



Good peer review practice should:



# GIVE PRACTICE IN HOLISTIC APPRAISALS

Give practice in making both holistic as well as analytic appraisals

*To what extent are students given practice in making holistic and analytic judgements about the quality of the work of their peers?*

Produced by Professor David Nicol as part of the PEER Toolkit project funded by the JISC

Viewpoints Project funded by the



## Give practice in holistic appraisals

S	W
O	T

- Ask students to provide written comments referring to the work as a whole, for example, to summarise the main argument, to state the hidden assumptions, to identify and comment on what is the 'centre of gravity' in a piece of work.
- Ask students to compare and rank the work of a number of peers from best to weakest and to provide a justification for their ranking.
- Get students to make a 'reader response' to the peer work, i.e. a non-judgemental response saying what they liked about the peer text and where it felt less convincing. They should still try to provide explanations for their views.
- A similar approach is to get student reviewers to feed back to the peer (the writer) information about what the text made them think as it was being read (a reader response perspective). Such information will help the peer see how different readers respond to their writing.
- Students could also illustrate directly from the peer text something that was convincing and something less convincing with reasons for each.
- Invent your own ideas and practices.
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

Produced by Professor David Nicol as part of the PEER Toolkit project funded by the JISC

[viewpoints.ulster.ac.uk/resources](http://viewpoints.ulster.ac.uk/resources)