



Provided by the author(s) and University College Dublin Library in accordance with publisher policies., Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Supporting student learning through collaborative assessment tasks
Authors(s)	Hernandez, M. Rosario
Publication date	2013-06
Publication information	Boyle, C. (ed.). Student Learning: Improving Practice
Publisher	Nova Science
Link to online version	http://www.novapublishers.org/catalog/product_info.php?products_id=42194
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/9726

Downloaded 2019-05-20T10:57:06Z

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



Chapter

SUPPORTING STUDENT LEARNING THROUGH COLLABORATIVE ASSESSMENT TASKS

Rosario Hernández

University College Dublin, Ireland

ABSTRACT

The significance of student learning as a social activity often manifests itself in collaborative learning through interaction and interdependence in higher education contexts. Approaches such as Problem-Based Learning (PBL), task-based learning and project work are examples of collaborative learning.

However, the translation of collaborative learning into collaborative assessment is not always successfully accomplished, and often the collaborative learning approaches are abandoned in favour of 'individual' assessment practices graded by academics; and, even when students are involved in collaborative assessment, their dissatisfaction is often reported in the literature.

This chapter makes a case for student interaction through peer-assessment tasks as a way of supporting collaborative learning. It draws on data collected from students and faculty staff from several higher education institutions in Ireland on the subject of peer assessment.

Discussion of the findings highlights that staff and students, in principle, support collaborative assessment, but its actual implementation seems to be less apparent. It is argued that failure to recognise the potential of collaborative student peer assessment tasks may be due to views of assessment held by faculty staff and by students, and to students not being sufficiently prepared for involvement in collaborative assessment. A number of proposals are suggested and substantiated by practices already implemented by the author, which are intended to move forward the current debate on the topic of collaborative assessment and pedagogical praxis.

Keywords: Collaborative assessment, student learning, student assessment

INTRODUCTION

A shift from a teaching to a learning paradigm (Barr and Tagg, 1995), where the focus is on what the students are learning has taken place in many higher education institutions in the last few decades. A learning paradigm can unfold itself at different levels including the aims of the institution, its program structures or the roles of faculty and students, to name a few. Expressions of this paradigm are at least twofold; first, learning is defined in terms of what students will be able to do (i.e. learning outcomes; Marsh, 2004) and second, it becomes a social activity through interaction and interdependence (Vygotsky, 1978). A curriculum based on learning outcomes has the potential to provide a cohesive structure to the teaching context where students are required to take more responsibility for their learning. This is one of the reasons why outcomes tend to be associated with a student-centred approach to teaching and learning (Biggs, 2003).

Such an approach to teaching and learning entails active participation in the learning process by the students, often in collaboration with one another.

Collaborative learning is becoming a common feature of students' higher education experience (Boud, Cohen, and Sampson, 2006). It epitomises the social constructivist perspective on learning, emphasising the importance of others, including teachers as mediators of learning (Vygotsky, 1978). Collaborative learning requires students to be actively involved in the process of learning from the outset, through Problem Based Learning (PBL), project work and task-based learning. However, collaborative learning, which is often reported as conducive to learning (Bryan, 2006; Hernández, 2007c; McDowell et al., 2005), is not always successfully translated into collaborative assessment. When collaborative assessment is used, an objection is often raised about the allocation of marks to each student on the basis of group work (Bloxham and Boyd, 2007; Falchikov, 2005). Thus, concerns about collaborative assessment often surface in a number of areas including assessment of process versus final product (Orr, 2010) or issues of fairness and free-loading students (Maiden and Perry, 2011; Nordberg, 2008).

