

**How to improve pupil Self-Assessment
through the use of Peer Work and Mini-
Plenaries**

Luke Eden

1400112

Student Self Evaluation Form

This section repeats in brief the common assessment criteria detailed on previous pages. The *extent* to which these are demonstrated by you determines your mark. Using these criteria, tick the box that best indicates the level of achievement you feel you have achieved with regard to each of them.

Common Assessment Criteria Applied	REFER		D	C	B	A
	OUTRIGHT FAIL	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT
1. Subject Knowledge and Understanding (which includes using research-informed literature and knowledge and understanding of the subject)			X			
2. Intellectual Skills (Analysis)				X		
3. Pedagogic and Professional Applications (Practical Application and Deployment)			X			
4. Key Transferable Skills				X		

PLEASE COMMENT ON AREAS IN WHICH YOU FEEL THAT YOU HAVE PERFORMED WELL

PLEASE COMMENT ON AREAS YOU FEEL THAT YOU NEED TO DEVELOP

I feel like I analysed the data well and gave good arguments to back up the statements. I also think that I reflected well upon the strengths and limitations of the study well.	I think I need to develop my referencing as I could have used more relevant literature and more accurately referenced them. I also think I need to develop my writing up of the lesson study as I feel it was too descriptive.
--	--

Aims Focus and Purpose of the Research

“The idea that self-assessment has the potential to raise performance was one from Paul Black and Dylan Williams. (1998a, 1998b) cited by Weeden, Winter and Broadfoot (2002). The aim and purpose of the research is to investigate the effectiveness of self-assessments in foundation phase classes. The topic chosen to research was ‘how to improve pupils’ self-assessment through the use of peer interaction.’ We will use the information we have gathered to draw up conclusions and answer the research question. We believe that pupils self-assessment could be made more accurate through the use of peer work. We also believe that mini-plenaries, used alongside peer work, may help to improve pupils self-assessment as it gives the pupils a chance to look through their peers work at different times during the lesson, seeing what they need to do from looking at their peers work.

Research Context

The research took place in two large schools in West Wales. Both of the lessons were in foundation phase; one in a reception class with twenty-five pupils, and one in a year one class with 27 pupils. In both of our classes, my research partner and I noticed a trend when pupils were completing their self-assessment following the lesson. we found that pupils were not always fully considering their learning when completing their self-assessment and they were not giving a true reflection. In one class, the pupils were given three faces (a smiley face they could colour green, an okay face they would colour orange and a sad face they would colour red). The pupils would often just colour the smiley face green and say “easy peasy” when asked how they found the work. However, they had not met the success criteria and struggled with the work. Also, in the other school, the pupils would need to colour in a character in relation to how they found the lesson. however, the issue that was found with this strategy was that pupils would choose the character simply on the basis of who the character was. For example, one of the characters to choose from was Ben 10; some of the

pupils would choose Ben 10 to replicate how they found the work. Whereas the pupils were choosing Ben 10 because they liked that particular character or he was their favourite. Therefore, my partner and I decided that we would use peer work to get the pupils to really think about their work and choose a character or colour a face based on whether they have achieved the success criteria or not.

Review of Literature

Daudelin (1996) is quoted saying “reflection is the process of stepping back from an experience to ponder, carefully and persistently, its meaning to the self through the development of inferences: learning is the creation of meaning from past or current events that serves as a guide for future behaviour.” This quote is interesting as it provides an explanation of reflection whilst also giving a viewpoint on the use of reflection and assessment. It shows how they are important within learning and progressing whilst learning. This quote will lend itself to the study by acting as a starting point on understanding the thought process when performing reflection upon work.

