# **Peer Assessment Rubric**

Activity Title

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Group Member reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Peer Review of Engagement**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Poor** | **Adequate** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| **Participation** | Did not participate in group activity | Minimal participation in group activity | Participation in activity was as expected | Participation was above and beyond expectation |
| **Give Feedback** | Did not give feedback | Gave minimal feedback | Feedback given was as expected | Feedback given was excellent and contributed to group’s success |
| **Input** | Input on ideas was nonexistent | Gave minimal input | Gave expected input for the project | Input contributed to the success of the project |
| **Collaboration** | Did not collaborate with other members | Collaboration was minimal | Collaboration was as expected | Went above and beyond to ensure members of the team are engaged |
| **Receive feedback** | Did not receive feedback well | Had issues with feedback given | Received feedback well and made some changes | Received feedback, reflected on it, and made changes to improve the outcomes |
| **Expectations** | Did not know what was expected of them | Were somewhat familiar with expectations | knew what was expected of them | Knew what was expected of them and acted on those expectations to make improvements |
| **Contribution** | Contribution did not improve other team members outcomes | Contribution was adequate | Contribution was good and improved other members outcomes | Contribution was good, improved others outcomes and encouraged them to excel. |

**Review of Work.**

| **Criteria** | **Adequate** | **Good** | **Excellent** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus on “Global Concerns” (larger structural, logic/reasoning issues) rather than detailed “Local Concerns” (spelling, grammar, formatting)** | Does not identify missing components.  Comments are restricted to spelling, grammar, formatting and general editing. | Identifies most components as present or absent.  One or two global concerns comments on a paper that required more focus there. Major comments are focused at the local concerns/ editing level. | Can identify all components of paper as present or absent. Provides logical and well-reasoned critique. Recognizes logic leaps and missed opportunities to make connections between parts of paper.   Provides a good balance of comments addressing ‘global concerns’ together with minor comments addressing ‘local concerns’ |
| **Thorough constructive critique including a balance\* of positive and negative comments** | Review is entirely positive or negative with little support or reasoning provided. | Good comments, but not balanced as positive and negative or not supported with reasoning | Supports author’s efforts with sincere, encouraging remarks giving them a foundation on which to build for subsequent papers. Critical comments are tactfully written. |
| **Evidence of thorough reading and review of paper** | Comments focused on one or two distinct issues, but not on the overall reasoning and connectedness of all sections in paper. Obvious that reviewer did not read the entire paper or skimmed through to quickly to understand. | Evidence that the reviewer read the entire paper, but did not provide thorough review. | Comments on all parts of paper and connections between paper sections. Comments are clear, specific, and offer suggestions for revision rather than simply labeling a problem. Appropriate comment density demonstrates the reviewer’s investment in peer review, while not overwhelming the writer. |
| **Outlines both general and specific areas that need improvement and provides suggestions** | Review is too general to guide authors revision or too specific to help author on subsequent papers | Provides both general and specific comments but no suggestions on how to improve. | Supplies author with productive comments, both general and specific, for areas of improvement. General comments are those that authors may use in subsequent papers, whereas specific comments pertain to the specific paper topic and assignment. Comments come with suggestions for improvement. |