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Do you already use Peer Assessment? What are you here to learn? What do you hope to get out of today’s session?
Peer Assessment Overview

1. Write
2. Read other students’ work
3. Evaluate other students’ work
4. Receive grades and/or feedback on own work
Learning Opportunities

- Write
  - Practice writing develops thinking skills, writing skills.

- Read other students’ work
  - Helps evaluate quality of own work. Exposure to more ideas.

- Evaluate other students’ work
  - Practice making judgments and comparing using criteria.

- Receive grades and/or feedback on own work
  - More—and more diverse—feedback. Opportunity to question and judge quality of feedback.
Implementation Tips

Train students in rubric use, peer review

Write

Read other students’ work

Evaluate other students’ work

Receive grades and/or feedback on own work

Large class?
Need a way to submit work and facilitate anonymous reviews. peerScholar, Moodle, turnitin, etc

Use 4+ reviewers, take average, for reliable scores.

Large class?
Need a way to auto-calculate grades and release them. Ask for raw data, check algorithms.
Example: Catherine’s PSYC 101 and PSYC 102 Introductory Psychology courses

Course Opening
• Practice round mini-assignment and peer assessment
• Peer Assessment Training Workshop

Test 1
• mini-assignment due before, 5-6 peer assessments due after
• Rate quality of peer reviews received

Test 2
• mini-assignment due before, 5-6 peer assessments due after
• Rate quality of peer reviews received

Test 3
• mini-assignment due before, 5-6 peer assessments due after
• Rate quality of peer reviews received

Final exam
• mini-assignment due before, 5-6 peer assessments due first week of exams
• Rate quality of peer reviews received

Total points value across all assignments, submissions, steps: 10%
Average peer review score: 4 x 1%
Quality of peer reviews (as rated by peers across term) average: 2%
Catherine’s Rubric Example

Your written work is evaluated based on the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Selecting a concept from the appropriate key terms list</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describing the concept thoroughly and accurately</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Drawing an interesting and useful connection between the concept and an experience or example beyond the course</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communicating ideas so they are easy to understand</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20 points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Describing the concept.

What have you learned about this concept? Describe the concept thoroughly, including its nuances, *in your own words*. In your response, you might explore how this concept compares and contrasts with another concept to show its nuances. Or you might compare your current understanding of this concept with what you used to think was true, and how your thinking has changed.

To be evaluated on a 0-5 scale, with these anchors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 points</th>
<th>4 points</th>
<th>3 points</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Perfect mastery of the concept. Accurate (check the course materials), complete, detailed, and thorough.</td>
<td>• Accurate, no key aspects about the concept are missing.</td>
<td>• Expected value for most work. Some detail, no major errors.</td>
<td>• Minimal detail, multiple small errors or one major one, key aspects about the concept are missing.</td>
<td>• Minimal description taken word-for-word from the text (if word-for-word and not quoted, provide feedback that it should be quoted or paraphrased).</td>
<td>• Missing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Peter’s PSYC 101 *Introductory Psychology* course

Course Opening
- Peer Assessment Training Workshop

Account Verification
- Moodle & TurnItIn

Submit & Review
- 6 reviewers for each essay; 10 item rubric (12% for essay)

Review Reviews
- Teaching staff review assessments (4%) & constructive feedback (2%)
Challenges

Students didn’t trust each other.
Comments were poor quality.
A Solution:
Peer Assessment Training Workshop
TLEF
Overview
## Which to choose for developing your PAT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choose Canvas if you...</th>
<th>Choose edX Edge if you...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Want to providing training opportunity for students</td>
<td>• Want to providing training opportunity for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Are seeking an easier set-up process</strong></td>
<td>• Are up for a bit more complex set-up process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Might use completion scores (e.g., 1% completion)</td>
<td>• Might use completion scores (e.g., 1% completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Might use PAPAQ pre-post data</td>
<td>• Might use PAPAQ pre-post data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Might use exit questionnaire</td>
<td>• Might use exit questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Don’t need</em> detailed student performance data (e.g., how accurately they did the training)</td>
<td>• <strong>Plan to use</strong> detailed student performance data (e.g., how accurately they did the training)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Talk to Bosung first to make sure you’ll be able to get data
Has the PAT helped address these challenges?

Students trust each other more than before the workshop.
Comment quality has improved.
Bonus: Students more accurately estimate their own paper grades.
Ready to Start?
peerassessment.arts.ubc.ca

Phase 1: Assignment
- Develop Assignment and Rubric
- Choose platform for Peer Reviews (e.g., peerScholar, Moodle, Canvas?), and create assignment there
  - Get advice!
- Test the platform *including any automatically-generated scores*

Phase 2: Peer Assessment Training Tool
- Create brief quiz to test knowledge of assignment & rubric
- Source 2-4 sample assignments, grade them using the rubric and add comments
- Choose Canvas or edX Edge
- Follow instructions in corresponding Workshop Setup Guide
- Option: Assign completion score

Phase 3: Evaluation
- Finalize Peer Review grades
  (Examine auto-generated scores to ensure fairness and accuracy)
- Options: Compare your students’ attitudes toward peer assessment before and after doing PAT (PAPAQ)
Some References

- [http://peerscholar.com/research](http://peerscholar.com/research)
  - Reviewed 63 studies and conclude that “the use of a combination of different new assessment forms encourages students to become more responsible and reflective.” Includes guidelines.
  - Literature review of 64 articles highlights disagreement and inconsistencies in application and measurement of peer assessment, implores use of technology to facilitate
  - Meta-analysis of 48 quantitative studies. Peer assessments are similar to teacher assessments when: global judgements based on well understood criteria are used (rather than many dimensions); no differences among different levels of courses or disciplines; no improvement by averaging multiples over singles
  - Using accounts of their experiences of peer review, this study illuminates students’ perceptions of the different learning benefits resulting from feedback receipt and feedback production, and, importantly, it provides insight into the cognitive processes that are activated when students construct feedback reviews. The findings show that producing feedback reviews engages students in multiple acts of evaluative judgement, both about the work of peers, and, through a reflective process, about their own work; that it involves them in both invoking and applying criteria to explain those judgements; and that it shifts control of feedback processes into students’ hands, a shift that can reduce their need for external feedback.
  - Includes theory of why this works, literature review showing reliable and valid.