

Peer Review

- **Contact Person:** Edward F. Gehringer, Dept. of Computer Science, NC State University, efg@ncsu.edu

- **Leaders**
 - a Ikseon "Ike" Choi, Learning, Design, & Technology, U. of Georgia, ichoi@uga.edu
 - b Eric Ford, Bryan School of Business, University of North Carolina-Greensboro, ewford@uncg.edu
 - c Ilya Goldin, Human-Computer Interaction Institute, Carnegie Mellon U., ilyagoldin@gmail.com
 - d Wendy L. Keeney-Kennicutt, Chemistry, Texas A&M, k-keeney@tamu.edu
 - e Jennifer Kidd, Teaching & Learning, Old Dominion U., jkidd@odu.edu
 - f Diane Litman, Computer Science, U. of Pittsburgh, litman@cs.pitt.edu
 - g Joline Morrison, Computer Science, U. of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, morrisjp@uwec.edu
 - h Arlene Russell, Chemistry & Biochemistry, UCLA, russell@chem.ucla.edu
 - i Christian Schunn, Psychology, U. of Pittsburgh, schunn@pitt.edu

- **Focus Area:** As individuals, we focus on several complementary aspects of peer assessment. We will examine how best to connect peer assessment techniques to specific STEM outcomes, e.g., how peer review may be used for learning to think like a scientist. Our members study learning in high-school biology, and college courses in biology, chemistry, physics, and psychology research. They train pre-service STEM teachers to provide more effective formative feedback and summative evaluations through peer reviewing. Others focus on integrating the knowledge and wisdom from the Writing-Across-the-Curriculum community on peer assessment as a tool to teach critical thinking skills, particularly in large classes in STEM disciplines. Three of us work on developing technology-supported assessment and intervention tools that are used primarily in STEM courses. Five of us hold, or have held, a total of 8 different CCLI/TUES grants.

- **Ultimate Goal:** To improve techniques for, and measurably increase the use of, formal and informal peer assessment in STEM courses, for both formative and summative purposes. To improve engagement of STEM students through social dialogue. To bring recognition to peer assessment as an important contributor to STEM learning.

- **Expected Outcomes of PI Forum:**
 - a Develop a list of effective peer-assessment techniques.
 - b Build a community of peer-assessment practitioners
 - c Share data from existing peer-assessment tools
 - d Describe best practices for building peer-assessment rubrics
 - e Connect rubric development to specific STEM outcomes

- f Describe strategies for involving students in the assessment process
- g List benefits of involving students in the assessment process
- h Develop approaches to increase student buy-in to peer assessment.
- i Improve validation efforts. Make students more comfortable with the validity.

- **Meeting Schedule and Topics**

Schedule

Wed., May 29, 3 PM-4:30 PM

Wed., June 12, 3 PM-4:30 PM

Thurs., June 27, 11 AM-12:30 PM

Thurs., July 11, 11 AM-12:30 PM

Wed., July 24, 3 PM-4:30 PM

Thurs., Aug. 8, 11 AM-12:30 PM

Wed., Aug. 21, 3 PM-4:30 PM

Topics

- a Introductions, list our areas of research, ideas for recruiting others
 - b Discuss our personal networks, who we've collaborated with, venues for research funding
 - c Our data: what data we have, how we have analyzed it, how we can share it
 - d Teaching students to provide effective feedback; evidence of rubric effectiveness, how to develop better rubrics
 - e Student interactions: what do they like, dislike, how to increase acceptance
 - f Joint research opportunities, using social media like blogs to continue discussion
- **Desired Participant Characteristics**
 - a Someone who already uses peer assessment, rather than someone who wants to
 - b Someone who seeks to systematically support and/or examine peer assessment, rather than someone who uses it only and is looking to get our input on how to do it better
- **Application process**
 - a Applicant fills out [form](#) about peer-assessment experiences and interest at
 - b We circulate responses to the group by email to our listserv, peer-assess@lists.ncsu.edu
 - c Current members respond "reply all" with votes. First 4 responses carry the decision. A tie vote means we wait until next meeting to discuss.