I have researched this theory further by reviewing relevant literature. I have looked at books, journal articles and other pieces of literature related to the research topic. MacBeath and Swaffield (2005) argued that self-assessment is something that schools “do themselves, by themselves, for themselves”. This shows that schools believe that self-assessment is an effective tool for improving pupil independence and improving pupils understanding of their work. However, self-assessment may not always be the most effective tool for improving pupils understanding of work. In young classes (such as Reception and Year 1), self-assessment may not always be accurate as the pupils do not always understand fully the use of self-assessment. Jones (2005) argues that it is essential that all learners in a group understand what they are trying to achieve in a given task and why they are doing it. Although this focuses on pupil understanding of the purpose of the task and what is needed to be achieved, it also relates to pupils understanding of their self-assessment and whether they have achieved the success criteria.

Although dated, the premise is still relevant, Towler and Broadfoot (2002) argue that if children take responsibilities for recording and assessing their work, it gives teachers a chance to talk to them about their self-assessment and they are able to check their understanding of their self-assessment.

Lewis (1984) believes that “self-help” groups, participants are able to discuss work with each other and give feedback to their peers. This was a premise for the study being conducted as we believed that pupils working together would help them as they could have different viewpoints and show their peers what they need to do. This is also backed up by the work of

Northcliffe et al (2003) who states that "Peer assessment promotes a more complex cyclical model of learning, involving three interrelated processes (learning, assessment and feedback) and carried out by a group of people (students) with multiple roles." They also believed that, in principle, pupils learn from both roles as an assessor and being assessed themselves. This is an interesting point as it is often missed, the opportunity for students to learn through assessing other pieces of work as it is not often done. especially with pupils of such a young age, such as the participants who will be taking part in our study.

The National Foundation for Education (NFER) believes that if pupils have assessed the work of others, they will then find it easier to see where they have made mistakes or have weaknesses in their work and will be able to improve themselves. This idea backs up the premise of our study and what my partner and I were looking to achieve from the study. We also believed that by using peer work, the pupils would be able to see good and bad points from their peers' work which they can then transfer to their own and they can accurately self-assess their work.

By reading all of this literature, we were able to decide on a question to ask and a purpose for the study. We found that there was some literature which supported the use of peer work to improve pupils' self-assessment. However, there was also some literature which did not support the use of peer work to improve pupils understanding of their self-assessment. Liu (2005) conducted a study which asked the participants to fill out a questionnaire on peer assessment. Some of the responses given in the survey consisted of a negative view on peer assessment. For example, some of the participants questioned the reliability of peer assessment. This is an interesting point as peer assessment is not always reliable and reliability is often difficult to judge.

Before conducting the study, all of the literature that was looked at was taken into consideration and shaped the outline of the study.

Methodology

The methodology my partner and I chose to use for the study was a lesson study, this is a form of action research. Action research often involves participants as researchers. (Mukherji & Albon, 2015). In this instance, my research partner and I were both participants, as we were teaching lessons, and we were also conducting research. Kumar (2014: 159) states that "action research is designed to improve practice or deal with a problem or issue." In this case, we are seeking to improve the participants understanding and use of self-assessment by using peer work and mini-plenaries. Kemmis and McTaggart (2000: 595) describe it as "participatory research. The authors state that action research involves a spiral of self-reflective cycles of: Planning a change, Acting and observing the process and

consequences of the change, reflecting on these processes and consequences and then re-planning, acting and observing, reflecting, and so on ...”

The methods used for data collection were observation notes and interviews. We chose these research methods as the data being collected was qualitative. Mukherji and Albon (2015) believe that observations suit the collecting of qualitative data. Interviews also suit qualitative data collection as you are able to gain information from the participants. There are differing types of interviews; structured, semi-structured and unstructured. As we were looking for qualitative data we chose to use semi-structured interviews. Cannold (2001) referred to semi-structured interviews as ‘structured conversations’ this is interesting as it shows that semi-structured interviews can be seen as more of an informal conversation. I believe that this will put the participant at ease and they will not feel as under pressure. We also chose semi-structured interviews as it allowed us to ask the questions we wanted to receive the answers and response we wanted. However, it did also allow for some leeway with answers and questions such as extra questions depending on the answers given by the participants. We also decided to use non-participant observations. This would allow for the non-participant observer to watch and listen to what the pupils were doing and saying. It also allowed the observer to ask questions of the participants during the lesson to further check their understanding and try to gain important information to answer the question and

