

Subject: Question and response concerning peer assessment in Project P2
From: "Dr. Stephen Batill" <batill@nd.edu>
Date: Wed, 16 Sep 2009 11:03:16 -0400
To: "AME30362-01-FA09@acadlist.nd.edu" <AME30362-01-FA09@acadlist.nd.edu>

To All:

The following, very important question was submitted to me.

"In regards to the peer assessment, while I feel that it is a good idea to analyze my group and my individual performance, I have some worries about effectively assessing all the members in my group. As with many of the groups, we subdivided our group into two different teams for each robot and although we have met all together, it has only been briefly. As such, I feel that I am not in a good position to effectively assess the other small group participants. If I were to complete the peer review, I would tend to analyze the group members I worked with directly and most likely give the other group members more negative reviews as compared to the others, simply for my lack of experience with them."

It is very important for you to provide fair and accurate peer assessments, as I know you too would like to be treated fairly. In the other group projects, the groups will be small enough for this not to be a problem, but for P2, depending upon how your group is organized, it could be a noted.

My suggestion to you is to provide the nominal/average value of "5" for individuals who were in the other subgroup (i.e. those with whom you did not interact and have no first-hand knowledge of their efforts or contribution. Obviously you might know if they did not attend the whole-group meetings but if you don't have first-hand knowledge of their performance in the other areas, I believe it best to give them an average rating. Thus an individual's performance will primarily be affected by those with whom they had direct interactions - the members of their subgroup. I might suggest that if you do that in your assessment, that you add something like -NR - after their name to indicate they were effectively not rated.

I hope this will allow you practice in making peer evaluations while at the same time allowing for the recognition of those who are more effective in their efforts without adversely influencing those who you didn't work with.

If you have any other questions on this issue, let me know.

S. Batill

--

Stephen M. Batill, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana
46556
USA

Office: 360 Fitzpatrick Hall of Engineering
Phone: 574-631-0601
Fax: 574-631-6855
email: batill@nd.edu