Peer and self evaluation form

Computational Modeling
Fall 2008

If you need more room for any of the following questions, feel free to attach another sheet..

1. Please write the name of the person whose book you are reviewing, or "self," and the number of the chapter you are reviewing:

2. Technical execution: did the writer check the text into the repository successfully and on time, and did it compile cleanly?

3. Clarity: is it easy for the reader to understand what is being said, or are there sentences that are ambiguous or confusing?

4. Level of detail: is there enough information to allow the reader to evaluate the technical material, but not too much? Did the writer make good choices about what to include?

5. Organization: is the material presented in a coherent organization? Is the writing concise or repetitive?

6. Correctness: is the work technically sound, or are there errors?

7. Contribution: does the quantity of work presented hear seem consistent with an effective effort given the time available?

8. Presentation: are there spelling and grammatical errors? Does the document look good? If there are figures, are they effective?

9. Enjoyability: did you enjoy reading this chapter?

10. Evidence: does the writer present evidence effectively? Is quantitative information presented clearly and appropriately?

11. Argumentation: does the writer draw conclusions that are supported by evidence?

12. Summative judgment: If you were teaching this class, what grade would you give the work represented by the chapter you read?