These matters could lead to resistance from students and faculty staff to engage in collaborative assessment (Falchikov, 2005; Gibbs, 1999) or lack of support at institutional level (Muldoon and Lee, 2007). As a result, when it comes to assessment, collaborative learning approaches tend to be abandoned in favour of 'individual' assessment practices graded by faculty staff. Even when group work is assessed the involvement of students in its assessment is limited and their dissatisfaction is often reported in the literature. Falchikov argues that "grading is not the most important aspect of involving students in assessment" (2005, p. 167). Sluijsmans, Moerkerke, van Merriënboer, and Dochy, (2001) found that students are not satisfied with awarding grades to their work. Furthermore, Patton (2012) concluded that students are in favour of peer assessment as a formative exercise but are highly critical of it as a summative practice. Shifting the involvement of students to formative aspects of assessment could result in a more positive learning experience for the students than if collaborative assessment focuses on summative activities that involve students in awarding marks to each other's work.

The type of collaborative assessment proposed in this chapter potentially results in deeper individual learning as students actively engage with the comments that they award and receive from fellow students and from faculty staff.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Traditionally, assessment of learning in higher education has been teacher-led. Boud (2007) argued that in the traditional discourse of assessment learners are “passive subjects” with “no other role than to subject themselves to the assessment acts of others, to be measured and classified” (p. 17). Thus, assessment that promotes learner-centred approaches is often problematic because it raises issues of power and control between students and teachers (Savin-Baden, 2004). In the literature on assessment, peer assessment is regarded as particularly relevant to ensure that students are “placed at the centre of assessment, working in partnership with academics to become autonomous and empowered in their learning” (Bain, 2010, p. 25).

The literature on the use of peer assessment suggests that peer assessment generally increases student responsibility for their own learning (McDowell and Sambell, 1999). Sambell, McDowell, and Sambell (2006) argued that reducing the control of the tutor and trusting students to respond to innovative methods of assessment allows students to exercise greater learner autonomy. In addition, MacDonald’s (2011) study concluded that peer assessment is seen positively by students and is perceived to motivate, to facilitate learning, as is a fair method of assessment. Furthermore, peer assessment can enhance students’ confidence and self-esteem (Hernández, 2007a), and is crucial in the development of life-long learning qualities (Brew, 1999; Hernández, 2007a; McDowell and Sambell, 1999). Other benefits include the promotion of critical thinking (Dochy, Segers, and Sluijsmans, 1999), and the reduction of test anxiety (Ioannou and Artino, 2010).

Resistance from students to becoming involved in collaborative assessment is often highlighted in the literature (Falchikov, 2005; McDowell and Sambell, 1999; Sluijsmans et al., 2001). One reason often given by students for such resistance is that they believe that it is the responsibility of the teacher to assess students’ learning (Falchikov, 2005; Patton, 2012). Students’ biases in assessing the work of their peers and their lack of knowledge on how to carry out such tasks are factors often mentioned by teachers as reasons for not involving students in the assessment of their own learning (Falchikov, 2005). However, Sambell et al. claim that often students feel they are “thrown in the deep end” (2006, p. 162) and the provision of structured and guided activities is needed during the early stages of their university studies to support them in the development of peer assessment practices.

In the same way, Segers and Dochy’s study (2001) concludes that despite positive attitudes of students about collaborative assessment, there is a need to develop their skills in this field. McDowell and Sambell (1999) contend that students are in a better position to take control of their learning when they are provided with the criteria that will be used to assess their learning.

However, Price and O’Donovan (2006) demonstrated that defined criteria is not enough to ensure a positive effect on students’ learning unless teachers and learners engage with the criteria in developing a common understanding. Falchikov (2005) also suggests that time be devoted to providing an explanation to the learners about their responsibilities and their role in the process of assessment. In addition to the adequate training and preparation of students for collaborative assessment, Pettigrew, Scholten, and (2011) argue that an alignment between assessment tasks and learning outcomes is essential.

Falchikov (2005) further suggests that faculty staff need to establish communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) to share knowledge and obtain support from colleagues who are already committed to collaborative assessment.

CONTEXT

Collaborative assessment involves the student, their peers and teacher in a critical assessment of student work. While the assessment is done collaboratively, the tasks may have been the result of individual or group work.

This chapter makes a case for student interaction through a variety of assessment tasks as a way of supporting collaborative learning within this new learning paradigm. It addresses the question of how collaborative assessment tasks support learning by developing students' capacity to evaluate the quality of their work.

