**Group: PAGE IT: Paula Haddad, Ian Sigmon, Akio Akazawa, Glenn Plant, Taoying Vollstedt, Ethan Crawford**

**Individual Appraisal Process – December 9, 2008**

Each group member rates every other member, round-robin, using the table seen in the enclosed individual results report. Individual rankings are tabulated and divided by the total number of rating points given to the entire team to get a percentage. This percentage is multiplied by 600 to determine the final point allotment. Group members do not rank themselves.

**Group ratings and rewards:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Member** | **Feedback** | **Overall rating** | **Points** |
| Akio Akazawa | * It was good having Akio in class, but he missed a lot and wasn’t able to contribute very heavily. * Don’t be afraid to interrupt the group if you can’t get a word-in. * Akio did good work when he attended classes and group meetings, but missed a lot of key classes during the quarter | 120/200 | 71 |
| Ethan Crawford | * Responsible, reliable * Tendency to take over conversations/projects to the exclusion of the other group members, try to keep all members involved * Ethan had the best work ethic of our group and turned out consistently good work | 195/200 | 116 |
| Paula Haddad | * Funny * Nice work * Tendency to take over conversations/projects to the exclusion of the other group members, try to keep all members involved * Paula was a pleasure to work with. She kept the group grounded when we were a bit too silly and participated well in group discussions. | 189/200 | 112 |
| Glenn Plant | * Nice work * Nice shirts | 186/200 | 111 |
| Ian Sigmon | * Nice work * Ian missed a few classes but overall did a good job | 170/200 | 101 |
| Lou Vollstedt | * Needs to be more assertive * Lou had difficulty participating in group discussions. However, when she was able to get her ideas across, they were often good. | 148/200 | 89 |

**Group Rating Detailed Chart:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Group Member** | Akio | Ethan | Paula | Glenn | Ian | Lou | **Peer Rating Totals** |
| **Grader** | **Metric** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Akio | Effort | 0 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 33 |
|  | Quality of Work | 0 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 31 |
|  | Participation | 0 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 28 |
|  | Attendance | 0 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 27 |
| Ethan | Effort | 6 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 48 |
|  | Quality of Work | 5 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 49 |
|  | Participation | 4 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 49 |
|  | Attendance | 3 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 49 |
| Paula | Effort | 4 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 46 |
|  | Quality of Work | 4 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 46 |
|  | Participation | 3 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 47 |
|  | Attendance | 3 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 50 |
| Glenn | Effort | 7 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 44 |
|  | Quality of Work | 7 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 44 |
|  | Participation | 6 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 48 |
|  | Attendance | 5 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 50 |
| Ian | Effort | 8 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 40 |
|  | Quality of Work | 7 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 43 |
|  | Participation | 6 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 7 | 44 |
|  | Attendance | 7 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 9 | 43 |
| Lou | Effort | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 35 |
|  | Quality of Work | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 38 |
|  | Participation | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 32 |
|  | Attendance | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 44 |
| **Rating** |  | 119 | 195 | 189 | 186 | 170 | 149 | **1008** |
| **Points** |  | 70.8 | 116.1 | 112.5 | 110.7 | 101 | 89 | **600** |

**Sample Individual Results Report (given to each group member)**

**Explanation:**

The highest **personal rating** you may receive is **200** (a perfect rating in all 4 metrics). However, grade points are distributed based on your personal rating divided by the total number of rating points given out by the team. For this review period, **1008** total rating points were given by the team.

**600** total grade points are available for distribution across the team. Your share is calculated by dividing your personal rating by the total rating and multiplying by 600.

**Individual results:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Member:** | **Metric** | **Group Rating (5 – 50)** |
| Effort |  |
| Quality of work |  |
| Participation |  |
| Attendance |  |
| Personal Rating | /200 (%) |
| **Grade points** | (/1008) |
| **Feedback:** | |

**Comments:**

I understand the personal rating I have received and the associated grade points allocated to me.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

December 9, 2008

**Explanation:**

The highest **personal rating** you may receive is **200** (a perfect rating in all 4 metrics). However, grade points are distributed based on your personal rating divided by the total number of rating points given out by the team. For this review period, **1008** total rating points were given by the team.

**600** total grade points are available for distribution across the team. Your share is calculated by dividing your personal rating by the total rating and multiplying by 600.

**Individual results:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Member:**  **Akio Akazawa** | **Metric** | **Group Rating (5 – 50)** |
| Effort | 33 |
| Quality of work | 31 |
| Participation | 28 |
| Attendance | 27 |
| Personal Rating | 119/200 (60%) |
| **Grade points** | **71** ((119 / 1008) \* 600) |
| **Feedback:**   * It was good having Akio in class, but he missed a lot and wasn’t able to contribute very heavily. * Don’t be afraid to interrupt the group if you can’t get a word-in. * Akio did good work when he attended classes and group meetings, but missed a lot of key classes during the quarter | |

**Comments:**

I understand the personal rating I have received and the associated grade points allocated to me.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

December 9, 2008**Explanation:**

The highest **personal rating** you may receive is **200** (a perfect rating in all 4 metrics). However, grade points are distributed based on your personal rating divided by the total number of rating points given out by the team. For this review period, **1008** total rating points were given by the team.

