

Peer Evaluation/Assessment Guidelines

The peer assessment/evaluation process is an opportunity for you to indicate how other members in your team have performed in the project based on the **quantity and quality of their input**. You will need to provide a score for each team member based on the criteria described in the table below. The score for each evaluation criterion ranges from 1 – 5. **Extreme scores (1 and 5) will need to be justified with comments as they are reserved for extraordinary events (lack of participation or going above and beyond, respectively).**

Rating Scale 1 - Did not contribute in this way 2 - Willing but not very successful 3 - Average 4 - Above Average 5 - Outstanding				
Evaluation Criteria	Team member: Abdulrahman Alhashmi	Team member: Jose Torres	Team member: Rebecca Jones	Team member: Tasnika Goorhoo
Attends group meetings regularly and arrives on time.	5	3	5	4
Contributes meaningfully to group discussions.	4	3	5	5
Completes group assignments on time.	5	5	5	4
Prepares work in a quality manner.	4	4	5	5
Demonstrates a cooperative and supportive attitude.	5	4	5	5
Contributes significantly to the success of the project.	4	4	5	5

Peer Evaluation/Assessment Guidelines

As an example, let's look at a group with 4 members: Yourself, Ann, Daya and Chris. You would need to score Ann, Daya and Chris, as show below:

Tutor View

The tutor will collate the total from each criterion for each student:

Evaluation Criteria	Team Member 1: Ann	Team Member 2: Daya	Team Member 3: Chris
Attends team meetings regularly and arrives on time.	5	4	1
Contributes meaningfully to team discussions.	5	3	1
Completes team assignments on time.	4	3	2
Prepares work in a quality manner.	5	3	3
Demonstrates a cooperative and supportive attitude.	4	2	1
Contributes significantly to the success of the project.	4	3	2
Individual Totals	27	18	10
Average of individual totals	18		

Peer Evaluation/Assessment Guidelines

Peer assessment factor = (individual total) / (average total)

So, the final scores each team member is calculated as follows (this will be calculated by the tutor)

Final scores will be reviewed by the tutor prior to release.

	Ann	Daya	Chris
Project Score	60	60	60
Average of Individual Marks	27	18	10
Calculation	$60 * (27/18)$	$60 * (18/18)$	$60 * (10/18)$
Final score	90	60	33

PEER EVALUATION REPORT

Comments for Abdulrahman Alhashmi:

Abdulrahman consistently attended meetings on time, including our first session on August 9th, though he initially faced some minor connection issues with WhatsApp. He contributed meaningfully to discussions, though his input was often prompted when tagged rather than volunteered. As regression lead, he completed his section within the agreed four-day timeframe, delivering work of good quality with only minor lapses. He demonstrated a cooperative and supportive attitude, responding positively when asked for assistance. Overall, his contributions were above average and valuable to the success of the project, though not at the level of outstanding as they sometimes required prompting.

Comments for Jose Torres:

Jose joined the WhatsApp group a little later than others and, due to the time difference in Mexico City, his attendance at meetings was less consistent and often delayed, which made his participation average in this area. His contributions to discussions were also limited and usually made after prompting, sometimes with delayed responses. However, as clustering lead, he completed his assigned tasks within the agreed timeframe and produced work of good quality, above average though not outstanding. He showed a cooperative and supportive attitude when engaged and responded positively when needed, though his involvement was less proactive. Overall, his role was valuable to the project, particularly in delivering his assigned section on time, but his engagement was generally average to above average rather than exceptional.

Comments for Rebecca Jones:

Rebecca consistently attended meetings early and on time,

and even took initiative by starting calls when needed. On the one occasion she could not attend, she informed the group well in advance. She contributed meaningfully and proactively to discussions without needing prompting, which made her input especially valuable. As EDA lead, she completed her tasks within the agreed four-day timeframe, producing high-quality work including detailed visualisations and a well-structured appendix. She was receptive to feedback and promptly revised her work when asked. Rebecca demonstrated strong cooperation and support throughout, and her timely completion of EDA set the pace for the rest of the team to align and deliver on time. Overall, her contributions were outstanding, and she significantly shaped the success of the project.

Comments for Tasnika Goorhoo:

Tasnika attended meetings regularly and was generally punctual, giving notice when she could not attend. She contributed meaningfully to group discussions, often picking up on small but important details to strengthen the project. As visualisation lead, she produced timely, well-structured, and high-quality outputs that were essential for the project, and she also supported with references and fine-tuning the document for clarity and word count. Although one task required an extra day, her work remained of a high standard. She consistently demonstrated a cooperative and supportive attitude, encouraging the team and giving her best throughout. Overall, Tasnika was a very positive and valuable teammate whose contributions significantly improved the success of the project.