Two case studies, taken from classroom practices developed by the author's work in a higher education institution illustrate how student learning can be supported through collaborative assessment activities. The case studies will be described later in the chapter. Prior to the case studies, empirical work on peer assessment will be examined in order to understand how to support students through collaborative assessment. This study was carried out during 2007-2008 with faculty staff and undergraduate students from the departments of Hispanic Studies in the seven universities in the Republic of Ireland (Table 1).

METHOD

Influenced by those who promote flexible methods (Robson, 2002) that make use of data in the form of numbers as well as in the form of words, this study is based on quantitative and qualitative data collected from two questionnaires and from interviews. To maintain the anonymity of the institutions, each university has been identified by a letter, e.g. A, B, C, etc.

The faculty staff cohort was drawn from two groups. The larger group comprised of all academic staff from seven departments/sections of Hispanic Studies in the universities who completed a postal questionnaire.

The second group was a sub set of the participants in the questionnaire, either in their capacity as heads of department/section, or as a member of the staff nominated by the head of the department/section. They participated in a semi-structured interview carried out by the author. The student sample was drawn from those individuals who were available and/or willing to participate in the completion of the questionnaire on the day that the researcher visited their university.

Table 1. Number of participants in target sample and the final sample

Group	Target	Final
Faculty	68	41
Heads of subject or nominee	7	7
Students	138	138

For the purpose of analysis, 41 completed surveys from faculty staff were classified with an ID number (S1, S2, ... S41). Interviews were fully transcribed and an ID number was assigned to each interview (I1, I2, ... I7) to preserve the anonymity of the participants and their institutions. Similarly, each student questionnaire was coded according to the university from which it originated (e.g. A, B, C, etc.) and was given an ID number ranging from 1 to 138.

For example (D.84) refers to a reply given by a student from university D, who has been given the ID code 84. Qualitative data were coded into categories using content analysis. Only data connected to collaborative assessment has been utilised in this chapter.

FINDINGS

The findings are structured into two sets. Firstly, quantitative data on the views of faculty staff and students about the involvement of students in collaborative assessment, specifically through peer assessment practices are reported.

The data is from the two surveys completed by the participants (faculty staff and students). The second set of data, which arose from the surveys and from interviews conducted with a sub-group of faculty staff focuses qualitative data related to the views of faculty and students who are in favour or against the involvement of students in peer assessment practices.

Views of Faculty and Students about Student Involvement Peer Assessment Practices: Quantitative Data

A 5-point Likert scale was used to elicit, in general terms, the extent to which peer (collaborative) assessment is used by faculty staff. More than half of the respondents (63.4%) indicated that they '*never*' or '*rarely*' involve students in peer assessment practices (Q. A1.14; Table 2).

To glean an insight from the cohort of students participating in this study on their involvement in tasks related to the assessment of their learning in Hispanic Studies programs, they were asked to indicate the extent to which teachers involve the students in practices that require their engagement in the assessment of the work of their classmates (Q. A6.4). Peer assessment practices reported by the students appear to be more limited than those reported by faculty staff, with 56.5% of students stating that it is '*never*' used and 31.2% reporting that it is '*rarely*' used. The results are displayed in Table 3.

A Likert scale (4-point) was used to request faculty staff to provide further details about the use of specific practices associated with collaborative assessment (Q. A8).

Table 2. Percentage of faculty staff reporting student involvement in peer assessment

Involvement of students in assessment (N= 41)	Never (%)	Rarely (%)	Sometimes (%)	Often (%)	Always (%)
'Peer assessment'	29.3	34.1	19.5	17.1	0

Table 3. Percentage of students reporting their involvement in peer assessment

Involvement of students in assessment (N= 138)	Never (%)	Rarely (%)	Sometimes (%)	Often (%)	Always (%)
'Peer assessment'	56.5	31.2	10.1	2.2	0

Table 4. Percentage of faculty staff reporting student involvement in peer assessment practices

