Instrument to report the characteristics of peer assessment designs

Designed by Panadero, E., Alqassab, M., Fernández Ruiz, J., & Ocampo, J. C. (2023). A systematic review on peer assessment: Intrapersonal and interpersonal factors. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. Use that citation if you include the instrument in your publication.

TITLE OF THE ARTICLE

Safe and sound: Examining the effect of a training targeting psychological safety and trust in peer assessment

Authors

Morgane Senden, Dominique De Jaeger, & Liesje Coertjens

Our study investigates:

\boxtimes	The impact of peer assessment on interpersonal/intrapersonal factors
	The impact of interpersonal/intrapersonal factors on peer assessment
	The impact of peer assessment on performance/behaviour
	The impact of moderator/mediator variables on peer assessment outcomes

Describe the characteristics of your peer assessment study in the table below.

Cont	ext		
	Category	Description i	Our study
1	Subject domain	Subject domain the study was done in (e.g., mathematics, instructional sciences, accounting, etc.)	Physical education (didactics of acrobatic sports)
2	Place/Time	Where was the PA conducted? (In class or out of class?)	☐ In class/class time ☑ Out of class/free time
3	Setting	Formal or informal education setting?	□ Formal □ Informal
4	Requirement	Was PA compulsory or voluntary for assessor/assessee?	☑ Compulsory☐ Voluntary
5	Alignment	Was the PA activity aligned to curriculum, learning goals or teaching?	✓ Yes□ No
Instr	uctional design		
6	Purpose	What was the assessment purpose of the PA activity? (Formative, summative or both?)	□ Formative□ Summative⋈ Both
7	Object	What was assessed? (e.g., written assignment, oral presentation, contribution to group work)	Instruction sheet illustrating a gymnastic exercice
8	Product/Output	What was the output of the PA? (e.g., score, written feedback, oral feedback, or a combination)	Score (level in a rubric) and written feedback
9	Relation to staff assessment	Was PA done without staff assessment (substitutional) or in addition to staff assessment (supplementary)?	☐ Substitutional☑ Supplementary
10	Official weight	Did participation in the PA activity or the grade given by peer(s) contribute to learners' final grades?	 □ No □ Yes-for participation in PA □ Yes-for PA grade ☑ Yes-both (PA & participation) □ Other: Click here to add text
11	Reward	Was there a reward for participation in PA?	No Yes-course credit Yes-incentives (e.g., free time, money, etc.) Other: Click here to add text
12	Directionality	Was the learner assessing another without being assessed (unidirectional) or acting as both assessor and assessee (bidirectional)?	☐ Unidirectional☒ Bidirectional
13	Degree of interactivity	How did the assessee demonstrate engagement and response to PA?	 □ Reactive: assessee responds to assessor □ Reciprocal: same learners assess each other on same task □ Negotiated: PA was done more than once on the same task and both parties negotiated it
14	Frequency	How often was the PA of the same task done? (Once, twice, etc.)	Once
15	Group constellation	Did members of the same group assess each other (intragroup) or peers from another group (intergroup) or both?	☐ Intragroup ☐ Intergroup ☐ Both
16	Constellation assessor	The number of assessors assigned to each assessee	7
17	Constellation assessee	The number of assessees per assessor	7
18	Unit of assessment (assessor)	At what level did the assessor(s) perform PA? Individual, group, or both?	☑ Individual☐ Group☐ Both

19	Unit of assessment (assessee)	At what level did the assessee(s) experience the PA? Individual, group, or both?	
20	Privacy	Did assessor and assessee know the identity of each other? (Was PA public, single-blind, or double-blind?)	□ Public □ Single-blind (for assessor) □ Single-blind (for assessee) □ Double blind (anonymous) □ Other: Click here to add text
21	Contact	Was PA done face-to-face or online? How was the contact between assessor and assessee?	□ Face-to-face synchronous: same time same place (ST SP) □ Online synchronous: same time different place (ST DP), e.g., skype, chat, etc. □ Online asynchronous: different time different place (DT DP), e.g., e-mail, SWoRD, etc. □ Other: Click here to add text
22	Matching	How were assessor and assessee matched for the PA activity? (e.g., random, skill, self-select, gender, friendship, performance, etc.)	Random
23	Format	How was the PA guided?	 □ Freestyle (no instruction provided to learers) □ Guided instruction □ Guided prompts ⋈ Guided criteria/rubrics □ Guided criteria/rubrics and prompts □ Other: Click here to add text
24	Training	Did the learners receive PA training at any time? If yes, describe the moment in which they received it and the type of training.	They received a 1-hour session to prepare them before the peer assessment (they learn how to give effective feedback according th Hattie & Timperley (2007)' framework and they practice peer assessment)
25	Revision	Did learners revise their work after receiving or providing PA?	□ No ⋈ Yes
26	Scope of involvement	How were learners involved in the PA activity?	 □ Development of assessment criteria □ Gave PA only □ Received PA only ⋈ Gave and received PA □ Additional self-assessment □ Other: Click here to add text
Outc	omes		
27	PA Outcomes	These variables are directly measured as outcomes of the PA activity (i.e., why was the PA activity conducted?) Select all the options that apply to your study from the right column.	Beliefs & perceptions: including perceptions of learning capacity to perform PA or any perceptions related to the PA processes (e.g., fairness, usefulness), metacognition and self-regulation, attitudes and beliefs (e.g., self-efficacy), teachers' perceptions/conceptions. □ Emotions and motivation: emotions experienced by learners (e.g., achievement emotions, social emotions, etc.) & all motivational beliefs (e.g., learning motivation). □ Performance: academic/domain specific performance, achievement, improved draft/work (i.e., revision). □ Skills: quality of contribution to the group, professional behaviour, problem solving skills, work habits, interpersonal skills, metacognitive & self-regulatory skills. □ Reliability of PA: consistency of PA scores compared to other peer assessors, or PA over several rounds. □ Validity of PA: accuracy of PA compared to teachers/tutor/expert's assessment. □ PF content: characteristics of the feedback messages including type, focus, quality, frequency of comments/posts (i.e., participation), etc. □ PF processing: Includes implementation, reactions to PF, seeking PF, coping with PF, etc. □ Other: Click here to add text
Mode	erators/mediators		
28	PA Moderators/mediators	Variables that are not usually manipulated but are taken into account when investigating PA. Select the variables that have been explored in your study from the right column.	 □ Gender: of assessor/assessee. □ Ability & Skills: includes prior knowledge, prior performance, achievement level, GPA, finished high school, previous level of education, year of enrolment, etc. □ Skills: reviewing ability, computer skills, etc. □ Age: of assessor/assessee. □ Culture, ethnicity, nationality or race □ Other: Click here to add text

Note. PA = peer assessment; PF = peer feedback

ⁱ For more detailed descriptions refer to the Online Resource 3 by Alqassab et al. (2023) via: https://osf.io/4jbr3/?view_only=9f5b223115f244ac88ac5b054eb21149