The reflections were captured using an ARC. My partner and I each completed an ARC following on from the lessons we taught. Within these we reflected upon our lessons and spoke about the strengths and limitations of our lessons which we would try to rectify if we were to undertake this study again. The reflection and awareness of the strengths and limitations also helped us to analyse the data as it would help to explain any anomalies and allowed us to give some context to our findings. Furthermore, it allowed us to improve from one lesson to the next by reflecting upon what we had done and then we sought to improve upon it.

The data was collected using notes made on pre-made observational schedule sheets (see appendix 1). The observation sheets consist of questions which facilitate the notes taken and things to look out for. They also include an involvement scale which is based on the Leuven scale of involvement (see appendix 2). This method was chosen as we believed that it was best suited for the study that was taking place and for the type of data that was being recorded. The non-participant observations were recorded using a pre-created observation sheet as we felt that we needed to create our own questions and key points to look for during the study. The school iPads were used to record the interviews, in the interest of data

protection and participant anonymity, these recordings were then transcribed with no names used and the recordings were then deleted.

The focus group were selected based on their ability. As the pupils were of such a young age, high ability participants were needed. This was because it allowed the pupils to fully understand what was being asked of them and also being capable of giving the desired responses. This decision is backed by Mukherji and Albon (2015) who make the point that when choosing a sample, if you are working in an early years setting, the decision will often already be made for you. As is the case with the study we conducted. The limitation of selecting the ability of the pupils participating in the study was that the results could be seen as biased and would not give a true reflection of the impact it could have on the whole class. That being said, we decided that choosing the ability of the participants and only undertaking the research with that group was the correct decision as the participants were of such a young age. We also chose to use small groups as we believe that they would best suit the collection of qualitative data. We believed that when collecting qualitative data, as explained by the name of the data, it is about quality, not quantity. Therefore, we used a small number of participants so that we could get a good depth of data from each participant with a good amount of information. Whereas, if we had used a larger group, we would have a larger amount of data, however it would not be in a great amount of detail.

“Reflection on observation can be used to evaluate the quality of the observational record” Papatheodorou & Luff (2013). After the lessons, we analysed the data by comparing it to the relevant literature discussed previously in the assignment. We then compared what we found during the study to the literature and based our findings upon that. Papatheodorou & Luff (2013) also continue to discuss the need for the observer to consider whether the record of the observation and the observation notes give enough detail to be able to address the aims of the objectives. In response to this idea, I decided that the observation notes I had written may not have been in enough detail. Therefore, I made sure that the following lesson and observation was recorded in enough detail and recorded the important information so that the correct data is collected.

Ethical Considerations

When undertaking the study, there were many ethical issues which needed to be considered and addressed. These ethical issues include the right to withdrawal, protection of data and participant consent, as well as parental consent due to their young age. To ensure that these ethical issues were addressed, we needed to complete an ethics form which then needed to be signed off by an ethics committee within the University. Within the ethics form, the issues previously mentioned were highlighted and addressed. For the completion of the ethics form

there were different guidelines which were followed to ensure the form was completed accurately and thoroughly, also to ensure that the lesson study was completely ethical and followed the guidelines provided. The ethical guidelines we followed were: BERA (2011), EWC Code of Professional Conduct and Practice for Registrants with the Educational Workforce Council (2017) and our Universities ethical guidelines.

