



Good peer review practice should:



REQUIRE EXPLANATIONS FOR REVIEWS

Require well-reasoned explanations for feedback reviews (not just marks)

To what extent are students required to explain and elaborate on the multiple reasons for their peer review judgements?

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

Viewpoints Project funded by the



Require explanations for reviews

S	W
O	T

- Ask students for written rationale for their reviews rather than single word answers or grades.
- State the kind of rationale that you would like to see – critical justifications for the review, suggestions for improvement – and state the length of response you would like to see (e.g. 'in a few sentences comment on...').
- Ask for constructive commentaries (e.g. how the rationale might be improved, suggest an alternative approach, provide a summary of the text), rather than critical or damaging commentaries (e.g. identify what is wrong with this work).
- _____
- Consider the use of different audiences (e.g. a board of directors, an editorial committee).
- Ensure that explanations tap into disciplinary thinking skills (e.g. focus on the quality of the design in engineering, the solution pathway in mathematics and the quality of the decision in business).
- Review commentaries could be produced by groups or by individuals so as to encourage more thoughtful responses and to enrich dialogue.
- 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