Type of student involvement in peer assessment (N= 41)	Never (%)	Rarely (%)	Sometimes (%)	Frequently (%)
'Orally peer to peer'	80.5	7.3	0	12.2
'Orally in groups'	70.7	2.4	24.4	2.4
'Written peer to a peer'	90.3	2.4	4.0	2.4
'Given written comments in groups'	82.9	4.9	9.8	2.4
'Give a grade to another student'	82.9	4.9	9.8	2.4
'Giving a grade in groups'	87.9	7.3	2.4	2.4

Six options were given: a) 'one student comments orally in class on the work of a classmate', b) 'in groups, students comment orally on the work of a classmate or group work', c) 'a student comments in writing on the work of a classmate', d) 'in groups, students comment in writing on the work of a classmate or group work' e) 'a student provides a grade to the work of another student', f) 'in groups, they give a grade to the work of a classmate or to group work'.

Additionally, there was space for the respondents to include 'other' types of peer assessment practices if the options provided did not cover the peer assessment practices used in their departments/sections. The only peer assessment practice that appears to be used more often comes under category b) when 'students, in small groups comment orally on the work of a classmate or on group work', reported as being used '*frequently*' or '*sometimes*' by one quarter of the respondents (26.8%). Assessing work orally, peer to peer was reported as being used '*frequently*' by 12.2% of the participants. One reply under the 'other' option was 'the whole class or group commenting on the work of a student' (anonymous), which could be incorporated into category b). The full results are displayed in Table 4.

In an attempt to establish what types of peer-assessment practices were used, the same question was included in the survey for students (Q. A8). The same six options provided in the survey for faculty staff appeared on the survey for students. Additionally, there was space for the respondents to include 'other' types of peer assessment practices if the options provided did not cover the peer assessment practices used in their departments/sections.

The results show that the frequencies with which peer-assessment practices are used in the assessment of students' learning are quite low regarding all the options presented to the students. Peer assessment in the form of 'oral comments to a student's work' was reported as being used 'sometimes' and 'frequently' by 8.4% of the respondents and being engaged in 'oral peer assessment in a group' was reported as being used 'sometimes' and 'frequently' by 6.5% of the respondents.

The option to provide 'other' types of activities that entailed peer-assessment was not utilised by any of the students. The results are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5. Percentage of students reporting involvement in assessing work from their classmates

Type of student involvement in peer assessment (N= 138)	Never (%)	Rarely (%)	Sometimes (%)	Frequently (%)
'Orally peer to peer'	87.6	4.3	7.2	0.7
'Orally in groups'	89.8	3.6	6.5	0
'Written peer to peer'	92.7	2.2	4.3	0.7
'Given written comments in groups'	93.8	3.5	1.7	0.7
'Give a grade to another student'	89.8	5.8	3.6	0.7
'Giving a grade in groups'	95.0	2.9	1.4	0.7

Views of Faculty and Students on Student Involvement Peer Assessment Practices: Qualitative Data

Faculty staff and students' views, in favour and against the involvement of students in collaborative assessment, were sought from qualitative data arising from the two surveys and from the interviews conducted with faculty staff. Due to space constraints, only a brief summary of the findings is presented.

In general, faculty staff and students alike were quite favourable to the idea of students being involved in the assessment of their own learning, as demonstrated by 84.2% of faculty staff replying 'yes' to that question (Q. A6) and 52.2% of the students 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' with the idea (Q. A9).

Sample quotations of views in favour of student involvement in the assessment of their learning are presented in Table 6.

Although the majority of faculty staff and students were in favour of the idea of students being involved in the assessment of their own learning, it should be noted that a significant minority of faculty (37.8%) and of students (29.6%) gave reasons against the idea (see summary in Table 7). Only 15.8% of faculty staff were of the opinion that they did not believe that students should be involved in the assessment of their own learning (Q. A6) and 9.4% of students 'disagreed' or 'strongly disagreed' with the statement that 'students should be involved in the assessment of their learning' (Q. A9).

Sample quotations of views against student involvement in the assessment of their learning are presented in Table 7.