**600** total grade points are available for distribution across the team. Your share is calculated by dividing your personal rating by the total rating and multiplying by 600.

**Individual results:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Member:**  **Ethan Crawford** | **Metric** | **Group Rating (5 – 50)** |
| Effort | 48 |
| Quality of work | 49 |
| Participation | 49 |
| Attendance | 49 |
| Personal Rating | 195/200 (98%) |
| **Grade points** | **116** ((195 / 1008) \* 600) |
| **Feedback:**   * Responsible, reliable * Tendency to take over conversations/projects to the exclusion of the other group members, try to keep all members involved * Ethan had the best work ethic of our group and turned out consistently good work | |

**Comments:**

I understand the personal rating I have received and the associated grade points allocated to me.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

December 9, 2008

**Explanation:**

The highest **personal rating** you may receive is **200** (a perfect rating in all 4 metrics). However, grade points are distributed based on your personal rating divided by the total number of rating points given out by the team. For this review period, **1008** total rating points were given by the team.

**600** total grade points are available for distribution across the team. Your share is calculated by dividing your personal rating by the total rating and multiplying by 600.

**Individual results:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Member:**  **Paula Haddad** | **Metric** | **Group Rating (5 – 50)** |
| Effort | 46 |
| Quality of work | 46 |
| Participation | 47 |
| Attendance | 50 |
| Personal Rating | 189/200 (95%) |
| **Grade points** | **112** ((189 / 1008) \* 600) |
| **Feedback:**   * Funny * Nice work * Tendency to take over conversations/projects to the exclusion of the other group members, try to keep all members involved * Paula was a pleasure to work with. She kept the group grounded when we were a bit too silly and participated well in group discussions. | |

**Comments:**

I understand the personal rating I have received and the associated grade points allocated to me.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

December 9, 2008

**Explanation:**

The highest **personal rating** you may receive is **200** (a perfect rating in all 4 metrics). However, grade points are distributed based on your personal rating divided by the total number of rating points given out by the team. For this review period, **1008** total rating points were given by the team.

**600** total grade points are available for distribution across the team. Your share is calculated by dividing your personal rating by the total rating and multiplying by 600.

**Individual results:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Member:**  **Glenn Plant** | **Metric** | **Group Rating (5 – 50)** |
| Effort | 44 |
| Quality of work | 44 |
| Participation | 48 |
| Attendance | 50 |
| Personal Rating | 186/200 (93%) |
| **Grade points** | **111** ((186 / 1008) \* 600) |
| **Feedback:**   * Nice work * Nice shirts | |

**Comments:**

I understand the personal rating I have received and the associated grade points allocated to me.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

December 9, 2008

**Explanation:**

The highest **personal rating** you may receive is **200** (a perfect rating in all 4 metrics). However, grade points are distributed based on your personal rating divided by the total number of rating points given out by the team. For this review period, **1008** total rating points were given by the team.

**600** total grade points are available for distribution across the team. Your share is calculated by dividing your personal rating by the total rating and multiplying by 600.

**Individual results:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Member:**  **Ian Sigmon** | **Metric** | **Group Rating (5 – 50)** |
| Effort | 40 |
| Quality of work | 43 |
| Participation | 44 |
| Attendance | 43 |
| Personal Rating | 170/200 (85%) |
| **Grade points** | **101** ((170 / 1008) \* 600) |
| **Feedback:**   * Nice work * Ian missed a few classes but overall did a good job | |

**Comments:**

I understand the personal rating I have received and the associated grade points allocated to me.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

December 9, 2008

**Explanation:**

The highest **personal rating** you may receive is **200** (a perfect rating in all 4 metrics). However, grade points are distributed based on your personal rating divided by the total number of rating points given out by the team. For this review period, **1008** total rating points were given by the team.

**600** total grade points are available for distribution across the team. Your share is calculated by dividing your personal rating by the total rating and multiplying by 600.

**Individual results:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Member:**  **Lou Vollstedt** | **Metric** | **Group Rating (5 – 50)** |
| Effort | 35 |
| Quality of work | 38 |
| Participation | 32 |
| Attendance | 44 |
| Personal Rating | 149/200 (75%) |
| **Grade points** | **89** ((149 / 1008) \* 600) |
| **Feedback:**   * Needs to be more assertive * Lou had difficulty participating in group discussions. However, when she was able to get her ideas across, they were often good. | |

**Comments:**

I understand the personal rating I have received and the associated grade points allocated to me.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

December 9, 2008