When provided effectively, feedback is among the most powerful teaching tools.

Feedback defined
Communicating to students what they are doing well and how they can do even better at performing some substantial task you are teaching them to perform.

Create assignments that support supercharged feedback
Identify your learning goals
Create a meaningful assignment
Articulate your criteria—including levels of performance—to yourself

Craft feedback that maximizes student learning
Distinguish feedback comments from grading
Coach, don’t criticize
Praise
Ask questions
Give students responsibility for revising (corollary: Give feedback when students can act on it)
Establish a hierarchy of issues and select what you will comment on
Use minimal marking

Be a good steward of your time
Give oral feedback to the whole class
Don’t waste time on careless work: Set a threshold
Build Feedback into Quizzes
Incorporate certainty-based marking
Save time with rubrics or marking guides in Moodle
Use screencasting
Jack Daniel's is facing an obvious ethical dilemma with regard to the "thick slop situation." Jack Daniel's had clearly established a relationship with the farmers in the area by giving them free "thick slop" to feed their cattle. There also existed an expressed agreement between farmers and Jack Daniel to continue this arrangement on the grounds that the farmers make substantial environment improvements. The farmers upheld their end of the bargain, but Jack Daniel's backed out of the deal as a result of economic problems. The question that arises here as to whether Jack Daniel's refusal to supply the farmers with cattle feed longer efficient is completely ethical. The situation can be reviewed and compared against three ethical criteria. The Utilitarian Theory, the Theory of Rights and the Theories of Justice can all be used to establish whether or not Jack Daniel's action is ethical.

When considering the Utilitarian Theory one can see that there does exist an ethical problem. The consequence of Jack Daniel's actions is that the farmers receive no feed for their cattle, and as a result there is severe tension between the farmers and the distillery. Jack Daniel's obviously backed out of the deal and the question that arises here is whether this action is producing the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Apparently this situation is more efficient for Jack Daniel's, but it is definitely not producing the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Their action falls short of helping the community, and the farmers are damaged in this...
You better define dry house situation. The "dry house" method of getting rid of slop is more economical, but under the Utilitarian Theory this alternative method is unethical.

Under the Theory of Rights one can conclude that Jack Daniel's behavior is unethical. The Theory of Rights states that humans have moral rights that should be respected in all actions and situations. The Jack Daniel distillery made a deal, albeit informal, with the farmers in the area to provide them with thick slop if they made environmental improvements. The farmers succeeded in fulfilling this requirement, but Jack Daniel's failed to comply with the agreement. The farmers relied on Jack Daniel's to their detriment by making investments in the environment for which they received no compensation. According to the Theory of Rights, Jack Daniel's action is considered unethical.

When considering the Theories of Justice, one can also see that Jack Daniel's action was unethical. The Theories of Justice are built on the premise that any should produce a fair distribution of the benefits and burdens when coming together in a working situation. It appears that the farmers and the distillery came together to make improvements in the environment. Benefits were to be received by both parties, but economic problems surfaced. Instead of sharing this burden, Jack Daniel's dumped the burden entirely on the farmers. Additionally, according to the Theories of Justice, there should be a consistent administration of rules and practices. Jack Daniel's traditionally provided the farmers with thick slop, and they should ethically continue to do so.
especially since there was an agreement between the two groups. Jack Daniel's should make some restitution for their action because they are in a position of control.

The restitution should be made in the form of providing the farmers with the thick slop as originally agreed. The farmers made environmental improvements and consequently Jack Daniel's should hold up their end of the bargain. Because Jack Daniel's hit an economic slump, they should consider charging a price for the "thick slop" that would be fair to the farmers and also help the distillery. Jack Daniel's could provide the greatest good to the greatest number of people by providing the farmers with the cattle feed for a low price, they would be respecting the rights of the farmers by doing so, they would share the burden of the economic problems and they would provide restitution for their action. According to the Utilitarian Theory, the Theory of Rights and the Theories of Justice, Jack Daniel’s acted unethically and should remedy the situation by going back to their form way of getting rid of slop by giving it to the farmers.