DISCUSSION

This study focused on how broadly undergraduate students of Hispanic Studies programs are involved in assessing the work of their peers. The findings show that there is very limited involvement of students in assessment that entails collaboration with their peers.

The six categories given to the participants (faculty staff and students) on different forms of collaborative assessment go from formative practices - orally or in writing form - to the grading of work which in many cases has a summative function.

Table 6. Reasons given by faculty staff and students in favour of the involvement of students in the assessment of their learning

Reason	Sample views from faculty	Sample views from the students
Increases student motivation	“It builds on their motivation and engagement” (S27)	“You are more likely motivated to learn” (C.29) “It could provide more motivation to do well” (F.92)
Fosters students’ awareness of their strengths and limitations	“Students become more aware of issues, be they linguistic or structural” (S8)	“Students can identify mistakes, rectify them and improve” (C.37) “In correcting and reviewing our work, we have to look more closely to find mistakes, which helps us remember them better” (F.95)
Contributes to greater student autonomy and responsibility	“Students take more responsibility for their learning” (S11) “In order to achieve the independent learning of the student” (S32)	
Makes students aware of what is required	“Find this an excellent method of getting students to understand criteria of assessment” (S41)	“It could prove interesting to understand how marks are gained or lost” (C.34)

Table 7. Reasons given by faculty staff and students against the involvement of students in the assessment of their learning

Reason	Sample views from faculty	Sample views from the students
Only faculty are qualified and students don’t have the knowledge	“I believe students are, largely, immature for such assessment” (S1) “Formal assessment is what the lecturer is there to do” (S38)	“It is up to the qualified faculty to assess work (D.64) “Students are neither experts in the language nor experts in assessment. They do not have a knowledge of university requirements” (G.133)
Peer assessment is biased		“Students would be biased towards each others work” (C.31)
Produces classroom anxiety		“If other students are involved, then it can become embarrassing for the student” (C.44)
General reluctance	“Not sure how this could work” (S33) “I have mixed feelings” (S21) “Not in third level education” (S36)	

For the purpose of the author's study, results under categories b) and d) (i.e. students working in groups are engaged in assessing the work of their classmates, see p. 6), are the most relevant because of their formative function. However, it may be appropriate to start by implementing categories a) and c) (i.e. when one student is involved in assessing the work of another peer on a one-to-one basis) so as to build trust among students in how to assess the work of another classmate. Great care needs to be taken in the process of involving learners in their own assessment if it is to be successful. The building of trust among students and between the teacher and the learners (Carless, 2009) is essential to create an atmosphere where collaborative assessment can take place. As suggested in the literature (Hernández, 2007b, 2012; Price and O'Donovan, 2006; Sambell, et al., 2006), the involvement of students in the understanding and development of assessment criteria appears to have a very positive effect in helping them to internalise the criteria which is an essential step towards the involvement of students in the process of collaborative assessment. For further details on how to involve students in the development and understanding of assessment criteria see Hernández (2007b; 2012).

A further analysis of the six categories listed in Table 4 indicates that although the use of collaborative assessment is limited, faculty staff appear to be using collaborative assessment practices with formative functions '*sometimes*' and '*frequently*' in oral (26.8%) or written (12.2%) group activities. This is encouraging as it indicates that faculty staff seem to be aware of the significance of collaborative assessment to support student learning. Data from the students (Table 5) on the other hand, is less conclusive as the involvement of students in collaborative assessment '*sometimes*' and '*frequently*' is very low in each of the categories. Although it is encouraging that collaborative assessment appears to be used somewhat in the context of oral activities, the results from this study suggest that there is still a long way to go before collaborative assessment could be a reality in Hispanic Studies.

