Peer review is a valuable learning activity that can help build student understanding of subject content and assessment activities. Giving and receiving feedback engages students in critical thinking and reflection within a structured framework.

PRAZE is a tool that manages the process of collating and distributing student work for the purposes of peer review. PRAZE can also be used to anonymously review the participation of individual team members in a group activity.

The stages of a peer review process

1. Students submit a document to the assignment.
   Each document is allocated to one or more other students (and / or staff) for review. Reviews are anonymous and may be randomly allocated, or you can select rules to govern the allocation of reviews based on classes (e.g. tutorial classes), groups (e.g. small teams of students) or topics (e.g. different essays).

2. Students review their assigned document(s) using an online form (which staff create within PRAZE).

3. Students read the reviews of their own work.

4. Students may also be given the opportunity to send feedback to their reviewer(s) and read feedback of their reviews.

Note: There is a timeline for each of the review activities: submission, allocation to reviewers, collection of reviews, feedback to reviewer(s) and feedback on reviews.

Things to consider

Before setting up a PRAZE assignment you should think about how you want students to use the tool.

What type of assignment should I use?

If you have one class of students all doing the same topic then the simplest assignment type Random Pairing will allow you to distribute work randomly amongst all students.

If your subject is arranged into classes (e.g. tutorials) or if students are working in small groups you may want to choose if students review work from outside their class or group. Similarly, if students are offered several topics, you will need to consider whether they can review work for the same topic. The Structured Pairing assignment type allows you to set rules that can manage both of these scenarios.

If students will be reviewing their team members participation in a group activity (e.g. laboratory experiment or group assignment), then the Team Member Rating assignment type should be selected.

How many, who and when?

How many reviews each student will complete?
Will staff be one of the reviewers?
Will students give feedback to their reviewers?
How long will students have to complete each stage and what period will there be between the stages? The pairing process within PRAZE means that if students miss a date they may not be included in the distribution for the next stage. PRAZE allows a grace period to be added after the published close date if desired. A grace period may also be added between the students’
submission close date and when the reviews open in order to generate and check the distribution of reviews.

A typical timeline might be:

- 2 weeks for students to submit their documents
- 3 days for staff to generate and check the distribution
- 1 week for students and staff to write and submit reviews
- 3 days for students to send feedback to their reviewers

**What level of guidance is needed for students to complete a review?**

PRAZE allows you to create customised forms to be used by students to write reviews and give feedback to reviewers. The structure and content of the form will have significant impact on how students write their review and feedback.

The Student Peer Review site [http://peerreview.cis.unimelb.edu.au](http://peerreview.cis.unimelb.edu.au) contains many useful resources for staff and students including:

- Examples of review forms from different discipline areas.
- Student resources explaining how to write, receive and act on reviews.
- Explanation of the rationale behind peer reviewing.
- Examples of helpful and unhelpful reviews.
- Discussion on constructive yet critical comments.

**Where do I go now?**


Please report any errors or omissions in this guide to lms-guides@lists.unimelb.edu.au
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