##### Appendix 2: Feedback proforma and statement bank

Source: Gibbs, G (1993) *Assessing More Students*. Booklet 4 in the Teaching More Students Project managed by the Oxford Centre for Staff Development, Oxford Brookes University – adapted by the authors of this Framework

**Name Marker**

**Date in Date Back Mark Writer’s Specific Requests for Feedback**

**Rating Scale Excellent**

### Introduction to the Essay

*Interpretation of title and introduction*

***Development of the Essay***

*Logical development Insight and originality*

**Very Satisfactory good**

**Needs some more work**

**Needs much more work**

*Subject relevance Use of sources Use of evidence*

*Understanding of topic Constructive critical analysis* ***Conclusion to the Essay*** *Summary*

*Implications*

***Other Features*** *Presentation of references Legibility*

*Spelling*

*Grammar and Syntax Style*

*Length*

*Overall Presentation*

***Specific features that the marker likes***

Rating definitions could be provided in

the module handbook. Some examples are provided on the following page

Rating definitions could be provided in the module handbook. Some examples are provided on the following page

***Specific features that need more work / specific things that could have been done to get a higher mark***

##### Examples of what the ratings mean: (these could be provided in the module handbook.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Introduction to the Essay -*** *‘Interpretation of title and introduction’* | |
| Excellent/Very good | Introduction shows a sound grasp of the question and provides a  clear outline of the scope of the essay |
| Satisfactory | Introduction rambles and scope of essay not defined. |
| Needs more/much more work | Launches straight in with no attempt to introduce and define the  topic questions may have been misunderstood |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Development of the Essay – ‘****Logical development’* | |
| Excellent/Very good | Develops a logical argument and materials ideas clearly |
| Satisfactory | Could be better organised by sequencing some of the material  more appropriately |
| Needs more/much more work | Fails to develop a clear theme or line of argument |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Development of the Essay –*** *‘Use of sources’* | |
| Excellent/Very good | Critical and wide-range use of relevant literature |
| Satisfactory | Likely sources and material covered |
| Needs more/much more work | Little evidence of supportive reading. Inadequate preparation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Development of the Essay –*** *‘Understanding of topic’* | |
| Excellent/Very good | Well argued. All main issues explored and evaluated and  conclusion justified. |
| Satisfactory | Most main issues explored. Some analysis and critical evaluation |
| Needs more/much more work | Work is descriptive, accepting and/or one-sided with little  analysis or criticism |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Conclusion to the Essay*** | |
| Excellent/Very good | Good concluding section which draws together the various  important points made. |
| Satisfactory | Rather brief and formalised conclusion |
| Needs more/much more work | The essay abruptly and/or simply rephrases the introduction |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Other Features –*** *‘Spelling’* | |
| Excellent/Very good | No problems |
| Satisfactory | A few spelling errors, including greater care required |
| Needs more/much more work | Too many intrusive spelling errors |