

# Comparative overview

Teacher & platform	Process	Unit of work being assessed	Frequency	Assessment purpose	Level of reciprocity	Purpose of PA	Context/ tool/ environment promotes
Jaclyn Stewart <b>ComPAIR</b>	Flexible, rubric provided by teacher (as simple as “which is better” or more detailed)	Assignment (written work, file uploads - including media files)	I used 1 x per course, many use it more frequently	Summative for a “Choice Project”. Often used formatively	Flexible. I had students assess three pairs of others’ work. 1-to-1 or 1-to-group	Peer learning, encourage students to think about their “audience”, reduce instructor grading load	Value of multiple sources of feedback; practice applying criteria to a piece of work→ leading to better understanding of standards
Michael Dugdale <b>Peerceptiv</b>	Highly structured (rubric provided by teacher)	lab report (large)	~ 3 times / semester	Formative	individual accountability Nx(1-1) (assess others) + ~Nx1 (receive feedback from others)	Promote epistemic growth in science.	Trust in the practices/ standards of the community (b/c of the anonymity of comments)
Alice Cherestes & Chloe Garzon (TA) <b>Visual Classroom</b>	Loosely structured & scaffolded (rubric emerges from students)	problem sets (small)	Weekly	Formative	High collective accountability  Individual to individual & Many to individual	Increase peer to peer learning (increase & improve peer feedback)	Trust in the peers (group) & the value of peers’ feedback/ knowledge (increase epistemic belief)
Anna-Liisa Aunio <b>Google doc (Span)</b>	Loosely structured	Semester long project (large)	3 x times/ project	Formative	Group-to-group and back again Negotiation; accountability	Peer learning; Revision before final submission	Multiple sources of feedback that are sometimes conflicting; Trust peers in course and group; Constructive feedback from peers and responses from students