To ensure that parental consent was gained my partner and I each sent out letters to the pupils within the two classes. These consent forms were then brought back in to the teachers when signed by the parents. Then, to gain the consent of the participants, we created a consent form which was child friendly (see appendix 4). Also, when giving the consent form to the participants we explained what it meant and was for (due to their young age). We also reassured them that they did not need to complete the form and agree to participating in the study. Furthermore, the participants were also told that at any time during the study that they were free to leave and say that they did not feel comfortable to participate any longer and there would be no repercussions, as well as their work or any data collected on them would not be used in the study.

In terms of anonymity, the participants and parents of the participants were assured that no names would be used and this would remain the case throughout the entirety of the study. Furthermore, the name of the schools used for the study were also kept anonymous throughout the duration of the study.

Lesson 1

The first lesson took place within one of the large schools and the lesson consisted of the pupils having to complete a table following on from their visit to a local farm. The pupils were also all given success criteria regarding the lesson. the pupils were then told to use the success criteria throughout the lesson to make sure they stayed on task and to ensure that they were doing what was asked of them. Then, at various intervals during the lesson, the lesson would be stopped and a mini-plenary would take place where the pupils would discuss with their partner about the success criteria and whether they had completed each section of it. The pupils would look through each other's work and tick off the checkpoints on the success criteria.

Throughout the lesson, I was observing the four participants and listening to their conversations about the work and the success criteria. I listened to what the participants were saying about their work and success criteria and I also asked the participants questions about their success criteria to check their understanding. The participants were able to respond to the questions asked and explained what they understood about the lesson, the success criteria and their self-assessment. The participants were sat in their pairs and were

on different sides of the classroom, therefore I needed to move myself around the class to listen to the two pairs. The pairs were given the success criteria and had a sheet on their table to remind them of the success criteria during the lesson. the success criteria sheet also worked as a checklist for the participants to tick off what they had completed. This allowed the participants to see what needed to be done and, in their pairs, they could check their work against the success criteria. It also gave their partner a chance to see what they had done and what they had missed. These were looked at during the mini plenaries which took place every ten minutes.

At the end of the lesson, the pupils were asked to self-assess their work. To do this there were four different areas of the class marked out by the teacher. These four areas each contained a Mr. Men character, each representing a feeling towards their work. The pupils would need to go to the area they feel best represented how they felt about their work. As the non-participant observer, I took it upon myself to ask the participants why they chose the area they chose.

After the lesson had finished, the interview was undertaken. During the interview, the four participants were asked questions about the lesson and about their self-assessment. The interview was recorded using an iPad and was later transcribed. The pupils gave their opinions on self-assessment and the lesson that took place. The interviewer ensured that the participants were aware of all of the ethical issues which had been taken into consideration and reminded of their rights during the study.

Following the lesson, we discussed, in our pair, what we think went well and what we could improve upon. We both agreed that the lesson was, overall, a success as the pupils were able to follow the success criteria to complete the task. One of the positives was that the pupils understood what was required of them and were able to do so without too much support. We decided that we needed to improve the pupils' communication with their partners as we found that this was a limitation for the study. We decided that we needed to make sure that the participants were talking to their partner and that they were discussing their work. This would be put into place in the second lesson to improve the quality of the lesson and the quality of the study.

Lesson 2

The second lesson took place within a reception class and the topic for the second lesson was to make an Easter card. The pupils were split into four groups, one with the class teacher, a group for each of the two teaching assistants and a group with myself. The pupils were read out the success criteria as they were not able to read it themselves. They were told what they needed to include in their Easter card to complete the success criteria. The

pupils within my group were put into pairs and they would make their Easter cards, they would then work with their partner and discuss whether they had completed each of the success criteria points. To do this I would ask the pupils to look at their partners work and I would then ask them if they had done a certain success criteria point. If they had completed it, then they would tick it off, if they had not then their partner would tell them that they would need to complete it. The non-participant observer again sat with the group and observed how the pupils were engaged and whether they understood what was required from them. They also asked the participants questions about their work and the success criteria to further check their understanding.

