

How does the Peer-Assessment Activity works?

What is peer-review?

Peer review by a fellow professional is powerful and useful. In peer reviewing you work with a partner, a “critical friend”, to share your plans and receive their feedback in terms of scores and comments. The peer review activity serves 2 purposes:

1. **To help you improve the design of your own activities through the feedback from others,**
2. **To reflect on your understanding, ideas and questions of what has been covered on the course by examining the work of your peer.**

Peer reviewing is part of the learning process and should be reflective and constructive. It should not be judgmental; comments and criticisms should be expressed in ways that propose and support further development, even if scores are low.

For peer reviewing to be effective the reviewer needs to have all the necessary information in order to comment usefully. In our case it is a complete and well formulated lesson plan based on the virtual and remote laboratories we’ve presented (Faulkes Telescopes and Hypatia).

What criteria should you use when reviewing a lesson plan?

Dimensions

For the purposes of the peer review activity, we ask you to focus on the following 2 “dimensions”:

1. To what extent the lesson plan develop students’ real skills?
2. How engaging the lesson plan is for students?

The peer-review activity will ask you to score each from 0 to 3 (from 0, not at all to 3 completely) and add a short comment on each to explain your score and suggest improvements.

For each dimension there are 3 questions that you should consider when scoring the dimension. These questions are for your guidance. As a guidance, if the lesson plan addresses all 3 questions of a dimension in a positive way, it should probably receive a 3 for that dimension. However feel free to consider other aspects that you think are important in the context of the dimension. If this is the case, you need to explain this accordingly in the appropriate section during the peer-review activity.

Questions

Let’s look at the 3 questions per core dimension:

1. Skills:
 - a. Does the lesson plan provide opportunities for students to use and extend personal skills (such as creativity, critical thinking, problem-solving, better use of ICT)?

- b. Does the lesson plan provide inter-personal skills (including skilled communication and collaboration)?
 - c. Does the lesson plan provide life skills (for example career motivation or preparation, flexibility)?
- 2. Engagement:
 - a. Is the lesson plan inspiring?
 - b. Could it bring about positive and lasting change in teaching and learning?
 - c. Does the lesson plan include new ways of working, for example involving other students, learning outside school, innovative teaching methods (e.g. inquiry-based learning, collaboration) or new forms of assessment?

How to score?

Score the “Skills” and “Engagement” dimensions from 0 to 3, where:

- 0 = no evidence at all that this dimension is present
- 1 = there is some but no clear evidence that the lesson plan meets the criterion
- 2 = there are concrete statements that show one or more of the elements of the dimension will be achieved
- 3 = the lesson plan fully meets many (if not all) of the elements of the criterion

Example

Example for the 2nd dimension: If the lesson plan includes radically new ways of working and assessment, feels exciting, makes you want to do it, and it brings some inspiration for teachers to use similar innovative tools, you score it 3. However, the lesson plan might be novel, but not include new ways of working, in this case you score it a 2. If the lesson plan mentions collaboration but lacks a lot of detail, and is already fairly widespread score it 1. Only if there really is nothing in the description of the activity that is relevant to the criterion should you not give any score at all.