

PEER REVIEW YOUR FELLOW DUO'S

Use Moskal (2000) scoring rubric to peer-review your colleagues' work.

PART ONE - ACADEMIC STYLE AND ARGUMENTATION

Asses the academic style of writing, referencing and argumentation skills on the basis of the following points:

- The structure of the text (is the text well-organized?)
- The transitions between the various parts of the text
- The use of professional / academic language
- The graphics support the reasoning in the text
- The style of writing is concise and grammatically correct
- The style of references (APA style)

Comments for improving Academic Style:

(maximum 200 words)

PART TWO - CONTENT

Assess the quality of the analysis of the country planning system, policies and practices on the basis of the following points:

The description of the Institutional Design framework.

The characterization / positioning of the planning issue.

The identification of the stakeholders identified and their roles in the planning process.

The use of social and spatial concepts to critically reflect on the planning issue at stake.

The positioning of the planning issue within de Roo 'nine cells model' (2018).

A critical reflection on the positioning of the planning issue in de Roo's (2018) 'nine cells model'.

The examples provided to illustrate the Institutional Design of the planning issue.

Comments for improving the content:

(maximum 400 words)

PART THREE – FINAL SCORE

Grade from 1 (insufficient) – 7 (very good) the overall quality of the work. You can use the guideline provided below.

7 – Very good

The content is clear, well-structured and organized. It is easy to understand the writer's argumentation and examples are given to illustrate them. Several references are provided to support discussion.

5 – Good

The content is clear, easy to understand and organized. It is easy to understand the writer's argumentation and some examples are given to illustrate them. References are provided to support discussion.

3 – Sufficient

The content is difficult to understand. Writer's arguments are fuzzy and few examples are given to illustrate them. Few references are provided to support discussion.

1 – Insufficient

The content is hard to understand. Writer's present little to no arguments. The content is only descriptive and no critical reflection is made. Few/no examples are given to illustrate them. No references are provided to support discussion.

Comments for overall improvement:

(maximum 100 words)