After the lesson, I asked the pupils how they felt about the lesson and how they feel they did in regards to completing what was asked of them. The pupils gave me their self-assessment (RAG rating) and when I asked them why they gave me the RAG rating they did they were able to refer to their work and what they had done in relation to what was asked of them.

Then, I gathered the four pupils who were chosen to participate in the study to conduct a semi-structured interview. For the interview I had set out a selection of questions which were linked to self-assessment and what they had been doing during the lessons. During the interview the participants were reminded of the ethical considerations of the study. They were first asked to confirm that they agreed to participating in the study, to which they all agreed. I then reminded the participants that they were free to leave the interview at any time and were also free to withdraw from the study completely. Furthermore, I informed them that were they to withdraw from the study, none of the evidence and data they had provided would be used and would be deleted. As well as this, I reassured the participants that they would remain anonymous for the entirety of the study and no names would be used for them or for the school.

Findings and Conclusions

From the research, my research partner and I were able to gain a good amount of qualitative data which can be discussed in relation to the relevant literature. The qualitative data that was collected was also able to be used to answer the question posed at the beginning of the study.

The data collected from the two different sources (observations and focus group interviews) was able to answer the question and supported the hypothesis my partner and I came up with before the start of the study. For the study we posed the question 'can self-assessment be improved through the use of partner work and mini-plenaries'. From the data collected and answers given by the participants in both classes we were able to gain an opinion on whether the question was answered and whether our hypothesis was confirmed.

During the first lesson, the participants were observed based upon their involvement using the Lueven scale of involvement and they were also observed on how they interacted with their partner, mainly looking at what was said between the partners regarding the work. From the first lesson a lot of crucial data was found from both the observations and the interviews undertaken.

From the first lesson, the pupils appeared to be engaged in their work and were aware of the steps needed to achieve the task they needed to complete. This was due to the teacher going through the success criteria before setting the pupils to do their work. Then, when the pupils were set the task they would work in their pairs to complete the task by constantly looking through the success criteria and checking whether they had hit certain points or not. This is backed up by the work of Towler and Broadfoot (2002), as previously mentioned, who believed that pupils who are engaged in peer-assessment will then use the steps given to their partner on their own work. They will also see what their partner have done with their work and will then add it to their own work. There was, however, one participant who did not seem as engaged in the work as the other three participants and became slightly distracted during the lesson. However, when the teacher engaged with the pupil and asked them about the lesson and the success criteria, the pupil was able to respond and showed a good understanding of what was required of them during the lesson.

We did find, however, that the use of mini plenaries helped the pupils understanding of what was required from them during the lesson. This was a positive from the lesson as it confirmed what we had predicted before the lesson and showed that we had achieved what we had set out to. Furthermore, we found that the mini plenaries also helped the pupils to understand their self-assessment and gave them a better understanding of why they self-assess their work. Referring back to Jones (2005) who argued that pupils need to understand what they are trying to achieve in the lesson to be able to self-assess their work. This was again shown at the end and after the lesson had finished. At the end of the lesson, the pupils were asked to self-assess their work by walking to an area of the room with a different Mr. Men character in each area. Each Mr. Men character represented a different level. Interestingly, the four pupils all went to the same area. The area they chose was to show that they were quite happy with their work. Then, when the pupils were asked by the non-participant observer why they had chosen that particular area of the class they said it was because they were quite happy with their work but could do better. When further questioned on why they were quite happy but could do better, the participants were able to refer back to the success criteria and they all explained that they had chosen that area based upon how much of the success criteria they had completed.

After the lesson, during the interview, the participants were asked a set of questions about the lesson. The participants were asked whether it helped for them to be working with a partner in relation to their success criteria and why. Two of the four participants believed that it did help them because they could talk about what they had done well and what they needed to do. Whereas the two other participants argued that it did not help them as they felt that they got distracted and they prefer to work on their own.

