850; James E Heyman and John J Sailors, 'Peer Assessment of Class Participation: Applying Peer Nomination to Overcome Rating Inflation' (2011) 36(5) *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 605, 606. See also John C Bean and Dean Peterson, 'Grading Class Participation', (1998) 74(1) *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 33.

teachers may reward students for their communication style or the quantity rather than the quality of their contributions. Further, this approach to evaluating CP may reinforce students' apprehensions that the marking process lacks rigour and integrity.[24] Concerns about subjectivity and fairness in assessing CP are exacerbated by the fact that, in the absence of documentary or other evidence of student contributions, there is limited capacity for moderation and review by other markers.

B *Inequity and Exclusion*

Another criticism of assessable CP is that the reliance on oral contributions and other forms of active engagement in class can lead to the inequitable assessment of students from diverse cultural, linguistic, or socioeconomic backgrounds, as well as students living with mental health conditions or students with disability. This concern is particularly pertinent in legal education due to the increasing diversity of Australian law student cohorts and the well-documented prevalence among law students of anxiety and depression.[25] Considering the risk that teachers may consciously or unconsciously assess CP on the quantity as opposed to the quality of student contributions, students who encounter structural, cultural, physical or other barriers to participation may be unfairly disadvantaged. Historically, law schools have been slow to address barriers faced by diverse student cohorts as teachers have lacked the knowledge, time, resources and support to develop and implement inclusive teaching practices.[26] Despite the greater focus on inclusive pedagogies and increased resourcing in this area, Noakes and Renshaw argue that 'non-traditional' or 'new' student groups continue to be framed in terms of their perceived deficits.[27] This deficit framing prioritises exposing these students to the hidden curriculum or implicit academic codes with a view to 'assimilating at law school', instead of recognising the value of the diverse knowledges and experiences of all students to legal education.[28]

For students from diverse backgrounds, the way in which a teacher interacts with individuals or the class as a whole can have a material effect on their learning experience, academic performance and the extent to which they feel empowered to participate in classroom

---

[24] See, for example, Arnold (n 21) 2; Xu and Qiu (n 1) 847–8; Heyman and Sailors (n 23) 606.

[25] Steel, Laurens and Huggins (n 1) 50; Natalie Silver and Penelope Crossley, 'Using Inclusive Socratic Method to Remove Barriers to Diverse Student Engagement in Law School Classrooms' (2024) 34(2) *Legal Education Review* 57, 58; Mark Israel et al, 'Fostering "Quiet Inclusion": Interaction and Diversity in the Australian Law Classroom' (2017) 66(2) *Journal of Legal Education* 333, 336–7.

[26] Israel et al (n 25) 341–2.

[27] Sandra Noakes and Katherine Renshaw, 'Centring New Students' 'Non-Traditional' Strengths: A Challenge for Legal Education' (2025) 35(1) *Legal Education Review* 139.

[28] Ibid 142.

discussions.[29] Teachers may develop conscious or unconscious biases about the commitment and engagement of students whose participation is directly or indirectly impeded.[30] For example, students with mental health conditions and disabilities have reported that teachers assume that they are lazy or underestimate their academic capacity due to the limitations on their ability to participate in class.[31] These challenges are especially pronounced where the condition or disability affecting the student's participation is invisible.[32] Students may be reluctant to attempt to counter these assumptions by seeking reasonable adjustments to support them in CP due to concerns about being dismissed, met with scepticism, or pressured to disclose their disability or condition to their teachers.[33] The inconsistent levels of disability awareness and inclusion practices among teachers may also significantly impact upon the assessment of CP for students with mental health conditions or disabilities, including where teachers engage in avoidance behaviours because they are unsure of how to respectfully and appropriately engage with a student or evaluate their performance.[34]

C *Use of Generative AI by Students*

Previously, the assessment of CP was thought to be resistant to academic integrity concerns, such as plagiarism or the misuse of generative AI, because it requires live, oral performance.[35] Increasingly, however, students are accessing generative AI tools in class to produce responses to discussion questions, which they then present as their own thoughts.[36] Identifying the use of generative AI tools in the context of assessing CP is difficult for teachers and likely to become more difficult as the tools used by students become more

---

29 Silver and Crossley (n 25) 58; Isreal et al (n 25) 345–52; Sarah Moulds and Narelle Perry, 'Belonging in the First-Year Law Classroom: Preliminary Reflections from a South Australian Case Study' (2024) 34(2) *Legal Education Review* 77, 81-83; Sean Darling-Hammond and Kristen Holmquist, 'Creating Wise Classrooms to Empower Diverse Law Students: Lessons in Pedagogy from Transformative Law Professors' (2015) 25 *Berkeley La Raza Law Journal* 1; Palma Strand, 'We Are All on the Journey: Transforming Antagonistic Spaces in Law School Classrooms (2017) 67(1) *Journal of Legal Education* 176.

30 Tanya Osborne, 'Not Lazy, Not Faking: Teaching and Learning Experiences of University Students with Disabilities' (2019) 34(2) *Disability & Society* 228, 242; Israel et al (n 25) 340-344.