From an analysis of the qualitative data, it appears that the majority of faculty staff and students are in favour of students being involved in the assessment of their own learning. Both groups commented that the participation of students in the assessment process makes students more aware of their strengths and limitations and provides a better understanding of the assessment criteria and the standard required of them. These findings concur with those of Hernández (2007b). As indicated above, another reason given by academics in favour of student involvement in assessment is that it increases motivation for learning, contributing to greater responsibility and autonomy on their part for their learning. This supports similar findings by McDowell and Sambell (1999) who reported that peer assessment gave students more responsibility and autonomy to take control of their learning. Students in the present study, however, did not believe that involvement in their assessment significantly enhanced their responsibility or autonomy. However, they reported that their involvement in the assessment process encouraged them to act on the feedback received. The findings suggest that both academics and students recognise the significant benefits of the involvement of students in the process of assessment.

When looking at the views of faculty staff and students against student involvement in collaborative assessment, both groups expressed the opinion that only faculty staff are qualified to assess student learning. In the case of faculty staff, their reluctance to involve students in the assessment process was attributed to a number of factors including a belief that it was not appropriate in third level education to engage students in this practice and were unsure about how it would work, questioning the ability of students to assess their own work.

In line with Sambell et al.'s study (2006), it must be acknowledged that students need training and preparation to successfully participate in collaborative assessment. Students require guided activities to support them in the development of peer assessment during the early stages of their university studies. Students were more explicit in expressing their views against student involvement in collaborative assessment; they perceived peer assessment as biased and that assessing each other would be embarrassing and stressful. The reluctance expressed by faculty staff and students to be involved in peer assessment practices may be the result of tradition and beliefs about how assessment should be approached. These views reinforce the idea of a teacher-led approach to assessment and give faculty staff total control of assessment practices with students being mere recipients of assessment practices decided by their teachers. Although these results are not particularly unique to this study, they demonstrate the need to address faculty staff and students' perceptions about student's ability to assess their work and to provide the necessary steps to facilitate collaborative assessment. Numerous case studies on collaborative assessment in higher education that support this practice can be found in the literature (see for example an edited collection by O'Neill, Huntley-More and Race, 2007 or McDowell et al., 2005). Two case studies in which collaborative assessment is a driver of student learning are described below. They are from the author's experience of teaching in higher education.

COLLABORATIVE ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES: CASE STUDIES

Case Study 1: Assessment of Group Presentations Done in Groups (Orally)

Level 2 students of Spanish (undergraduate students generally take modules at Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3) enrolled in a business language module work in groups to develop a business project. A peer-assessment activity is used earlier in the semester to train students on how to assess oral work presented by the groups working on the project. A set of criteria is agreed upon among the students and the teacher and is used to assess a five-minute oral presentation on one aspect of the group project. There are generally five working groups with four or five students in each group, as the total number of students taking this module ranges between 20 and 25 each year. When all the groups have completed their presentations, which are also video-recorded so that students can obtain a copy of their group presentation, each group is given an opportunity to express their views orally on each of five short presentations delivered. The aim of the exercise is to reflect on how to improve the final presentation of their group at the end of the semester. This activity appears to be a beneficial way of involving students in the assessment of their work in a non-threatening manner. Each group is able to see for themselves the aspects of their presentation that need to be improved (e.g. content, coordination of group work, use of slides, oral skills in Spanish, time management) when they compare their presentation with the presentations given by the other groups. The students perceive this activity positively and they are enthusiastic to provide comments on the presentations. They appear to benefit more from reflecting in groups about their presentation, having seen the presentations of all the groups, than if the teacher tells them the criteria that would be used to assess the presentations of the group projects but are not allowed to apply the criteria on their own work.

Case Study 2: Assessment of Written Texts Done in Groups (Orally and in Written Form)

Undergraduate students of Spanish enrolled in a Level 3 language module complete a written task individually (in Spanish) outside the classroom. Students are requested to submit the stories typed in a Word document format. The teacher removes the names of the students from the texts and gives each story an ID from 1 to 25 (or whatever is the total number of texts submitted). The teacher reads the stories and organises them in six sets - four/five stories in each set - ensuring that in each set there is a mixture of stories whose quality is excellent, good, adequate or poor. Only the teacher knows who the authors of the stories are.