At the end of the first lesson we discussed what went well and what did not go so well during the study. We agreed that the pupils did understand the success criteria and were able to complete the task by checking the success criteria and making sure everything was completed. However, we found that the participants were not engaged in much discussion and did not talk about their success criteria to each other much unless they were prompted to. Therefore, we decided that in the next lesson we would make sure that the participants were talking to each other throughout the study. To do this we decided that we would ask more questions and reinforce the need for the pupils to talk to their partner about their work.

In the second lesson, we slightly changed the methods of the study following on from the discussion we had after the first lesson. We made sure that the participants were constantly asked questions and encouraged to talk with their partners. This was down to both the age of the pupils (meaning that they could not read the success criteria) and because this was something we picked up on from the first lesson which needed to happen more to gain a larger amount of credible data.

From the non-participant observation, we could see that, from the beginning, the pupils were finding it hard to stay focused on the task. However, this was mainly down to the fact that the lesson was fairly unorganised and it took a while to get the pupils to focus. Although, once the pupils were given their instructions and knew what they had to do, they worked well and were able to do what was asked of them. In comparison to the first lesson, the pupils were not able to follow the success criteria to the same level as their predecessors.

However, my partner and I believed that this was due to the pupils being a year younger and not producing the reading skills of the same level. When the pupils were told what was required of them, however, they were able to work well and completed most of the success criteria. When it came to the pupils needing to assess their work during the mini plenaries

During the interview the participants were asked a set of questions related to the lesson and the tasks we set for them. The participants were asked why they self-assessed their work. Participant A responded saying that it shows if their work was “easy-peasy, a little bit difficult or really hard”. This shows that the participants had a good basic understanding of self-assessment and why it was used. From that, the participants were then asked why they

thought it would help the teacher if they self-assessed their work. Participant A again answered by saying that if they found something hard then the teacher could make it easier for them next time. This shows that the participants had a basic understanding of their self-assessment and why it was important.

The participants were then asked whether working with their partner helped them with their work and if it helped them to understand what they needed to do. Child A stated that the lesson was “easy-peasy” because they had a partner. When asked why that made it easier participant A said that it was because their partner was able to show them what they had done and what they had not done. I believe that this is a point which supports the premise of this study and gives one participants viewpoint to give an answer to the question posed. This viewpoint was also held by Child D as they believed that working with a partner made it easier because if they did not have a partner they would not know where to tick. However, as previously mentioned, this view was not shared by all of the participants. Child C argued that they did not find it easier working with a partner. When asked why, they said that they do not get distracted when they’re on their own. This is a viewpoint which opposes the hypothesis posed before the study. This is supported by some of the participants of Liu’s study (2005) who also did not enjoy peer assessing.

We found that during the two lessons the pupils had varying levels of engagement moved up and down the Leuven scale of involvement throughout the course of the lesson. my partner and I were aware of the change in involvement and found that the participants became involved when prompted (by either their peer or the teacher), however they then lost concentration when not in discussion with either.

Recommendations

If I were to undertake a study again there would be many things that I would keep the same and also many things I would change. As referenced in the ARC, I believe that my partner and I were able to gain some good data from the methods we used. The observations allowed us to listen to the participants and get an insight into how they found the work and how they felt about their self-assessment. The observations also meant that we were able to see how the mini plenaries and partner work affected the participants understanding of their self-assessment. The interviews were also a positive aspect of the study as we were able to ask some good questions which allowed us to collect some good data which helped to come to an overall decision of whether the study was successful or not and whether the question and premise posed at the beginning of the study was confirmed. Some changes I would make if I were to perform this study again would be, firstly, to make the success criteria sheets more child friendly (especially regarding the second lesson as the pupils were

younger). This would allow the pupils to work in their pairs without too much help from the teacher, making the results more accurate as it is a true reflection of the participants understanding.

Appendices

1.