31 Osborne (n 30) 239.

32 Ibid 245.

33 Ibid 229–230.

34 Ibid 231; Mario Biggeri, Diego Di Masi and Rosa Bellacicco, 'Disability and Higher Education: Assessing Students' Capabilities in Two Italian Universities Using Structured Focus Group Discussions' (2020) 45(4) *Studies in Higher Education* 909, 910, 920. See also Suzy Prentiss and Dakota Horn, 'Exploring Speech Anxiety' in Stevie M Munz, Tim McKenna-Buchanan and Anna M Wright (eds), *The Routledge Handbook of Public Speaking Research and Theory* (Routledge, 2024) 165.

35 Steel, Laurens and Huggins (n 1) 49; Xu and Qiu (n 1) 843.

36 Chung Kwan Lo, 'What is the Impact of ChatGPT on Education? A Rapid Review of the Literature' (2023) 13(4) *Education Sciences* 410.

sophisticated.[37] If teachers suspect the use of generative AI, they may employ strategies such as mandating device-free segments in classes, probing students' answers with follow-up questions, or inviting students to directly engage with previous comments or specific content in the readings.[38] Such strategies may not always be practicable, however, and are by no means an absolute safeguard.[39] In these circumstances, teachers may find it difficult to evaluate a student against the marking criteria and to confidently award them an appropriate mark for CP. Relatedly, if teachers do not identify or manage the use of generative AI in CP, inequities may arise between students who have access to and the skills to use generative AI to support their participation and those students who do not.[40]

III INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT: CLASS PARTICIPATION AND SELF-REFLECTIONS

At UNSW Law and Justice, the assessment of CP is inextricably linked to the Faculty's teaching model.[41] This model champions 'interactive' and 'intimate' seminar-style classes, which are designed to promote active participation and develop students' oral communication and critical thinking skills.[42] Evans describes this teaching approach as having the 'hallmarks'[43] of the 'soft Socratic' teaching method. In other words, it promotes a gentler, less interrogative form of engagement between teachers and students where both are positioned as discussants on the set readings.[44] CP is integral to one of the Program Learning Outcomes for both the undergraduate (LLB) and postgraduate (JD) programs and is assessed in most core and elective courses, where it typically accounts for 10-20% of the total course mark.[45] Students and teachers are provided with guidance on the rationale, definition and marking criteria for CP, all of which emphasise the assessment of oral

---

37 Mike Perkins, 'Academic Integrity Considerations of AI Large Language Models in the Post-Pandemic Era: ChatGPT and Beyond' (2023) 20(2) *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice* (Article 7), 12; Gary D Fisk, 'AI or Human? Finding and Responding to Artificial Intelligence in Student Work' [2024] 52(3) *Teaching of Psychology* 314, 314-315; Debby Re Cotton, Peter A Cotton and J Reuben Shipway, 'Chatting and Cheating: Ensuring Academic Integrity in the Era of ChatGPT' (2024) 61(2) *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 228.

38 Perkins (n 37).

39 Ibid.

40 Simon, Fryer and Nakao (n 16).

41 Steel, Laurens and Huggins (n 1) 33-35.

42 University of New South Wales, 'Bachelor of Laws' (Web Page, UNSW Law & Justice) <https://www.unsw.edu.au/law-justice/study/undergraduate/bachelor-laws>.

43 Alex Evans, 'A Learning and Teaching Method for the Online Environment That Delivers: Coupling a Soft Socratic Method with a Humanistic, Nurturing Approach' (2022) 32(1) *Legal Education Review* 33, 55.

44 Ibid 54-55.

45 University of New South Wales, 'Program 4701: Bachelor of Laws' (Web Page) <https://www.handbook.unsw.edu.au/undergraduate/programs/2026/4701?year=2026>; University of New South Wales, 'Juris Doctor (9150)' (Web Page) <https://handbook.unsw.edu.au/postgraduate/programs/2026/9150?year=2026>.

communication skills.[46] While there is some flexibility in how different courses and individual teachers evaluate CP, for example, whether they rely solely on voluntary contributions or nominate students for prepared contributions, standard marking criteria generally apply across each course, and rubrics are commonly used to promote consistency among markers. The marking criteria include evidence of preparation for class; the frequency and quality (as distinct from correctness) of participation; the extent to which contributions demonstrate critical thinking and reflective, responsive and respectful engagement in discourse; and the clarity and articulation of contributions.[47]

Student self-reflections are a common but not universal feature of CP across courses at UNSW Law and Justice. While these reflections are generally optional and are not graded, they serve a number of pedagogical and practical purposes. Self-reflection refers to the process of a student considering and evaluating their own experiences, learning processes or outputs. The benefits of such a process include helping students to develop self-regulatory learning strategies and improve their academic performance.[48] Self-reflections are typically written, although they may also be recorded in an audio or video format. Unlike written self-reflections, audio or video self-reflections include additional verbal and non-verbal communication features, such as tone of voice and body language, and encourage a more conversational tone.[49] While self-reflection can support students to consolidate the learning objectives of CP, meaningful reflection requires students to intentionally engage with a reflection activity rather than viewing it as mere 'busy work'.[50]

In light of the growing body of literature regarding the design, implementation, and implications of assessments to support reflective learning, it is timely to explore the experience of teachers who engage with the formative self-reflections submitted by students. Within the Faculty's seminar-based teaching model, where teachers primarily interact with students in-person and in an oral, conversational manner, video self-reflections represent an extension of the typical mode of teacher-student interaction, thereby enhancing the coherence and authenticity of the self-reflection that students undertake in relation to their CP performance.

