

Formative essay writing assessment

Peer review with a difference

Alan Fielding, MMU

Background

- Essays are important in many end of unit examinations
- Students have poor writing skills
- Students get little experience
- Staff have insufficient time to provide detailed / appropriate feedback
- Tutorial assessment (formative) to help students – but minimum staff time

Description

- Five REAL examination answers given to students (V. poor to Excellent)
- Typed (with all original errors) to help maintain anonymity.
- Detailed assessment criteria.
- One answer 'marked' in staffed tutorial.
- Students mark remaining four.
- Online form to reduce data processing

Information for students

Structure	Good			Poor		
	5	4	3	2	1	
Content relevant to topic						Little relevance to topic
Sufficient depth						Superficial treatment
Adheres to specification						Idiosyncratic presentation

- Argument
- Originality
- Style
- Presentation
- Sources

Information for students

Mark range	Quality of student work
85-100	Achieved all that could reasonably be expected in the time available. Mistakes, if any, are trivial. No marks less than 4 and no more than 3 sections with a mark of 4.
70-85	Excellent work, highly focused and relevant with few errors, some minor errors (<4) towards lower end of the range. No marks less than 3.
60-70	No more than two major deficiencies (marks less than 3) and no major flaws (marks of 0 or 1). Good content, structure and presentation.
50-60	No major flaws (marks of 0 or 1) but a large number of deficiencies (marks of 2 or 3).
40-50	Sufficient evidence of knowledge and understanding to indicate familiarity with subject area though may be confused and/or unfocused. Some relevant material but omits key points and/or contains significant errors. Usually has at least 4 marks below 3.
20-40	A fail – a large number of major flaws and shows limited evidence of knowledge and understanding.
0-20	A token effort, shows no evidence of knowledge and understanding with major errors and misconceptions. Very poor work, all marks below 3.

Online Data Input

Student ID	<input type="text"/>	(Required Field)				
Unit Number	<input type="text"/>	(Required Field)				
Essay Number	<input type="text"/>	(Required Field)				
Mark that you would award	<input type="text"/>	(Required Field)				
Structure	Good		Poor			
	5	4	3	2	1	
Content relevant to topic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Little relevance to topic / question
Sufficient depth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Superficial treatment
Adheres to specification	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Differs significantly from specification

Evaluation

- Very popular with students.
- Want to know why they didn't have it before.
- Very variable peer assessment, rank order sometimes reversed.
- Some don't believe best answers were written by students during examination.
- Tracking students through 2nd to 3rd year.