Time of observation: 9.40

	Focus Areas	Comments
Child A H	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ✓ <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	- referred to work well with some prompts from teacher. - was able to read through success criteria and tell the teacher what they had done. - Preferred working on their own, found it easier.
Child B	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	
Child C	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	
Child D	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	

Time of observation: 9.45

	Focus Areas	Comments
Child A A	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	- IS able to recognise what they are yet to do and what needs to be done
Child B L	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ✓ <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	- Discussed with their partner on what they have done. - Shown on their work where they have done it. - Liked working together, can see where you are in your work.
Child C	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	
Child D	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	

Time of observation: 9:50

	Focus Areas	Comments
Child A	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	- knew where to look for each success criteria point - understood what they needed to do next.
Child B	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	
Child C M	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ✓ ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ✓ Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	- knew where to look for each success criteria point - understood what they needed to do next. - was able to follow success criteria - Happy with work as they nearly hit all the success criteria
Child D	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	- knew why they self-assess

Time of observation: 10:00

	Focus Areas	Comments
Child A	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	
Child B	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	
Child C	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	
Child D N	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ✓ ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ✓ <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	- was able to show some understanding of what needed to be done and where the work was. - was sometimes quiet and partner answered - was happy as they nearly hit all the success criteria - referred to Mr. Men + RAG rating

- Liked working in a pair to talk about it
- Preferred working on their own
- sees limitations with self-assessment

Time of observation: 9:20.

28.08.18

	Focus Areas	Comments
Child A glasses	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? Leuven Scale of engagement: with activity 1 2 3 4 5	folding his card, working solitary. Not engaged in task.
Child B boy 2	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	not engaged in activity drawing on another piece of paper.
Child C blonde	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	Engaged in task. what steps do we need. "stick + cut eggs"
Child D brunette	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☐ Have they justified their understanding? Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	~~Engag~~ slightly engaged. happy she finished her work.

Time of observation: 9.30 First time they had

	Focus Areas	Comments
Child A	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☒ X ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☒ ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☒ X ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ☒ X Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	Seen criteria looked at partner work.
Child B	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☒ X ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☒ ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☒ X ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ☒ X Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	Teacher Structured Success criteria
Child C	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☒ X ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☒ ✓ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☒ X ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ☒ X Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	answered questions modelled by teacher
Child D	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☒ ✓ when modelled by teacher ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☒ ✓ when modelled by teacher ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☒ X ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ☒ X Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	Understood criteria when modelled.

Time of observation:

	Focus Areas	Comments
Child A	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☒ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☒ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☒ ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ☒ <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	Not engaged. When teacher modelled they answered.
glades Child B	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☒ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☒ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☒ ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ☒ <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	Disengaged. Did look at work when modelled by teacher.
boy 2 Child C	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☒ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☒ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☒ ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ☒ <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	Engaged in task noted she needed decorations. When asked he knew what the success criteria.
blonde Child D	☐ Are they engaged in discussion? ☒ ☐ Have they referred to their work? ☒ ☐ Have they referred to their learning intention? ☒ ☐ Have they justified their understanding? ☒ <u>Leuven Scale of engagement:</u> 1 2 3 4 5	Engaged in task.

understood when modelled by teacher. But not interacting with peer.

Time of observation:

	Focus Areas	Comments
Child A glasses	○ Are they engaged in discussion? ✓ ○ Have they referred to their work? x ○ Have they referred to their learning intention? → teacher led ○ Have they justified their understanding? x Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	when Teacher modelled they understood criteria
Child B boy	○ Are they engaged in discussion? x ○ Have they referred to their work? x ○ Have they referred to their learning intention? ✓ ○ Have they justified their understanding? x Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	→ able to read some of the success criteria.
Child C blonde	○ Are they engaged in discussion? - ○ Have they referred to their work? ✓ ○ Have they referred to their learning intention? ✓ ○ Have they justified their understanding? ✓ Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	→ showed where her name was
Child D brunette	○ Are they engaged in discussion? x ○ Have they referred to their work? ✓ ○ Have they referred to their learning intention? x ○ Have they justified their understanding? x Leuven Scale of engagement: 1 2 3 4 5	Was able to point out if they had done the task with support.