Then, the students are involved in a peer-assessment activity in class. The teacher divides students into six groups and the task of each group is to act as the jury of the stories by agreeing on classifying the stories according to their quality by applying the assessment criteria that has been adopted to assess previous tasks. The teacher ensures that the members of the groups are different from those whose stories are distributed so that none of the stories allocated to them belongs to any member of the group. By doing so, not only is anonymity ensured but it also allows students to engage in the assessment process without being embarrassed by confronting them with the assessment of their own story in a public domain. An amount of class time is allocated to reporting orally from each group. One of the students in each group acts as spokesperson on behalf of the group and he/she has to report to the rest of the class the recommendations of the group. Each group also provides a written report on each story commenting on positive features and providing recommendations to the anonymous author on what could be improved. This peer-assessment activity is non-threatening because the names of the students have been removed from the assignments. Students do not express any fears in providing comments on anonymous assignments (Hernández, 2007c).

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that faculty staff and students seem to be in favour of the idea of involving students in the assessment of their learning. However, both groups reported a limited use of practices where students are involved in the assessment of their learning. The perception by both groups that assessment is something that should be controlled by the experts must be challenged, as there is evidence from the literature that students are capable of assessing their own work if they are provided with the right conditions to do so. The historical tradition of assessment for grading and certification seems to be a barrier in moving towards practices of assessment with greater involvement of students in developing skills to assess the value of their work. Those perceptions suggest that faculty staff need to introduce practices involving collaborative assessment that do not necessarily entail grading for summative purposes; only then may students achieve a greater awareness of their ability to assess their own work and to appreciate its value in enhancing their learning.

Shifting the beliefs of faculty staff and students about the benefits of collaborative assessment will take time. This shift implies sharing power between faculty staff and students, fostering engagement and working towards students taking responsibility for their

own assessment. In addition, preparing students to get involved in the development of assessment criteria, and building student confidence in their ability to assess their work are not easy tasks for faculty staff. Case studies documenting how students can be involved in the process of assessment provide opportunities for faculty staff to familiarise themselves with existing practices in which students are involved in collaborative assessment. Besides, faculty staff that wish to introduce collaborative assessment practices but lack the necessary pedagogical knowledge could participate in workshops that address how to develop collaborative assessment tasks and their implementation. Furthermore, the creation of communities of practice at the departmental/section level would provide the context in which academics could share their practices with each other and encourage others to introduce collaborative assessment practices. Communities of practice have the potential to support faculty staff in the implementation of classroom practices. In addition, communities of practice could provide the context for faculty staff to engage in research activities such as action-based research and/or practitioner enquiry studies that would contribute to institutional change in the areas of pedagogy and in the scholarship of assessment.

REFERENCES

- Bain, J. (2010). Integrating student voice: Assessment for empowerment. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 4(1), 14-29.
- Barr, R. B. and Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 27(6), 13-25.
- Biggs, J. B. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University.
- Bloxham, S. and Boyd, P. (2007). *Developing effective assessment in higher education: A practical guide*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Boud, D. (2007). Reframing assessment as if learning were important. In: D. Boud and N. Falchikov (Eds.), *Rethinking assessment in higher education: Learning for the long term* (pp.14-25). London: Routledge.
- Boud, D., Cohen, R. and Sampson, J. (2006). Peer learning and assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 24(4), 413-426.
- Brew, A. (1999). Towards autonomous assessment: Using self- and peer-assessment. In: S. Brown and A. Glasner (Eds.), *Assessment matters in higher education: Choosing and using diverse approaches* (pp. 159-171). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Bryan, C. (2006). Developing group learning through assessment. In: C. Bryan and K. Clegg (Eds.), *Innovative assessment in higher education* (150-157). London: Routledge.
- Carless, D. (2009). Trust, distrust and their impact on assessment reform. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(1), 79-89.
- Dochy, F., Segers, M. and Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(3), 331-349.
- Falchikov, N. (2005). *Improving assessment through student involvement: Practical solutions for aiding learning in higher and further education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

