

The **purpose** of the peer review is to demonstrate that you can assess your peers objectively in order to help them become better ADSAI professionals. Please record feedback in the form of comments and action points in your learning log to reflect how you are doing and if you have potential areas of improvement!

Final Score

Field	Min	Max	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Variance	Responses	Sum
Score	1.00	4.00	2.25	2.00	1.09	1.19	4	9.00

Your **final score** is **calculated by dividing your Mean score by 7** (amount scored questions = 7). So 5.83/7 = 0.83. People with a modifier above 0.7 can potentially be marked up 1 assessment criteria; e.g. you go from a sufficient to a good for any ILO which is group-assessed. Peers with a modifier below - 0.3 can potentially be marked down for all group deliverables by receiving either a missing or by being marked down by one assessment criteria; e.g. you go from a sufficient to an insufficient for any ILO which is group-assessed. The examinations can move a class/group the modifier threshold up and down with a 0.2 range after examination and peer-review is complete to ensure appropriate assessment.

Your **first assessment** in week 4 counts as a **preliminary grade** to allow the team member to change their behaviour if their team contribution and collaboration are in need of improvement. The **second assessment** in week 8 will count towards your **final grade** and will influence your grade towards group deliverables.

Disclaimer: Note that the peer-review system is an aid for ADS&AI lecturers to determine fair team contributions & collaboration in group projects. **No rights can** therefore **be obtained from** the **final score**. The tool is still under development in terms of software and development, final modifiers for grades will always be awarded using a mixed-method approach where the qualitative input of the two final assessors regarding the quality of the deliverables and observed activity (i.e. on trello, version-control systems such a Github and Datalab behaviour) of a given student of a is the defining factors.

Team Participation



Comment & Feedback - (for in the Learning Log):

Please add a comment if any:

Missed some DataLab sessions but none since we started working together.

You are mostly the one seeing that everyone is available before the group call and you also participate in any group activity

Action points (for in the Learning Log & Sprint Retrospective):


Comment & Feedback - (for in the Learning Log):

Please add a comment if any...

You did well with the preprocessing of the data with Mihai

Action points (for in the Learning Log & Sprint Retrospective):

Professional Behaviour



Comment & Feedback - (for in the Learning Log):

No data found - your filters may be too exclusive!

Action points (for in the Learning Log & Sprint Retrospective):

Team Support




Comment & Feedback - (for in the Learning Log):

Please add a comment if any...

You and Mihai have supported eachoter well when completing ILO 5 and you always support or give me feedback when I ask

Action points (for in the Learning Log & Sprint Retrospective):

Developmental Feedback




Comment & Feedback - (for in the Learning Log):

Please add a comment if any...

When I asked for feedback on the roadmap you suggested making the letter textbox bigger

Action points (for in the Learning Log & Sprint Retrospective):

Role Fulfilment




Comment & Feedback - (for in the Learning Log):

Please add a comment if any...

You did good completing the preprocessing and adding reasoning behind decision

Action points (for in the Learning Log & Sprint Retrospective):

Team Communication



Comment & Feedback - (for in the Learning Log):

Please add a comment if any...

You and Mihai were communicating well from what I have seen but as a team there is room for improvement however the important and most relevant information was shared

Action points (for in the Learning Log & Sprint Retrospective):