2. interview Transcription

I: Is everyone okay to be recorded?

All: Yes

I: Also, if you don't want to do this anymore after we finish, you can tell Miss and then Miss can tell me and what you say will not be used. I've already told your mums and dads this with the letter sent home. Also, if you want to stop at any time then we can stop and you can leave and what you say won't be used. Is that okay?

All: Yes

I: Firstly, why do you self-assess? Why do you colour faces?

Child A: To show if its *easy peasy*, a little bit difficult or really hard.

I: So the teacher can know?

Child A: Yes, and if you found something hard you can try something easier.

I: What if you found something easy?

Child A: You could keep doing it or try something harder.

Child B: You can do a challenge like making 100p.

I: What did you the lesson today?

All: It was *easy peasy*

I: why was it *easy peasy*?

Child B: Because I did everything.

I: On the sheets I gave you, why do you think we used those?

Child C: Because if we didn't do something we could do it again.

I: *Child A* why do you think it was *easy peasy* today?

Child A: Because we had a partner.

I: How did that help you? Why did it make it easier?

Child C: I'd find it easier on my own

I: Why?

Child C: So I don't get distracted

Child A: It was easier because our partner could show us what we've done and what we haven't done.

I: How can your partner help you?

Child B: They can say we haven't done stuff yet.

I: Did you think it helped working in a pair?

Child A: Yes

Child C: No

I: *Child D* do you think it helped?

Child D: Yeah

I: Why?

Child D: We could do it quicker

I: Was it easier with the checklist working in a pair?

Child D: Yes.

I: Why?

Child D: It would be harder if we didn't have a partner it would be harder because we wouldn't know where to tick.

Reference List

Black, P & William, D. (1998) *Assessment and Classroom Learning*. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice. 5(1)

BERA, (2011) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. London: BERA

Cannold, L. (2001) 'Interviewing Adults', in G. McNaughton, S. Rolfe and I. Siraj-Blatchford (eds) *Doing Early Childhood Research: International Perspectives on Theory and Practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

EWC Code of Professional Conduct and Practice for Registrants with the Educational Workforce Council (2017)

Jones, C, A. (2005) *Assessment for Learning*.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 567-607). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kumar, R. (2014) *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*, 4th edition. London: Sage.

Lewis, R. (1984) *How to Help Learners Assess Their Progress*. London: CET

Liu, N. F. (2005) Hong Kong academics' and students' perceptions of assessment purposes and practices. (Learning Oriented Assessment Project report, Hong Kong Institute of Education).

MacBeath, J. & Swaffield, S. (2005) *Researching Leadership For Learning in Seven Countries (The Carpe Vitam Project)*. Education Research and Perspectives, Vol. 32, No. 2,

Mukherji, P & Albon, D. (2015) *Research Methods in Early Childhood: An Introductory Guide*. London. SAGE.

NFER <https://www.nfer.ac.uk/pdf/getting-to-grips-with-assessment-4.pdf>

Nortcliffe, A.L., S. Featherstone, R. Garrick and G. Swift (2003) Supplemental instruction a higher level learning? In: Aung, W., M. Hoffmann, R. W. King, W. J. Ng and L. M. S. Ruiz

(eds.) Engineering education and research – 2002: A Chronicle of Worldwide Innovations, iNEER: Arlington, VA., 30

Papatheodorou & Luff (2013) *Child Observation for Learning and Research*. New York: Routledge.

Towler & Broadfoot (2002) *Self-Assessment in the Primary School*. Educational Review. 54(2).

Weeden, P, Winter, J. & Broadfoot, P. (2002) *Assessment*. Psychology Press

Wood Daudelin, MW. (1996). Learning from Experience through reflection. Organisational Dynamics, 36-48.