---

46 University of New South Wales, 'Common Assessment Types' (Web Page) <https://my.law.unsw.edu.au/common-assessment-types#Class%20Participation>. See also University of New South Wales, 'Succeeding in Class Participation | Law & Justice students' (Web Page, 18 February 2025) <https://www.student.unsw.edu.au/notices/2025/02/succeeding-class-participation-law-students-0>.

47 UNSW, 'Common Assessment Types' (n 46).

48 Ernesto Panadero, Gavin T.L. Brown and Jan-Willem Strijbos, 'The Future of Student Self-Assessment: A Review of Known Unknowns and Potential Directions' (2016) 28(4) *Education Psychology Review* 803, 804.

49 Cecilia KY Chan and Hannah YH Wong, 'Students' Perception of Written, Audio, Video and Face-to-Face Reflective Approaches for Holistic Competency Development' (2023) 24(3) *Active Learning in Higher Education* 239.

50 Alicia S Bouldin, 'Reflection is not Reflexive' (2017) 81(9) *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 1.

IV Design, Aims and Method

This qualitative, exploratory study examined the use of video self-reflections on CP in legal education, focusing on the challenges experienced by teachers in facilitating and assessing CP. The study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What do law teachers perceive to be the key challenges in relation to CP?
2. What value, if any, do law teachers perceive video student self-reflections on CP to have in addressing these challenges?

A *The Self-Reflection Task*

The research was conducted in two core law courses, Course A and Course B, over two sequential terms in 2024. Both courses included JD and LLB students who were in either Stage 1 or Stage 2 of their degree program when they took each course. In both courses, students attended two seminars each week over a ten-week period. Seminars were two hours in duration and were delivered face-to-face, with the exception of one 'hybrid' class for each course, in which one class per week was conducted online and one class each week was conducted in person. Class sizes were capped at 44 for Course A and 56 for Course B.

Both Course A and Course B included CP as a component of the assessment, with both courses also inviting students to submit a formative self-reflection at the conclusion of the term. In both courses, LLB and JD students were taught in separate classes. In terms with larger cohorts of students, the LLB students were asked to submit a 300-word written self-reflection, while JD students were asked to submit a 2-minute self-reflection video. In terms with smaller cohorts, all students were asked to submit a video self-reflection. This variation in the format of the self-reflection task was due to concerns that the previously untested video self-reflection task could impose an increased workload burden on teachers, which would be less manageable with large cohorts. The self-reflection task was not mandatory and was not assessed.

Students who were asked to submit a written self-reflection were instructed to outline how they met or found it challenging to meet the marking criteria for CP. Students undertaking a video self-reflection were given more guidance owing to the novelty of the activity. These students were advised to record a simple, unedited video on their phone or computer with a conversational and reflective tone. The following points were provided as prompts:

- Your preparation for class—what worked well for you? How could you improve?
- Your participation in class—how well did you participate across the term? What were your strengths? Did anything hold you back?

- Your engagement with the content—what did you find easy or challenging? What did you find interesting or not so interesting? Did anything help or hinder your engagement?
- Your understanding of your learning and participation style—what helps you to feel confident to participate? What contributed most to your sense of understanding of course content?

B *Data Collection and Analysis*

At the conclusion of Term 1 and Term 2 in 2024, all teachers who engaged with the video self-reflections in Course A and/or Course B were invited to participate in the study. To mitigate any perceived pressure that casual teaching staff may feel to participate in the study, a professional staff member with no role in the hiring, supervision, or management of casual academics distributed the recruitment email to potential participants and managed responses to it. Nine of the 11 teachers who engaged with video self-reflections agreed to participate in the study. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with individual participants and both authors. The interview questions were informed by the literature on the facilitation and assessment of CP, although participants were provided with significant scope to discuss issues beyond the pre-identified topics. Interviews were conducted between 13 June 2024 and 23 September 2024, either in-person or online, and were between 35 minutes and 50 minutes in duration. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed.

A reflexive thematic analysis approach was adopted for the interpretation of the data, as this provided a flexible way to identify 'patterns of shared meaning' in teachers' accounts of their experiences with video self-reflections.[51] Initial coding was iterative and primarily inductive, guided by the research questions and informed by the authors' professional experience as educators.[52] Initial codes were developed independently, after which the authors discussed and developed themes across participants' accounts.

V LIMITATIONS

The study was conducted within a single higher education institution and, reflecting its exploratory nature, engaged a relatively small sample of legal educators. These factors may constrain the transferability of the findings. Further, while many participants drew on prior experience with written self-reflections when discussing their perceptions of video self- reflections, the study did not involve a direct

---

[51] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke, 'Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing Reflexive Thematic Analysis and Other Pattern-Based Qualitative Analytic Approaches' (2020) 21(1) *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research* 37, 39.