You have some good points here, but to improve this paper, you need to clarify your sentences. You need to clarify your thesis and argument, too. Proofread.
managers of The Jack Daniel Company must resolve a conflict between the company and local farmers who were promised free "thick slop." Explain "thick slop" and its relevance to farming. Also explain the dry house method of getting rid of slop. Jack Daniel managers had promised by giving them free "thick slop" to feed their cattle. There also existed an expressed agreement between farmers and Jack Daniel to continue this arrangement on the grounds that the farmers make substantial environment improvements. The farmers upheld their motivation to substantially improve the environment. [You might explain their end of the bargain, but Jack Daniel's backed out of the deal as a result of economic problems. The question that arises here is as to whether Jack Daniel's refusal to supply the farmers with cattle feed longer efficient is completely ethical. The situation can be evaluated on the basis of theories reviewed and compared against three ethical criteria: The Utilitarian Theory, the Theory of Rights and the Theories of Justice, can all be used to establish whether or not Jack Daniel's action is ethical. According to the managers of Jack Daniel Company, an action should produce the greatest good for the greatest number of people. On this basis, the managers of the Jack Daniel Company acted unethically because the farmers had no feed for their cattle, and as a result, there was severe tension between the farmers and the distillery. Jack Daniel's obviously backed out of the deal, and the question that arises here is whether this action is producing the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Apparently, this situation was more efficient for the company, but it is definitely not producing the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Their action falls short of helping the community, and the farmers were damaged in this
situation. The "dry house" method of getting rid of slp is more economical, but under
the Utilitarian Theory this alternative method is unethical.
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especially since there was an agreement between the two groups. Jack Daniel's should make some restitution for their action because they are in a position of control.

The restitution should be made in the form of providing the farmers with the thick slop as originally agreed. The farmers made environmental improvements and, consequently, Jack Daniel's should hold up their end of the bargain. Because Jack Daniel's hit an economic slump, they should consider charging a price for the "thick slop" that would be fair to the farmers and also help the distillery. Jack Daniel's could provide the greatest good to the greatest number of people by providing the farmers with the cattle feed for a low price, they would be respecting the rights of the farmers by doing so, they would share the burden of the economic problems and they would provide restitution for their action. According to the Utilitarian Theory, the Theory of Rights and the Theories of Justice, Jack Daniel's acted unethically and should remedy the situation by going back to their former way of getting rid of slop by giving it to the farmers.
Jack Daniel’s is facing an obvious ethical dilemma with regard to the “thick slop” situation. Jack Daniel’s had clearly established a relationship with the farmers in the area by giving them free “thick slop” to feed their cattle. There also existed an expressed agreement between farmers and Jack Daniel to continue this arrangement on the grounds that the farmers make substantial environment improvements. The farmers upheld their end of the bargain, but Jack Daniel’s backed out of the deal as a result of economic problems. The question that arises here as to whether Jack Daniel’s refusal to supply the farmers with cattle feed longer efficient is completely ethical. The situation can be reviewed and compared against three ethical criteria. The Utilitarian Theory, the Theory of Rights and the Theories of Justice can all be used to establish whether or not Jack Daniel’s action is ethical. You thesis might be rewritten more concisely by saying “According to XYZ theories, the Jack Daniel Co. did/did not act ethically.”

When considering the Utilitarian Theory one can see that there does exist an ethical problem. The consequence of Jack Daniel’s actions is that the farmers receive no feed for their cattle and as a result there is severe tension between the farmers and the distillery. Jack Daniel’s obviously backed out of the deal and the question that arises here is whether this action is producing the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Apparently this situation is more efficient for Jack Daniel’s, but it is definitely not producing the greatest good for the greatest number of people. They said they would stop if the improvements were not made. This is not the same thing. Their action falls short of helping the community, and the farmers are damaged in this
situation. (The "dry house" method of getting rid of slop is more economical, but under the Utilitarian Theory this alternative method is unethical.)

Under the Theory of Rights one can conclude that Jack Daniel's behavior is unethical. The Theory of Rights states that humans have moral rights that should be respected in all actions and situations. The Jack Daniel distillery made a deal, albeit informal, with the farmers in the area to provide them with thick slop if they made environmental improvements. The farmers succeeded in fulfilling this requirement, but Jack Daniel's failed to comply with the agreement. The farmers relied on Jack Daniel's to their detriment by making investments in the environment for which they received no compensation. According to the Theory of Rights, Jack Daniel's action is considered unethical.

