

**Heriot Watt University**  
 Department of Economics  
 School of Management & Languages

Assessment Sheet

Microeconomics 1 (C21AA1/C21OA1)

Student Name:						Time Penalty:
Essay Number:						<b>Grade:</b>
<b>Itemised Rating Scale</b>						
<b>Presentation</b>	Excellent	VG	Good	Poor	VP	
Legible						Untidy
Well Structured						Difficult to Read
Clear Diagrams						Poor Diagrams
Stayed Within Word Limit						Exceed Limit
No Repetition						Repetition of Points
<b>Content</b>						
Answered Question						Failed to Answer Question
Focused on Question						Irrelevant Discussion
Good Explanation						Poor Explanation
Sufficient Detail						Insufficient Detail
<b>Sources</b>						
Correct Citation of References						Incorrect Ref.
Adequate Acknowledgement of Sources						Inadequate Ack.

Comment

**Tutor:**



**Date:**

**Course/Assignment:**

**Tutor:**

**Author:**

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Weak</b>	<b>Very Weak</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Development of Essay</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Validity of Argument</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Insight and originality</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Subject Relevance</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Use of sources</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Use of illustrations/analysis</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Conclusion</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Demonstrated Understanding</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Spelling, Grammar, Syntax</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Overall Presentation</b>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Strengths of Essay</b>					
<b>Weaknesses of Essay</b>					
<b>Other comments</b>					

**University of Glasgow - Department of Economics**  
**COURSEWORK FEEDBACK FORM**

**Course:**

**Due date:**

**Matric #:**

**Mark:**

Late penalty:

**Final Mark:**

*(with penalty deducted where appropriate)*

**Ratings**

*Please Note: These ratings should be read and interpreted in conjunction with the Honours descriptors as set out in the Department's Undergraduate Handbook.*

**Structure, Approach and Argument**

Essay focuses on question set


Essay has little relevance to question

Key points are identified

Essay rambles and lacks continuity

Topic covered in depth

Superficial treatment of topic

Coherent and appropriate analysis

Lacking in coherent analytical content

Critical evaluation

Uncritical account

**Use of Diagrams and/or Algebra where appropriate**

Accurate


Poor, inaccurate

Used effectively

Weak or absent

Clearly explained

Inadequately explained

**Sources and their use**

Good knowledge of literature


Insufficient use of literature

Uses representative evidence

Inadequate use of evidence

Correct citations

Citations incorrect or missing

**Style and presentation**

Fluent writing


Clumsy expression

Succinct

Unnecessarily repetitive

Well organised and presented

Untidy, careless and messy

**Comments:**

## Peer Assessment Feedback Form ISC 2003/4

Completed By \_\_\_\_\_ about \_\_\_\_\_

Please complete the following table about one of your group collaborators. The mark awarded should be a whole number between 0 and 20. The forms will be collected during the first revision class.

Worth 20	Mark	Justification for mark	Worth 0
<b>Regular attendance at group meetings</b>			
Attended all meetings, stayed to agreed end, working within timescale, active and attentive, prepared to be flexible about meeting times			Missed several, most of meetings, always or often late, left early, digressed, giggled, day-dreamed or gossiped most of the time
<b>Contribution of ideas for the task</b>			
Thought about the topic in advance of the meeting, provided workable ideas which were taken up by the group, built on others' suggestions, and were prepared to test out ideas on the group rather than keep quiet			Didn't come prepared. Didn't contribute any ideas. Tended to reject others' ideas rather than build on them
<b>Researching, analysing and preparing material for the task</b>			
Did what you said would do, brought materials, did an equal share of the research and helped to analyse and evaluate the material			Did no research. Didn't do what promised to do. Didn't manage workload. Didn't get involved with the task and allowed others to provide all the material
<b>Contribution to the cooperative group process</b>			
Left personal differences outside the group, willing to review group progress and tackle conflict in the group, took on different roles as needed, kept group on track, willing and flexible but focused on the task			Did not take initiative, waited to be told what to do. Always took the same role (leader, joker etc) regardless of circumstances, created conflict, and was not prepared to review group processes
<b>Supporting and encouraging group members</b>			
Keen to listen to others, encouraged participation, enabled a collaborative learning environment, sensitive to issues affecting group members, supported group members with special needs			Sought only to complete the task, spoke over others and ignored their opinions, kept ideas and resources to themselves. Insensitive to individuals' needs and did not contribute to the learning process
<b>Practical contribution to end product</b>			
Willing to try new things. Not hogging the tasks, made a high level of contribution, took own initiative, was reliable and produced a high standard work/presentation			Not willing to take on any task, did not take any responsibilities, was unreliable so others felt the need to keep checking up, and made a limited, poor quality contribution
<b>Total =</b>			

Adapted from Heathfield M, 1999