[52] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke, 'One Size Fits All? What Counts as Quality Practice in (Reflexive) Thematic Analysis? (2021) 18(3) *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 328, 341.

comparison between the two formats. Additionally, the more detailed prompts provided to students completing the video self-reflections may have affected the analytical depth or focus of their responses when compared to written self-reflections and should be considered when interpreting participants' perceptions of the video self-reflections. Finally, both authors had previously implemented the video self-reflection task in their teaching and therefore brought prior knowledge and experience of the task to the interpretation of the data.

VI FINDINGS

The findings of this study reflect some of the key challenges identified in the literature about CP, particularly those relating to concerns about subjectivity and equity. The authors identified four themes relating to teachers' perceptions of the challenges of facilitating and assessing CP and their experiences with student video self-reflections on CP. While overlapping, the themes canvas layered and nuanced perceptions about the pedagogical value, practical implications and utility of video self-reflections in relation to CP. These themes related to the complexity of facilitating CP; the potential of video self-reflections to enhance teachers' confidence in facilitating and assessing CP; issues of equity and inclusivity; and pedagogical considerations about timing, feedback and implementation of the self-reflection task.

A *A Complex Interplay: The Challenges of CP for Teaching, Learning and the Student Experience*

A number of participants in the study identified challenges relating to the facilitation of CP, including in relation to the management of classroom and peer dynamics among students. In particular, several participants demonstrated a keen awareness of the competing pressures that teachers face in facilitating discussion on course content while simultaneously promoting opportunities for all students to participate and maintaining effective records of participation. For example, one participant described the 'constant balance' required to provide students with sufficient opportunities to engage in class while also trying to 'get through the content', while another noted it was challenging to enable students to 'verbally and visibly participate' while also 'giving them what they want, which is the content'. Participants also reflected on the practical consequences of creating records of CP on their teaching and the learning environment, with one expressing a desire to be 'engaged in the class rather than writing down names', and another commenting that it was 'hard to take notes on the run, especially if you're walking around. And it does disrupt the class'.

Relatedly, participants noted the difficulties associated with managing student expectations and anxieties regarding CP, both in terms of the assessment of CP and the facilitation of class discussion. Participants reported trying to navigate students' interpretations of what

constituted sufficient participation, as well as concerns about the nature of other students' participation and views about how much of the class should be dedicated to opportunities for participation. For example, one participant commented:

> I also think students sometimes are not sure what to do, even though, like we tell them, that's what we expect. But just a lot of them, just simply don't do the readings. Or they come not prepared and then some students…they always participate, but you can tell … they're general comments and ideas and opinions, and they never actually do the readings…They just have something to say about everything and it's like, well, actually, that's not what this is about. But then they talk a lot in class. So I mean, even from my perspective…they are participating. And from their perspective as well, they are participating …

Interestingly, the pressure of these student anxieties was not felt by another participant, who expressed the view that students should be able to anticipate their CP mark because of the public nature of the assessment:

> …I think people know. Yeah. They, in the end, they know. Maybe even more than in the other assignments. They know when they did well and when they didn't, because class participation is very obvious.

Amid the challenges of balancing the discussion of content, facilitating participation, and assessing CP, participants discussed the benefits of video self-reflections for the broader student experience, both in relation to student learning and their teaching practice. From the outset, several participants commented that self-reflection tasks generally were a beneficial pedagogical tool that encouraged students to move beyond the superficial reflection process prompted by simply receiving a CP mark and to engage more deeply with the marking criteria. One participant made the following comment about how the reflective task achieved this purpose:

> When you're asking them to just sort of, in a sense, justify their participation through the term, I think you get them really thinking about, actually, there's a lot that I could have done to improve my mark.

Similarly, another participant commented that the ability to engage in self-reflection was an important legal skill that should be encouraged:

> I think self-reflection is a skill … and the more you encourage it through the course, I think whatever discipline they choose to go into they're better when they're becoming aware of their weaknesses or their challenges.

The perceived value of the video format in supporting students to engage in genuine reflection was noted by several participants who drew comparisons with previously reviewed written self-reflections. These participants suggested that the video self-reflections appeared to be more authentic than those in written format. As one participant commented:

> I found the reflective video really useful in that regard because rather than it being a 'tick-a-box' exercise … it actually meant that they were able to do some self-reflection in that it was less formulaic and you also were able

> to assess their … facial expressions when they talk about the course to actually pick up whether they were really engaged.

Similarly, another reflected:

> I think I had some really thoughtful video self-reflections … I think some of my students did put more time into thinking through something a little bit more profound than most of my group would normally do. Maybe I just had a really great group this term, but I remember reflecting when I was doing the video self-reflections … oh, so these people really thought about this. Good on them, you know. I think there is something about your face being identified with your words that does change your approach.

Two participants expressed some dissatisfaction with the content of the video self-reflections, highlighting the existence of different teacher perspectives about what constituted a valuable reflection. One participant noted that students tended to provide their views on the course content as opposed to their views on their CP performance, while another referred to extraneous commentary from students in the self-reflections as 'tangents' that were 'not a true reflection of the criteria'. In contrast, other participants viewed the broader reflections on the class as 'kind of nice actually', considering that the general discussion of the course and its themes in some self-reflections 'shows a level of engagement'. One commented that the videos were more 'personable' than written self-reflections, which could be 'really brief', while another noted that students in their video reflections 'really focused on what they would do to improve'. Another participant suggested that the process of speaking aloud on a video for their teacher might assist students who were anxious or shy about participating in class to develop the skills necessary to do so in the future.