When considering the Theories of Justice, one can also see that Jack Daniel's action was unethical. The Theories of Justice are built on the premise that any should produce a fair distribution of the benefits and burdens when coming together in a working situation. It appears that the farmers and the distillery came together to make improvements in the environment. Benefits were to be received by both parties, but economic problems surfaced. Instead of sharing this burden, Jack Daniel's dumped the burden entirely on the farmers. Additionally, according to the Theories of Justice, there should be a consistent administration of rules and practices. Jack Daniel's traditionally provided the farmers with thick slop, and they should ethically continue to do so.
especially since there was an agreement between the two groups. Jack Daniel's should make some restitution for their action because they are in a position of control.

The restitution should be made in the form of providing the farmers with the thick slop as originally agreed. The farmers made environmental improvements and consequently Jack Daniel's should hold up their end of the bargain. Because Jack Daniel's hit an economic slump, they should consider charging a price for the "thick slop" that would be fair to the farmers and also help the distillery. Jack Daniel's could provide the greatest good to the greatest number of people by providing the farmers with the cattle feed for a low price, they would be respecting the rights of the farmers by doing so, they would share the burden of the economic problems and they would provide restitution for their action. According to the Utilitarian Theory, the Theory of Rights and the Theories of Justice, Jack Daniel's acted unethically and should remedy the situation by going back to their form way of getting rid of slop by giving it to the farmers.

You've made a compelling case that JD acted to some degree unethically and should make restitution. To make your good argument even stronger, you could focus your thesis (by qualifying it and by specifying on which grounds JD was unethical) move your thesis to end of 1st par (where reader usually expects it), you could also refine your argument throughout by explaining more specifically the part of the theory (maybe not all of it) that is
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An ongoing challenge in my role is knowing how to avoid sharing too much at once. With that in mind, I've carefully selected three different methods of either gathering or sharing feedback in your classrooms. These methods represent a comfortable place to begin using technology as a medium for feedback. They're accessible enough to learn with the resources below (and about 20 minutes of free time).

As an Instructional Technologist, ensuring your success with educational and instructional technology is at the heart of what I do. If you're interested in learning more, please contact me via phone, email, or at my office in the Belk Library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What's the big idea?</th>
<th>How can I learn more?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Journaling in Moodle** | Setting up an Online Text Assignment in Moodle: [bit.ly/1wUDgR3](bit.ly/1wUDgR3)  
Using the Assignment as an ongoing Journal: [bit.ly/1ouRL9b](bit.ly/1ouRL9b) |
| Reflective journals can be a powerful tool for allowing your students to provide feedback about where they are in the learning process. Journals can be created in less than a minute in Moodle with just a few clever tweaks to the Assignment activity (just use the settings in the links to the right). Oh, and be sure to change the Feedback settings to "Yes" so you can share your responses. | |
| **Making a Choice in Moodle** | What is the Choice Activity?: [bit.ly/1uySVrj](bit.ly/1uySVrj)  
Choice Activity Settings: [bit.ly/1rquX0j](bit.ly/1rquX0j)  
Ways to Use the Choice Activity: [bit.ly/1vyO11B](bit.ly/1vyO11B) |
| Sometimes the easiest way to gather feedback from your students is by asking. The Choice activity in Moodle lets you ask your students a single question, and offer a selection of possible responses. Your question could be used to test your students' understanding of a concept, or gather feedback about whether or not you should spend more time covering a topic in class. You can even publish the question results after your students have answered, after a certain date, or not at all. | |
| **Show and Tell with a Screencast** | Examples of Assessment Feedback with Screencasts: [bit.ly/1sLSREJ](bit.ly/1sLSREJ)  
Talking with Students through Screencasting: [bit.ly/UYAA2s](bit.ly/UYAA2s)  
Screencast Feedback on Writing: [bit.ly/11upJCZ](bit.ly/11upJCZ) (Note: This is a PDF!) |
| A screencast is a digital video recording of your computer screen, which is typically accompanied by voice narration. Some educators have begun using screencasts to record their feedback on digitally submitted work. Early student responses to the use of screencasts as a feedback tool seem to indicate that students have an overwhelmingly positive view of the screencasts, prefer it over traditional written comments, and feel it improves their connection with and opinions toward their instructor. | |