Subject: Accounting and Finance

Class/ course: Financial Accounting 1

Student numbers: 150 1st year students

Technology: AROPA

Learning Benefits:

- Students practice to critically evaluate work
- Being able to construct their own marking criteria meant that students were better able to understand the meaning behind the comments leading to better learning
- Students were able to observe their own ability to create feedback which can empower them to do the same for future work

Academic staff: Suzanne McCallum

The issue

- To build reading and essay writing skills
- To learn to create performance criteria
- To build evaluative judgement

The method

Students were asked to write essays for the tutorial. They were then allocated three essays – two randomly from their peers and one high-quality essay from the previous year – and were asked to rank and evaluate these by creating their own criteria. After this exercise students were asked to write three self-reviews of their own essay against each of the three allocated essays. These self-reviews were guided by the following reflective questions:

1. What are the differences between this essay and yours?
2. What did you learn from these differences?
3. Overall which essay is better your essay or this one?

For their last review students were also asked to create a complete ranking of essays, what changes they would make to their current essays and what they learned for future work. The essay and self-review were formative.

The results

Students were very successful at identifying all the weaknesses in their work, the number of additional students that fully identified their weaknesses after each self-review is a follows:

	SELF-REVIEW 1	SELF-REVIEW 2	SELF-REVIEW 3	SELF-REVIEW 4	INCOMPLETE MATCH
ADDITIONAL PERCENTAGE	17%	29%	20%	24%	10%
TOTAL PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS	17%	46%	66%	90%	100%

What worked well?

- Students understood very well what the benefits to their learning were, after having been given an explanation, and took the process very seriously.
- Student self-reviews contained a lot of information, including more in-depth information than what the lecturer would have provided in her feedback.
- The process works with large and smaller groups of students.

What could have worked better?

- The technology was created for a more traditional peer-review, so setting up that self-reviews are not sent to the students whose essay is reviewed was difficult.