Beyond the perceived pedagogical benefits to students, participants observed that the content of the video self-reflections provided useful direct and indirect feedback on their teaching practice. While the purpose of the self-reflections was to encourage students to think deeply about their CP, not to provide feedback to teachers, student reflections about their experiences involved commentary on teaching. For instance, some students commented on teaching styles and methods, the pace of the teacher's delivery of course content, the classroom environment fostered by the teacher, the physical layout of the classroom, and whether teachers had appropriately 'controlled' the 'unruly students'. One participant commented that:

> I found that I was hearing a lot about the students' study methods and their preferred approaches to preparing for class and things that they found hard and challenging that I hadn't known about.

This kind of feedback provided teachers with insights about how students prepared for class and how they learned in class that were otherwise not readily apparent through CP alone.

B *Enhancing Teachers' Confidence*

Participants identified a number of challenges associated with evaluating student CP over the course of the term. In particular, a recurring concern among participants was the need to ensure fairness and accuracy in their marking, with one stating that they aimed for the final CP grades to reflect more than 'literally the time takers' and to ensure that they had accurately 'given each student credit for what they did and didn't say'. For many, however, there were multiple factors that made translating these intentions into practice challenging. For instance, a majority of participants noted that identifying students could be difficult in the context of relatively short terms. Learning the names of students in classes of 44 or 56 was a key pressure point, alongside the challenges identified above regarding the facilitation of discussion in courses with 'crowded' content loads.

A further challenge identified by participants was the quantification of participation when allocating a final grade. In particular, some participants grappled with how to compare the less frequent but higher quality contributions of some students with the more frequent but less insightful contributions of others. Notably, participants discussed the techniques they used to record CP, linking these to their concerns about fairness in the process of marking CP. Techniques included memory alone, tick or dot markings against names on the roll, creating lists of students who spoke in each class, and maintaining spreadsheets that varied in detail from recording attendance and noting the extent of participation to identifying the activities in which students participated with added commentary about their contributions.

For some participants, the strategies used to record CP were directly linked to their awareness of the risk of undue subjectivity involved in grading CP. In particular, some participants identified the value of their strategies for grading students whose participation was more modest. One, for example, noted that record keeping was 'essential' to 'tease out the nuance in the middle of the group', and to keep them 'honest' by providing 'some evidence to back up my vibes about…the middle of the pack'. Another summarised the value of record keeping as follows:

> I come home and I make a record after each class of their engagement so I can then see over the course of the term which students engaged in which classes quite well. And…it also means I can track students that then lifted their game over the course of the term … And obviously the students who participate, you get to know them much better, so I'm very conscious of my own cognitive bias in that line as well.

In addition to easing participants' concerns about fairness, the techniques used to record CP over the term also contributed to a stronger sense of confidence in the marks that were ultimately awarded to students. Participants described their record-keeping strategies as informing an 'instinctive synthesis' or providing a 'sound basis' for 'appropriate' marks.

The records kept by participants assisted them to address a further challenge identified in relation to CP, which was the potential for

differing perceptions between the teacher and student about their performance. Several participants commented that the video student self-reflections about their CP performance tended to accord with their perceptions as educators, with some making comments such as 'I think their perceptions were in line with where they were vaguely sitting' and 'I think most of the time students and I are pretty aligned'. Such alignment was not universal, however, with some participants observing that students often 'did much better than they thought they did', while others observed that they had students who hadn't spoken at all who claimed to have performed at a high level against the marking criteria. Critically, where the participant and student differed in their perception of the student's CP, the participant's records supported their perception.

While the video self-reflections were a formative task that was not considered in allocating a CP mark to students, the broad consensus was that they helped to improve participants' confidence in the marks they allocated, especially for students 'in the middle' of the range of marks. Participants identified several benefits in relation to the video self-reflections, with one common benefit being that video self-reflections increased their confidence about student identities, helping them to 'clearly put a face to the name' or 'recognise' the student among the 44 or 56 other students. As one participant observed:

> I actually found it very helpful, the video reflections, because it helped me to reassure myself that I was actually getting the marks right. I thought, 'That's right, you're that student, and the three or four examples of how you participated I can remember … and I can… feel confident that I've probably got the right mark.

Another participant observed that:

> there's something about the video, it's just an instant connection to them. That's right, that's their manner, that's their way of speaking, I am absolutely confident … I have that impression of the student from the preceding 10 weeks referable to that video in a much more immediate way … that's a bit part of the benefit for me of the process.

Despite these perceived benefits of the video self-reflections, participants expressed differing views about the additional time required to view and consider them. For some, viewing student self-reflection videos had no or minimal impact on their workload, with the time spent viewing video self-reflections being approximately equivalent to the time they would have otherwise spent reading written self-reflections. For others, viewing self-reflection videos extended the time associated with evaluating CP, particularly when students exceeded the two-minute time limit or the participant had a large number of students. Several participants also observed that technical difficulties with the videos took some time to resolve, with some students requiring assistance to upload the video link or set appropriate permissions so that teachers could access the OneDrive file. Consequently, six participants spent additional time sending follow-up emails requesting access to the file.

