

Self-appraisal essay rubric

BA 2 · Lecturer: Graham Gill Emerson

Module: Group Process Development 1 (COUN6017) or Group Process Development 2 (COUN6018) —
Module link not confirmed from the source PDF.

Online version: psych-dashboard.duckdns.org/rubrics/self-appraisal-essay

How the marks work

There are 4 criteria. Each one has a weight in marks. The weights add up to 100.

For each criterion, your work is placed in one of five bands. Each band shows the marks for that criterion and what the lecturer is looking for.

Excellent (70-100%)	Excels in this area.
Very Good (60-69%)	Performs in a consistently competent and confident way.
Satisfactory (50-59%)	Performs at an adequate level but has scope for development.
Needs further work (40-49%)	Performs somewhat less than adequately and needs development.
Unsatisfactory (20-39%)	Performs considerably less than adequately and needs development.

CRITERION 1

Quality of insight and awareness

Weight: 30 marks

Excellent 70-100% 21-30 marks	Shows excellent quality of insights and awareness. Shows sophisticated understanding of own patterns and processes. Provides excellent analysis of personal growth and challenges.
Very Good 60-69% 18-20.7 marks	Shows good quality of self-awareness and insight. Shows a good understanding of own patterns and processes and gives a good analysis of personal growth and challenges.
Satisfactory 50-59% 15-17.7 marks	Occasionally struggles with self-awareness and quality of insight. Shows some understanding of own patterns and processes and gives some analysis of growth and challenges. C
Needs further work 40-49% 12-14.7 marks	Frequently struggles with maintaining levels of self-awareness and insights. Shows little understanding of own patterns and processes and gives a poor analysis of growth.
Unsatisfactory 20-39% 6-11.7 marks	Unable to maintain self-awareness or any quality of insights. Unable to show any understanding of personal process.

CRITERION 2**Comprehensiveness of self-awareness**

Weight: 30 marks

Excellent 70–100% 21–30 marks	Excellent comprehensive coverage of significant personal themes. Exhibits deep awareness of impact on others and their impact on self.
Very Good 60–69% 18–20.7 marks	Good coverage of personal themes and strong breadth of self-examination. Good awareness of impact.
Satisfactory 50–59% 15–17.7 marks	Some exploration of themes and patterns. Basic awareness of impact. C
Needs further work 40–49% 12–14.7 marks	Limited coverage of personal themes and patterns. Limited awareness of impact.
Unsatisfactory 20–39% 6–11.7 marks	Insufficient understanding of impact. Inadequate exploration of personal patterns and themes.

CRITERION 3**Match between the content of personal process review, journals and experience in group**

Weight: 30 marks

Excellent 70–100% 21–30 marks	Demonstrates exceptional consistency between review, journal entries and experience in group. Provides rich specific examples from group experience.
Very Good 60–69% 18–20.7 marks	Demonstrates good evidence of consistency between journal, review and experience in group. Gives solid examples from group experiences.
Satisfactory 50–59% 15–17.7 marks	Basic consistency in three components. Some links to examples in group. C
Needs further work 40–49% 12–14.7 marks	Limited consistency between components. Minimal connections.
Unsatisfactory 20–39% 6–11.7 marks	Poor consistency. Inadequate examples.

CRITERION 4**Presentation and writing**

Weight: 10 marks

Excellent 70–100% Not given clearly in source (printed as 7–100) ^A	Exceptional clarity and organisation. Excellent writing style.
Very Good 60–69% 6–6.9 marks	Good organisation and writing style.
Satisfactory 50–59% 5–5.9 marks	Adequate organisation and writing style.
Needs further work 40–49% 4–4.9 marks	Basic organisation. Limited writing style.
Unsatisfactory 20–39% 2–3.9 marks	Poor organisation. Weak writing style.

Notes on the source

Only spelling and typing slips were fixed. Gaps and unclear values in the lecturer's rubric are shown, not guessed.

A. Presentation and writing, Excellent: the lecturer's rubric prints this mark range as “7 – 100”. This may be a typo. Check the range on Canvas or with your lecturer.

C. Criteria 1 to 3, Satisfactory: the number “11.5” also appears beside these mark ranges in the lecturer's rubric. Its meaning is not clear, so it is left out here.

Module. Module link not confirmed from the source PDF. It is linked from both Group Process Development modules.

Typed from the lecturer's rubric (Oct 2026). Check the official copy on Canvas if in doubt.