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Assisting the development of assessment for learning

Developing assessment literacy in our students

Engagement with and ownership of assessment and feedback

Recognise that resources are limited
...and existing marking practices may be unreliable
ADAPTIVE COMPARATIVE JUDGEMENT

Lots of judges: Every item judged many times

Which one is better? (No grade/mark)

Feedback optional

Generates a rank order of all work
The Edinburgh Award: Peer Assessment

Over 40 different award programmes, 800 students

Recognises student development

Assessment via structured report: reflections on development and impact

Crowd Assess 1: Formative Feedback on mid point reflections (by peers)

Crowd Assess 2: Peer ranking of final reflections

Review by staff (using sampling)
Physics (2013)

Draft Essay Plan (of a critique of a paper)

72 students, 3\textsuperscript{rd} year

About 10 judgements each, including feedback
## Pilots (Spring 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Total judgements</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Essay plan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Education</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24 (students)</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3 (staff)</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2845</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>Book review</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>0.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoscience</td>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Precis</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10 (staff)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student feedback (107 responses)

I have learned from reading what my peers submitted

- Disagree strongly: 6 (5.6%)
- Disagree: 13 (12.1%)
- Neither agree nor disagree: 8 (7.5%)
- Agree: 57 (53.3%)
- Agree strongly: 23 (21.5%)

“It was useful to see different perspectives on approaching the problem we were assigned.”
Student feedback

Did reviewing other students' submissions make you feel differently about your own submission?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>76 (71%)</td>
<td>31 (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Yes, it was interesting! I learnt much information from my peers' work and I could identify where I went wrong.”

“It was interesting to see how other people tackled the topic. Moreover, it gave me a few ideas as well. I think that this provides us with a better view of how we should prepare for the task, and also gives you a bit of a head start.”
Student feedback

Having taken part in the activity, do you think you would now write your submission differently?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65 (60.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42 (39.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 / 62 comments about concise & clear writing, use of diagrams

13 / 62 comments about accuracy, doing more in-depth research
Was it straightforward? (Free text response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s straightforward</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s difficult</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes it is easy and sometimes it is really hard</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of answer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Sometimes it was quite hard to figure out which text was the better one because often they would have different positive and negative qualities.”
What was really being judged?

“I made my decisions about the quality of the work largely based on the quality of the writing as I didn't have enough background knowledge to assess the validity of the actual content.”
Cautions

This isn’t a new way to do traditional marking, **it is different**

Staff say it takes more time

And everyone thinks it takes longer than it does!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded mean judgement time</th>
<th>Survey reported mean judgement time</th>
<th>F2F feedback reported mean judgement time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5 mins</td>
<td>9.7 mins</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What to report back to students?
Context: Technology Enhanced Assessment

- Assisting the development of assessment for learning
- Developing assessment literacy in our students
- Engagement with and ownership of assessment and feedback
Thank you

Nora.Mogey@ed.ac.uk
SPOT TEST

1. What’s the temperature in this room?
2. What’s the temperature outside?
3. Which is warmer, in here or out there?
1 round = all scripts judged at least once
Round 1 = totally random allocation

Rounds 2-6 (ish) = “swiss” tournament

Later rounds allocated by adaptive algorithm