One participant commented that although watching video self-reflections took time, this was offset by the fact that it was an enjoyable experience, while another expressed the view that watching the video self-reflections was 'time well spent'. Another commented that while watching the video self-reflections took more time, the video was preferable to written self-reflections because it enhanced their confidence in the final mark.

C *Equity and Inclusivity*

Several participants explicitly identified issues in relation to equity that reflected those discussed in the literature about the challenges of CP. For example, one commented:

> I think it's great to get people to talk in class, but I just don't know if the way it's assessed at the moment is the best approach for everyone, cause it's just really up to the lecturer. Some students are just more confident talking. Some students are less confident talking. Some students do really prepare for the classes and don't participate. Some students don't actually prepare and end up participating.

Further, four participants discussed the structural barriers to participation that international students may encounter in the form of differing cultural expectations and the students' own confidence in their language proficiency. One acknowledged the gap in expectation that arises where the student has been attentive despite not verbally participating and, consequently, 'who would assess themselves as having been engaged and actively participating':

> …I want to check my own biases and make sure that I'm not unfairly marking someone down when it has been a confidence thing or it has been that there were loud, confident students who sucked up all the oxygen and I didn't do a good enough job of trying to maintain an equitable playing field in the classroom.

For two participants, the video self-reflections provided them with their only opportunity to see some students verbally engage with them and the course, with one observing that this 'gave me something I didn't get out of actually teaching them'. When reflecting on these equity-related challenges, participants observed that the self-reflections helped them to understand why some students didn't engage in class discussions as much as others. Participants noted that students nominated a range of reasons for their lack of participation in their self-reflection tasks, including English language barriers; poor preparation due to time constraints caused by employment or other personal commitments; fear of looking 'stupid'; lack of self-confidence; the habit of deferring to more vocal students in the class; feeling uncomfortable when put in groups with particular peers; and struggling with the speed of the class discussions.

Several participants observed that they found this information useful as there were 'tweaks' that they could make when asking students questions to accommodate some of these barriers to participation. As one participant noted:

> It also helps me with future terms, where I can see what are the sorts of issues that students are facing in terms of why they're not participating as much as they would like to.

D *Timing, Feedback and Pedagogy*

The incidental feedback that teachers received from students through the video self-reflections prompted further observations on the timing of the task, and the potential value of incorporating the video self-reflections at an earlier point in the teaching period. Some participants commented that the feedback they received about their teaching, the students and the classroom environment would have been useful to them during the term, as they could have made necessary and appropriate adjustments to further facilitate CP. For instance, one participant noted:

> I think the reflection I had about the self-reflections was that I would have found it … more helpful if it had happened earlier … especially with our ESL students saying things like 'I didn't keep up with the tempo of the class well because I was still processing things' … and that 'it was a lot easier when we had the slides in advance…For me, having those insights earlier might have helped me adjust what I was doing to try and capture the students who were maybe not as vocal.

It was also observed that mid-term self-reflections could give teachers an early 'general consensus' about the views of students about the teaching style and content.

The timing of the self-reflection task was also discussed by participants in terms of pedagogy and workload. While the majority of participants suggested that a mid-term self-reflection would be more beneficial both for students and for teachers, one observed that having the self-reflection due at the end of the course was 'sort of self-evident'. For others, the timing of the self-reflection task meant that students were not able to use any feedback about their CP in that course, with any benefit flowing from the feedback being realised only in later courses. As one participant stated:

> I actually thought that maybe these video-self reflections would be a good exercise for students in the middle of term where they might go, actually, you know what, I'm being assessed on this criteria and now that I think about it and I'm forced to reflect on it, maybe I should lift my game and challenge myself a bit.

In addition to prompting students to develop their CP strategies and skills, one participant observed that an earlier self-reflective task could help to 'mitigate possible disappointment at the end of term'. Another observed that although an earlier self-reflection task could be useful, it would carry workload implications for teachers:

> We need the time to be able to properly look at that and see how we can support those students and obviously the larger the classes, the harder it is to do that, because if each student [submits a 5 minute video], you have 40 students… you need a week really to look at that and then be able to give feedback or have a plan for each student.

VII DISCUSSION

Within a 'crowded curriculum', facilitating, evaluating and assessing CP requires teachers to balance competing pedagogical and institutional demands. The participants in this study identified a number of key challenges in relation to CP, many of which align with the existing literature on its assessment. In particular, participants described the pressures and workload associated with promoting fairness and ensuring equity in the context of CP. These findings highlight the many complex factors and imperatives that teachers must balance when teaching, contributing to their own experience of the pressures associated with a crowded curriculum. Participants discussed the strategies they used to facilitate CP, navigate student expectations and concerns about the assessment of CP, and maintain records of student contributions to class discussions. Interestingly, however, none raised concerns about student use of generative AI to formulate their contributions to classroom discussions. This contrasts with the literature that suggests student use of generative AI is becoming more commonplace, requiring teachers to develop skills in recognising and managing such use for CP.[53]

