Self & Peer Evaluation of Group Work Contributions for Research Papers and Oral Presentations

Shared by: Whitney Scott

Materials needed:
- Syllabus statement announcing that peer evaluations will be used to determine group project scores.
- Self & Peer Evaluation Worksheet (see below)

Learning challenge addressed/predictable outcome:
This should help students understand what is expected of them during group work and to experience the natural consequences when equal contributions are not put forth.

Best used for:
Group projects spanning significant time (e.g., at least several weeks) that must produce/create a final product.

Learning objectives/skills fostered:
This should facilitate student’s interpersonal communication skills, team building, and conflict resolution problem solving.

Tips for implementing:
- It’s important that students know in advance (1) they will be evaluating both themselves and group members and (2) the criteria they will be evaluated upon.
- Students will want to know what you plan to do with the results; be prepared to respond specifically. If you plan to deduct points, what will be your formula for determining deductions?

What to do / how to do it:
Below are two sample evaluation worksheets that are distributed WITH the group project guidelines at the beginning of the semester. One is for a research paper project and the second is for an oral presentation project.
Self & Peer Evaluation for a Research Paper Project

Students are required to evaluate the personal productivity of each group member, including themselves. Rate yourself and your group members on each of the following 6 categories. Total the score for yourself and each of the group members. You may also provide additional comments about group members (or the dynamics of the group) on the back of this paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1. My Name</th>
<th>2. Member’s Name</th>
<th>3. Member’s Name</th>
<th>4. Member’s Name</th>
<th>5. Member’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td><strong>out of 24</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 of paper*  
(total should add up to 100%)

*as we discussed, section 2, the literature review is the most important part of the paper.

---

When our group was collaborating together, this person:
4- Listens to other’s ideas. Gives broad ideas and expands on them or encourages others to do so. Builds on contributions of others.
3- Listens well. Contributes ideas but the ideas do not deepen the discussion rather maintain it at current level.
2- Listens fairly well but interrupts at times. Rarely deepens the discussion.
1- Overbearing. Interrupts. Doesn’t allow discussion of ideas other than own and/or does not listen or contribute.

The way in which this person participated was:
4- Contributes ideas. Actively speaks up. Brainstorms.
3- Contributes some ideas but is mainly passive.
2- Sits passively.
1- Does nothing.

This person was prepared in the following way:
4- Does more than required.
3- Does what committed to do.
2- Does some of what committed to do.
1- Does nothing.

The typical quality of input this person provided was:
4- Provides extensive accurate information to group members.
3- Information is usually accurate and is an adequate amount.
2- Mostly misinforms group or provides little information.
1- Provides group with no useful accurate information.

This person displayed a knowledge of the subject such as:
4- Attends class and demonstrates understanding of relevant topics. Takes good notes.
3- Misses occasional info., but is generally informed about material covered in class and readings.
2- Misses info. often, but knows some class material and readings.
1- Misses class and expects others to inform him/her about material.

They way in which this person communicated was:
4- Reliably communicates progress to group. Reachable and regularly checks messages/email. Talks with others in group.
3- Stays in fairly good touch with the group, but is occasionally difficult to contact.
2- Is unreachable but initiates communication with others occasionally.
1- Is unreachable and does not communicate with group members about the project.

Section 2 of the paper:
What percentage of section 2 of the paper was contributed by this group member? To what extent did they help write this section, help gather research for this section, help discuss how this section should be written and improved, and contribute to the overall quality of this section of the paper? Rate anywhere from 0% to 100%. If everyone contributed equally, then the grand total should equal 100%.

Please write any additional comments on the back of this sheet of paper...→
Sample #2: Group Presentation

Self & Peer Evaluation for a Class Presentation Project

Answer the following questions and submit after your presentation.

Your Name: ____________________________
Presentation Topic: ______________________  Class day/time: __________________________

1) How much **time was spent** meeting as a group outside of class for this presentation?

2) How much time did you **personally spend** on putting this entire presentation together (group meetings & alone)?

3) Did your group **practice the presentation** in actual role-play (not summarizing what you intend to say, but saying it like you plan to actually present it)? If not, what did you do?

4) Did your **group discuss** everyone’s group role tendencies/ways of communicating? Did you discuss an action plan of what you would do if a conflict occurred (if yes, what was your specific plan)?

5) Did everyone **attend** outside meetings? If not, who missed meetings?

6) Did someone **dominate or take-over** the project to the exclusion and detriment of others? If yes, who, how so exactly, why do you think that happened, and what did you do?

7) Did someone **lack critical contributions** to this presentation (you felt they were invisible and did not add anything specific to the project)? If yes, who, how so exactly, why do you think that happened, and what did you do?

8) What were your **specific responsibilities** in putting this presentation together?

9) If your presentation earned an A from the professor’s point of view, who do you think in your group should also receive this A grade? If you don’t think they should get that A, what grade do you think they earned? Use a standard scale from A+, A, A-; B+, B, B-, down to F.

   My grade would be: _______

   Group member’s Name__________________ grade would be: _______

   Group member’s Name__________________ grade would be: _______

10) Is there anything else you want to share?