

# Students as partners

Nicky Meer  
Amanda Chapman

# Collaborative learning

- \* Defined as any learning process where students '*learn with and from each other*' (Boud, 2001:2)
- \* Students need a sense of ownership of assessment process in order to fully engage.

# Research Group

- \* Second year core module for Business with HR
- \* 24 students (4 groups of 6)
- \* Assessment is a training needs analysis. They have to investigate a skills gap within the other groups and create a development training intervention.

# Learning –Oriented Assessment

Carless (2007) outlines three principles which provide a framework for understanding the conceptual base of this type of assessment:

- 1) Assessment tasks should be designed to stimulate sound learning practices amongst students
- 2) Assessment should involve students actively in engaging with criteria, quality, their own and/or peers performance.
- 3) Feedback should be timely and forward-looking so as to support current and future student learning.

# Action research

- \* 3 marking criteria (see handouts)
  - \* Staff one in the Module Guide: MC1
  - \* Students created theirs in groups
  - \* Groups came together to create MC2
  - \* Discussion with staff led to MC3

# Outcomes from that process

- \* Notion of excellence: students found v difficult to articulate 70+
- \* MC2 v simplistic compared to MC1
- \* Student engagement with the process was v high
- \* Formative task with direct correlation and feed forward to the assessment.

# Implementation of marking criteria

- \* Using agreed MC3
- \* All students given a copy of criteria to peer-assess each group
- \* Training intervention was videoed and then played back to group.
- \* Discussion then held with group who had to self-assess
- \* Mark then agreed based on lecturer assessment, peer-assessment and self-assessment

# Results from that process

- \* Students engagement and discussion about marks and achievement from both peer assessment and self assessment
- \* Clear difference with self assessment, often over-marking themselves but more realistic when peer marking.



# Results

	Lecturer Mark	Average peer mark	Average self-mark	Agreed mark
Group 1	72	68	78	74
Group 2	60	62	65	63
Group 3	70	72	75	72
Group 4	70	68	70	70

# Lecturer's feedback

- \* 'I felt it went really well, I was pleased with their engagement. They weren't sure at the beginning but by giving them the opportunity they took it. I believe that it helped, they owned it – it was their criteria.
- \* Completely voluntary as it was a formative task but they all really engaged.
- \* The weaker or less committed students surprised me, no difference in engagement with them and the more motivated students.
- \* They were so happy to get the marks and feedback straight away too.
- \* I've suggested to the students that they deliver their training sessions to the first years'

# Student comments on process

*“Being involved in creating an MC form instantly engaged me. It helped me understand the difference in getting a 2:1 and a 1<sup>st</sup> better as it was thoroughly discussed”*

*“Found peer assessment easy as could see clear difference between boundaries”*

*“First time I have utilised and understood marking criteria”*

# Conclusions from the marking criteria exercise

- \* Student understanding of 'excellence' is different from staff
  - \* Whole classification difference
- \* Simplistic nature of MC2:
  - \* Are MC created for QA and external examiners?
  - \* Over complication of MC1

# Conclusions from Marking process

- \* Understanding of excellence still an issue
- \* Students need early interventions on marking criteria and assessment practices at HE level
- \* Peer assessment and self assessment is a useful tool for collaborative learning
- \* Students are better at grading each other than themselves