In relation to the challenges of subjectivity and equity, participants perceived value in the use of video self-reflections. For subjectivity challenges, the key value of the video self-reflections was their capacity to enhance teacher confidence in the process of tracking and evaluating CP, particularly by enabling teachers to more accurately recognise and identify students by connecting their face, voice and name. The range of techniques that participants used to record CP indicate that teachers are alert to the risks to fairness in assessing CP and take active steps to mitigate those risks. For some participants, however, the imperative of ensuring fairness in their marking had significant time and workload implications. For example, the time dedicated by one participant to maintaining a detailed spreadsheet of student contributions and participation in activities, motivated by a desire to produce an evidence base for allocating marks, was substantial and potentially disproportionate in circumstances where CP only constituted 10% of the total course grade. The reliance on such practices highlights the need to investigate ways in which to support teachers and ease the workload burden associated with CP without compromising the perceived or actual accuracy and fairness of the marking process. The findings of this study reveal that video self-reflections on CP represent one such way to provide this additional support. While video self-reflections do not replace the need for record keeping about CP, they represent a valuable supplement in supporting teachers' efforts to mitigate undue subjectivity and promote fairness, especially in circumstances where teachers find it difficult to learn students' names. Participants noted that the video self-reflections were particularly useful in confidently identifying students in the 'middle of the pack'.

---

[53] Lo (n 36); Fisk (n 37) 314–315.

While the video self-reflections were not assessable and did not influence students' CP marks, participants were positive about the inclusion of these formative self-reflections in the broader context of CP. Participants described the videos as 'very helpful', an 'excellent idea', 'enjoyable', 'quite interesting' and 'insightful'. This positive sentiment towards video self-reflections is particularly important in light of growing concerns about the wellbeing of academic staff. Changes in the higher education landscape have intensified the workload of academics, resulting in staff reporting high levels of psycho-social distress associated with work pressures.[54] Work pressure refers to the 'speed, intensity and demands'[55] of tasks. For legal academics in particular, these work pressures can be seen in the 'emotional labour' of navigating complex and sometimes distressing content, managing classes of students of increasingly diverse backgrounds, and bearing the responsibility to teach emotional and relational skills in addition to substantive content.[56] The challenges identified by participants in this study exemplify these work pressures in the context of CP, though they must be understood against wider changes in the legal education landscape that are increasing the intensity of the teaching role. The demands on teachers are also likely to increase as identifying and managing the use of generative AI in class becomes a standard feature of teaching and marking CP. While structural reforms are required to address these pressures, the support provided to teachers through video self-reflections offers some relief from the work pressures associated with CP in their absence. In particular, the findings highlight that some of the pressure and intensity that teachers experience in relation to CP is related to the complexities of balancing the need to facilitate and record student participation. Video self-reflections provide an additional tool for facilitating recognition and recall of students and their contributions so as to support the strategies already employed by teachers.

In addition to enhancing teacher confidence, the video self-reflections presented unexpected value in addressing equity-related challenges by promoting the professional development of teachers. Several participants highlighted the value of hearing directly from students about the factors that prevented them from participating effectively in class, such as developing English language proficiency and mental health concerns. While video self-reflections cannot and should not be understood as a substitute for formal supports available to students and teachers, by providing a channel for students to communicate these issues to teachers, video self-reflections on CP have the potential to enhance teacher sensitivity to diversity more generally. Given the criticisms that legal education has traditionally 'struggled to create learning environments that expect, welcome, acknowledge,

---

54 Neser et al (n 4); Kenny and Fluck (n 4) 508; Skead and Rogers (n 4).

55 Neser et al (n 4).

56 Mary Heath et al, 'Learning to Feel Like a Lawyer: Law Teachers, Sessional Teaching and Emotional Labour in Legal Education' (2017) 26(3) *Griffith Law Review* 430.

accommodate and value diversity in students',[57] initiatives that improve the capability of teachers to recognise and respond to the students of diverse backgrounds are of vital importance. While teachers can devise other activities to gather student feedback about student barriers to participation throughout a course,[58] these inevitably have workload implications. A unique benefit of video self-reflections on CP, therefore, is that they not only enhance teacher confidence, but also provide an opportunity to deepen teachers' understandings of the personal and structural factors impacting student participation.

More generally, participants recounted how the video self-reflections contained informal, formative feedback on their pedagogical practices and the classroom environment, with students often linking their performance in CP to factors such as the speed of in-class discussions, the power dynamics in the classroom or their enjoyment of classroom activities. In this way, the video self-reflections functioned as a valuable alternative to the feedback typically obtained through formal student evaluations of teaching (SETs) administered at the end of each course. In particular, participants reported a high rate of student engagement with the optional self-reflection task, which can be contrasted with the limited engagement of students with SETs.[59] Moreover, the lack of anonymity in the task may have discouraged students from providing abusive, offensive or nonconstructive feedback,[60] with no participants reporting any concerns in this respect. Finally, the unstructured and qualitative nature of the feedback that participants reported receiving can be contrasted with that obtained from the Likert-scale measures of teacher knowledge and effectiveness in many SETs,[61] with participants reporting that they found the feedback useful in informing their approaches to teaching in the future.

