

# Educational Design Analysis Instrument

## Citation for published version (APA):

Kasch, J., Van Rosmalen, P., & Kalz, M. (2017). *Educational Design Analysis Instrument*.

## Document status and date:

Published: 09/10/2017

## Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

## Document license:

CC BY-SA

## Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

## General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

<https://www.ou.nl/taverne-agreement>

## Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

[pure-support@ou.nl](mailto:pure-support@ou.nl)

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Downloaded from <https://research.ou.nl/> on date: 05 Feb. 2021

Open Universiteit  
[www.ou.nl](http://www.ou.nl)





# Educational Design Analysis Instrument

Julia Kasch, Peter van Rosmalen, Marco Kalz  
Open Universiteit Heerlen  
9 oktober 2017

# Peer-feedback ontwerp richtlijnen

Peer-feedback design recommendations	Examples
Clarity: regarding instructions, expectations and tools	Students need clear instructions on what they are expected to do, how and why. If tools such as a rubric are used students should understand how to interpret and use them.
Practice	Students need the opportunity to practice with feedback tools such as a rubric beforehand.
Exemplars	Exemplars make expectations clear and provide transparency.
Alignment	Peer-feedback activities should be aligned with the course content to make them valuable for students.
Sequencing	Guide students through the peer-feedback process by sequence the activities from simple to complex.

Table 1. Provides a short overview of common peer-feedback design recommendations in face-to-face higher education

## A Typology of peer-feedback in (Open) Online Education

<i>Design variable</i>	<i>Variable content</i>
Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Peer-feedback as a skill and learning goal of the course</li> </ul>
Allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Automatic, random</li> <li>- Automatic, algorithm</li> <li>- Teacher choice</li> <li>- Student choice</li> </ul>
Constellation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Individual students provide each other with feedback</li> <li>- Individuals within a group of 3-4 students provide each other with feedback</li> <li>- A group provides another group feedback</li> <li>- Student only</li> <li>- Student &amp; teacher feedback</li> </ul>
Choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Peer-feedback activity is voluntarily</li> <li>- Peer-feedback activity is mandatory</li> </ul>
Integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Peer-feedback activity on course level</li> <li>- Peer-feedback activity on task level</li> </ul>
Learning Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Formative feedback</li> <li>- Summative feedback/score</li> <li>- both</li> </ul>
Loop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complete loop (receiving/providing feedback, improvement based on feedback, feedback on improvement/reaction to feedback)</li> <li>- Incomplete (receiving/providing feedback)</li> </ul>
Mode	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Written feedback</li> <li>- Video feedback</li> <li>- Combination of modes</li> </ul>
Privacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anonymous</li> <li>- Public</li> </ul>
Training	<p>Focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feedback Content (do's &amp; dont's)</li> <li>- Feedback Perception (fairness, reliability, usefulness, validity)</li> <li>- Feedback Provider (nature of feedback, usefulness, qualification)</li> <li>- Feedback Receiver (using feedback, reacting to feedback)</li> <li>- Teacher (introducing peer-feedback)</li> </ul>
Tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rubric</li> </ul>

# Educational Scalability Analysis Instrument

48 items:

- 16 gesloten vragen
- 18 open vragen
- 14 mixed

**Waarom?**

- Weinig/geen kwalitatieve analyse instrumenten
- **Peer-feedback is een skill – een doel op zichzelf!**

# Type & complexiteit leeractiviteiten

**Q7. The set of learning activities provided in the UoL operate and are assessed at the complexity level (indicate the highest level applicable):**

*Choose one of the following answers*

- Knows (score 1) The student demonstrates factual knowledge
- Knows how (score 2) The student demonstrates knowledge application. Shows that (s)he understands the material
- Shows how (score 3) The student demonstrates learning. Shows that (s)he can apply knowledge and skills within a defined context
- Does (score 4) The student performs in practice. Shows that (s)he can apply knowledge and skills in (related) real world problems that are ill-structured

**Comments:**



# Uitgebreidheid & type

**Q18. The peer-feedback is specific and explains and elaborates on weak and strong points:**  
*Choose one of the following answers*

- Very little (score 1)
- Somehow (score 2)
- Much (score 3)
- Very much (score 4)

***Additional information regarding item 18:***

Very little (score 1) = Feedback simply indicates whether the answer is strong **or** weak or correct **or** incorrect by providing a score or a check mark/cross

Somehow (score 2) = Same as score 1 but additionally provides a short explanation why the feedback is either correct **or** incorrect.

Much (score 3) = Same as score 2 but provides an explanation for why the answer is correct (strong) **and** why it is incorrect (weak)

Very much (score 4) = same as score 3 but additionally provides information on how the answer could be improved

# Rollen, verwachtingen & instructie

**Q16. The peer-feedback role of the student in this UoL is clearly explained i.e. when, how it matches with the assignment and with what criteria:**

*Choose one of the following answers*

- Very little (score 1) The design does not give information on what, to whom, when, how and with what criteria the students have to provide peer-feedback.
- Somehow (score 2) The design gives some information on what, to whom, when, how and with what criteria the students have to provide peer-feedback. However, not everything is communicated clearly.
- Much (score 3) The design communicates the criteria of score 2 clearly and might also mention how the students should apply/use the peer-feedback.
- Very much (score 4) The design has met the previous listed criteria of score 3 but also provides students with a training about how to provide peer-feedback.



# Rollen, verwachtingen & instructie

**Q17. Detail question: Students know with what goal they have to provide peer-feedback:**

*Choose one of the following answers*

- Very little (score 1) The goals for giving peer-feedback are not mentioned.
- Somehow (score 2) The goals for providing peer-feedback are vaguely mentioned. There is room for interpretation.
- Much (score 3) The goals for providing peer-feedback are clearly mentioned and explained.
- Very much (score 4) The goals for providing peer-feedback are clearly mentioned, explained and supported by an example.

# Training

**Q19. Detail question: The student gets prepared/trained to give peer-feedback:**

*Check any that apply*

via guidelines on how to use the tool

via an instruction video

via a training in how to formulate formative feedback

other

the students get not prepared

# Training

## QUESTION 1 (1/1 point)

Below you see the student's description of the focus of the marine litter case. How would you label the quality level of the student's description?:

"The focuses of the case is on recycling discarded flipflops as handcrafted artwork to help the marine ecosystem and sharpen the locals environmentalism"

- Low: The focus of the marine litter case is not (correctly) described
- Average: The focus of the marine litter case is described ✓
- High: The focus of the marine litter case is described and explained in terms of the DPSIR elements

### EXPLANATION

The student describes the focus of the case but does not explain it in terms of the DPSIR elements. A correct answer would be: This case is focusing on the responses by setting up a campaign that recycles discarded flip flops. Handcrafted artwork, toys, fashion items etc. are made out of these flip flops and sold all over the world and create a lot of awareness. By recycling the washed up flip flops the beaches in that area are kept clean and there is less plastic in the ocean ('State'). Sea animals are less exposed to swallowing plastic too ('Impact').



# Vragen?