

One of the advantages of working as a member of a team is that you can all **benefit** from each other's strengths. The purpose of this exercise is to **give recognition** to the contributions that individuals make to the working of a group. In this peer marking exercise, you should:

1. Fill the tables below **individually** to assess the relative contribution of each group member in each category. You should take into consideration **quality** and **effectiveness** of the contributions as well as the **amount of effort spent** throughout the project.
2. Provide a **justification** in the comment box below, using the evaluation criteria provided below. Forms **without** specific written comments will **not** be accepted.

Your peer's final mark should be the sum of the 5 marks in the different categories and will count 20% of the final coursework mark.

**Student Group: 0**

**Assessor URN/Name: Gavin Lotay**

1. Assess the **ideas** and **suggestions** your team members have provided on the research project:

Student's name(s)	Poor 1	Adequate 2	Good 3	Excellent 4	Total
Arnau		X			2
Daniel				X	4

**Criteria:**

Ideas were vague / difficult to understand / adequate/original / clear / informative  
Suggestions were flawed / confusing / constructive / helpful / insightful

2. Assess the **leadership** and **group organisation** skills of your group members:

Student's name(s)	Poor 1	Adequate 2	Good 3	Excellent 4	Total
Arnau	X				1
Daniel				X	4

**Criteria:**

The student was irresponsible / uninterested / unmotivated / responsible / professional / collaborative / inspiring / driven  
The student cannot work with others / was unprofessional / worked with others / was committed / was motivational

3. Assess the **research skills** of your group members:

Student's name(s)	Poor 1	Adequate 2	Good 3	Excellent 4	Total 4
Arnau		X			2
Daniel				X	4

**Criteria:**

The student was not involved in the research / helped develop the research / proposed & developed the group's research question  
The student's contribution to the research project was superfluous / constructive / useful / necessary / key

4. Assess the **report writing skills** of your group members:

Student's name(s)	Poor 1	Adequate 2	Good 3	Excellent 4	Total 4
Arnau				X	4
Daniel			X		3

**Criteria:**

The student contributed little to the report / drafted the report / contributed significantly to the report / wrote the full report  
The student's writing is difficult to follow / confusing / clear / relevant / flawless / perfect

5. Assess the **presentation skills** of your group members

Student's name(s)	Poor 1	Adequate 2	Good 3	Excellent 4	Total 4
Arnau			X		3
Daniel			X		3

**Criteria:**

The student contributed little to the presentation / helped draft the presentation / had a key role in the presentation  
If the student presented the work, the oral delivery was unclear/hesitant/adequate/clear/engaging / fluent  
If the student did not present, the contribution to the presentation was unclear/helpful/significant/key/necessary

Comments on group contributions of Student \_\_Arnau \_\_\_\_\_

*Arnau's suggestions throughout the project were insightful but did not necessarily drive the research project forward. As a matter of fact, Arnau was mostly absent in the group discussions and did not seem particularly motivated at the early stages. His ideas were adequate, but not key to the development of the group's work. Arnau's main contribution to the research project was concentrated on the report, which he singlehandedly drafted in the first instance, delivering an almost final ideal write-up. Arnau was also involved in the presentation: he provided a couple of useful slides, helped at the rehearsal stage and answered questions at the conference at the correct level.*

**Total Mark**  
**2+1+2+4+3 = 12 /20**

Comments on group contributions of Student \_\_Daniel \_\_\_\_\_

*Daniel was a key element in our group. He had the initial ideal on our project and developed it throughout. His suggestions were continuously constructive and clear, and he helped develop the code and the necessary insights to prepare an excellent report. His research contribution was key and helped shape our work. Daniel was involved in the writing of the report after Arnau's first draft and provided all the figures as well as some relevant bibliography. Daniel provided a key contribution to the presentation, organizing the first draft and rehearsing it thoroughly. Unfortunately, his delivery at the Conference was a bit hesitant and he did not explain himself very well – this did not reflect his excellent preparation beforehand.*

**Total Mark**  
**4+4+4+3+3= 18 /20**