A *Future Directions and Research*

This study focused on teacher perceptions of video self-reflections submitted at the conclusion of a course. The formative nature of the

---

57 Israel et al (n 25) 335.

58 Lamiaa S. Youssef, 'Using Student Reflections in the Formative Evaluation of Instruction: A Course-Integrated Approach' (2012) 13(2) *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives* 237, 240.

59 Anniken Hoel and Tove Irene Dahl, 'Why Bother? Student Motivation to Participate in Student Evaluations of Teaching' (2019) 44(3) *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 361; Dawn Jones, 'Law Student Evaluations of their Experience: Influencing Factors, Reliability and Participation' (2024) 9 *Wolverhampton Law Journal* 44.

60 Richard Lakeman et al, 'Appearance, Insults, Allegations, Blame and Threats: An Analysis of Anonymous Non-Constructive Student Evaluation of Teaching in Australia' (2022) 47(8) *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 125; Beatrice Tucker, 'Student Evaluation Surveys: Anonymous Comments that Offend or are Unprofessional' (2014) 62 *Higher Education* 347.

61 Iris Borch, Ragnhild Sandvoll and Torsten Risør, 'Discrepancies in Purposes of Student Course Evaluations: What Does it Mean to be "Satisfied"? (2020) 32 *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability* 83; Mary Risacher and Sara Fier, 'Reflective Course Evaluation as a Complement to Traditional Course Evaluations' (2023) 24(3) *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education* 43.

feedback that teachers received through the video self-reflections, together with the information about student barriers to CP, indicates that the self-reflection task may be more effective if introduced earlier in the course. As participants noted, earlier consideration of student self-reflections would enable teachers to adjust their pedagogical approaches in response to the learning needs of specific cohorts of students. Future studies could investigate the experiences of teachers with mid-term video self-reflections, with a view to further examining the possible opportunities and benefits raised by participants in this study.

Future studies may also consider the relationship between the value of video self-reflections identified in this study and the process of dialogical feedback involving video self-reflections. For example, a participant in this study suggested that the self-reflection task be divided into two short self-reflections, one at the mid-term point and one at the conclusion of the course. This two-stage model would provide students with an 'opportunity for adjustment and correction'[62] within the course itself and enable direct feedback on any efforts students made to address comments on their initial self-reflection. Existing scholarship further suggests that a mid-term feedback dialogue could also help with the early identification of any misconceptions or misunderstandings that students may have about the assessment requirements or the students' competencies.[63] Such dialogue also has the potential to support relationship-building between teachers and students, which may in turn help to mediate the 'negative affective reactions and threats to identity'[64] that are often associated with student feedback. The introduction of a two-stage self-reflection task, however, creates further challenges in the context of a crowded curriculum, requiring consideration of how to ensure both teachers and students have sufficient time and capacity to engage meaningfully in the tasks. Such a redesign of the self-reflection task would need to be accompanied by structural or policy changes targeted at managing the workload of teachers and students.

Though most participants in this study did not report an increased workload associated with the use of video self-reflections, the responses of participants did highlight a number of ways in which the task could be optimised to streamline the process for teachers and students. In particular, the technical implementation of video self-reflections could be improved. Future iterations of this task should investigate the availability of platforms that are compatible with the Learning

---

62 Heidi L. Andrade, 'A Critical Review of Research on Student Self-Assessment' (2019) 4 (87) *Frontiers in Education* 1; See also David Carless and David Boud, 'The Development of Student Feedback Literacy: Enabling Uptake of Feedback' (2018) 43(8) *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 1315.

63 Heidi L Andrade, 'Feedback in the Context of Self-Assessment' in Anastasiya A Lipnevich and Jeffrey K Smith (eds), *The Cambridge Handbook of Instructional Feedback* (Cambridge University Press, 2018) 377. See also Carless and Boud (n 62).

64 Carless and Boud (n 62) 1317.

Management System, allow time limits to be automatically imposed on videos and avoid access issues due to incorrect permissions settings.

Although the focus of this study was on teacher perceptions of the value of video self-reflections in relation to CP challenges, some participants commented on the importance of self-reflection tasks in developing reflexivity skills among law students. Further research is needed to explore whether the video format enhances the benefits to students of a written CP self-reflection task. For example, future studies could examine whether CP self-reflections assisted students in improving their CP, feedback literacy,[65] or communication skills more generally.

VIII CONCLUSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that law teachers consider video self-reflections to be valuable in addressing the challenges associated with CP. In an increasingly 'crowded curriculum' that demands that academics teach content, develop students' substantive and 'soft' skills, and design and administer assessments with sufficient authenticity and integrity, providing support to teachers is imperative. Video self-reflections supported participants in this study by enhancing their confidence in relation to the evaluation of CP and presenting them with insights into the student experience that they had not received through formal course evaluations. These findings suggest that video self-reflections can usefully supplement teachers' record keeping by facilitating the immediate recognition and recall of students and their contributions. In addition, and more broadly, the video self-reflections provide opportunities for embedding equity in teaching practices by increasing teachers' awareness of the diversity of student experiences in relation to CP.

---

[65] For a discussion of student feedback literacy, see Ibid.