-
- Gibbs, G (1999). Using assessment strategically to change the way students learn. In: S. Brown and A. Glasner (Eds.), *Assessment matters in higher education: Choosing and using diverse approaches* (pp. 41-53). London: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Hernández, R. (2007a). The impact of innovative assessment practices on students' learning. In: S. Frankland (Ed.), *Enhancing teaching and learning through assessment: Deriving an appropriate model* (pp. 266-278). The Netherlands: Springer.
- Hernández, R. (2007b). Students' engagement in the development of criteria to assess written tasks. *REAP International Online Conference on Assessment Design for Learner Responsibility*, May 29-31. Paper available at: <http://www.reap.ac.uk/reap/reap07/>
- Hernández, R. (2007c). Using peer and self-assessment practices to assess written tasks. In: G. O'Neill, S. Huntley-Moore and P. Race (Eds.), *Case studies of good practices in assessment of student learning in higher education* (pp. 85-89). Dublin: AISHE.
- Hernández, R. (2012). Student engagement in learning-oriented assessment: A case study, *Global Education Review*, 1(2), 76-84.
- Ioannou, A. and Artino, A. R. (2010). Learn more, stress less: Exploring the benefits of collaborative assessment. *College Student Journal*, 44(1), pp. 189-199.
- MacDonald, K. (2011). A reflection on the introduction of a peer and self assessment initiative. *Practice and Evidence of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 6(1), 27-42.
- Maiden, B. and Perry, B. (2011). Dealing with free-riders in assessed group work: Results from a study at a UK university. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(4), 451-464.
- Marsh, C. J. (2004). *Key concepts for understanding curriculum* (3rd ed.). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- McDowell, L., Sambell, K., Bazin, V., Penlington, R., Wakelin, D., Wickes, H., and Smailes, J. (2005). *Assessment for learning: Current practice exemplars from the centre for excellence in teaching and learning, guides for staff*. Newcastle: University of Northumbria at Newcastle.
- McDowell, L. and Sambell, K. (1999). The experience of innovative assessment: Student perspectives. In: S. Brown and A. Glasner (Eds.), *Assessment matters in higher education: Choosing and using diverse approaches* (pp. 71-82). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Muldoon, N. and Lee, C. (2007). Formative and summative assessment and the notion of constructive alignment. In: S. Frankland (Ed.), *Enhancing teaching and learning through assessment: Deriving an appropriate model* (pp. 98-108). The Netherlands: Springer.
- Nordberg, D. (2008). Group projects: more learning? Less fair? A conundrum in assessing postgraduate business education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 481-492.
- O'Neill, G., Huntley-Moore, S. and Race, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Case studies of good practices in assessment of student learning in higher education*. Dublin: AISHE.
- Orr, S. (2010). Collaborating or fighting for the marks? Students' experiences of group work assessment in the creative arts. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(3), 301-313.
- Patton, C. (2012). 'Some kind of weird, evil experiment': Student perceptions of peer assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(6), 719-731.

- Pettigrew, C., Scholten, I. and Gleeson, E. (2011). Using assessment to promote student capabilities. In: T. Barrett and S. Moore (Eds.), *New approaches to problem-based learning: Revitalising your practice in higher education* (pp. 171-186). London: Routledge.
- Price, M. and O'Donovan, M. (2006). Improving performance through enhancing student understanding of criteria and feedback. In: C. Bryan and K. Clegg (Eds.), *Innovative assessment in higher education* (pp. 100-109). London: Routledge.
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sambell, K., McDowell, L. and Sambell, A. (2006). Supporting diverse students: Developing learner autonomy via assessment. In: C. Bryan and K. Clegg (Eds.), *Innovative assessment in higher education* (pp. 158-168). London: Routledge.
- Savin-Baden, M. (2004). Understanding the impact of assessment on students in problem-based learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 41(2), 223-233.
- Segers, M. and Dochy, F. (2001). New assessment forms in problem-based learning: The value-added of students' perspectives. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26 (3), 327-343.
- Sluijsmans, D. M. A., Moerkerke, G., van Merriënboer, J. G., and Dochy, F. J. R. C. (2001). Peer assessment in problem based learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 27, 153-173.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.