Peer Rating Factor

[Felder and Brent, 2001, p. E-11]

A "auto-rating" (peer rating) system designed to account for individual performance in cooperative learning team projects has been developed by Professor Rob Brown at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology and adapted by Richard Felder for team homeworks. Team members confidentially rate how well they and each of their teammates fulfilled their responsibilities, taking the ratings from a prescribed list of nine terms ranging from "excellent" to "no show." The students are cautioned that they are rating only responsibility of performance and not academic ability or percentage contribution to the project. The instructor assigns numerical values to each rating as follows:

Excellent	100
Very good	87.5
Satisfactory	75.0
Ordinary	62.5
Marginal	50.0
Deficient	37.5
Unsatisfactory	25.0
Superficial	12.5
No show	0

and computes a weighting factor for each student as the student's individual average rating divided by the team average of individual ratings. The square root of that number may be used instead if the instructor wishes to give less weight to the peer ratings. The student's final project grade is the product of the weighting factor and the team project grade.

For example, before the first examination, four-member teams have worked cooperatively to solve and document four, weekly homework assignments. A single team solution was provided for each assignment. The members have rotated through the roles of coordinator, recorder, checker, and group process monitor on each assignment. The four homework grades are averaged to give a team project grade. After completing the four team assignments, team members confidentially rate how well they and each of their teammates fulfilled their responsibilities, using the attached form. These verbal ratings are entered as numerical ratings into a spreadsheet table like the following:

Team Homework Project Grade = 80								
Team Member	**Rating 1**	**Rating 2**	**Rating 3**	**Rating 4**	**Indiv. Avg.**	**Team Avg.**	**Adjust Factor**	**Indiv. Grade**
Betty	87.5	87.5	75.0	87.5	84.4	82.0	1.02	82
Carlos	87.5	100	87.5	87.5	90.6	82.0	1.10	88
John	62.5	75.0	50.0	75.0	65.6	82.0	0.80	64
Angela	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	87.5	82.0	1.07	85
Team Peer Rating Average:					82.0			

The adjustment factors are the individual's average divided by the team average of peer ratings. The individual project grade equals the adjustment factor times the team's homework project grade of 80. If this is done three times during a semester, an individual course average for homework can be calculated.

This "peer rating" assessment technique is often questioned for its validity. Common concerns are that individuals will inflate their self-ratings; team members will agree to give everyone identical ratings to avoid conflict; and gender or racial bias and personal dislikes might influence the ratings. Kaufman, Felder, and Fuller [2000] have reported that most of these concerns about peer ratings in cooperative learning are unfounded, with a possible exception being the potential influence of personal prejudice in assigning ratings.

Peer Rating of Team Members

Print Your Name _____ **Team #** _____

Please print the names of all of your team members, INCLUDING YOURSELF, and rate the degree to which each member fulfilled his/her responsibilities in completing Projects 1 to 5. The possible ratings are as follows:

Excellent	Consistently went above and beyond, tutored teammates, carried more than his/her fair share of the load.
Very Good	Consistently did what he/she was supposed to do, very well prepared and cooperative.
Satisfactory	Usually did what he/she was supposed to do, acceptably prepared and cooperative.
Ordinary	Often did what he/she was supposed to do, minimally prepared and cooperative.
Marginal	Sometimes failed to show up or complete assignments, rarely prepared.
Deficient	Often failed to show up or complete assignments, rarely prepared.
Unsatisfactory	Consistently failed to show up or complete assignments, unprepared.
Superficial	Practically no participation.
No Show	No participation at all.

These ratings should reflect each individual's level of participation and effort and sense of responsibility, not his or her academic ability.

Print Name of Team Member	**Rating**
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Your Signature _____ **Date** _____