

Johns Hopkins University, Whiting School of Engineering
605.621 Foundations of Algorithms
Collaborative Group (CG) Peer Assessment (v0.2)

Your Name:

Assess your collaboration group (CG) members on their performance on the most recent assignment. The criteria are given on the last page. Your CG Peer Assessment grade will depend on providing scores (50%) and corresponding comments (50%) for each CG Group Member.

CG Member Name:		
Criterion	Score (0-4)	Comment
Graduate Level Contribs		
Respectful to Others		
Engaged, Enthusiastic		
Accepts Others' Ideas		
Timeliness		
General Comments:		

CG Member Name:		
Criterion	Score (0-4)	Comment
Graduate Level Contribs		
Respectful to Others		
Engaged, Enthusiastic		
Accepts Others' Ideas		
Timeliness		
General Comments:		

CG Member Name:		
Criterion	Score (0-4)	Comment
Graduate Level Contribs		
Respectful to Others		
Engaged, Enthusiastic		
Accepts Others' Ideas		
Timeliness		
General Comments:		

CG Member Name:		
Criterion	Score (0-4)	Comment
Graduate Level Contribs		
Respectful to Others		
Engaged, Enthusiastic		
Accepts Others' Ideas		
Timeliness		
General Comments:		

CG Member Name:		
Criterion	Score (0-4)	Comment
Graduate Level Contribs		
Respectful to Others		
Engaged, Enthusiastic		
Accepts Others' Ideas		
Timeliness		
General Comments:		

Scoring Rubric

Criteria / Score	4	3	2	1	0
G raduate-Level Contributions	Well informed contributions, insightful posts, a great example of graduate-level work.	In-Between a 4 and a 2	Sometimes had useful ideas, but several errors, careless mistakes. Minimally acceptable graduate-level effort.	In-Between a 2 and a 0	Questionable contributions, no original thought or effort, possibly just a “dump and run” paste of content from the web with no useful analysis.
R espectful to Others	Respected team mates and always had a positive outlook. Kind and supportive of others. A genuine joy to work with.		Sometimes hard to work with. Often terse answers to questions/emails. Once spoke sharply to a teammate. Visibly annoyed that some are not at their level.		Rude to others. Poor communication style. Dismissive.
E ngaged, Enthusiastic	Interacted frequently with the group. Attended all meetings, posted frequently, answered all emails, fully “reachable” in communications. Willing to take risks and offer up insightful ideas. Clearly eager to learn. At most one or two planned “absences,” notified the group ahead of time.		Missed some meetings, sometimes hard to reach, maybe a little reserved with their ideas. Showed some enthusiasm but not much. Unexplained absences.		Did not show up at all—was “AWOL” the whole time, never put their own ideas out first. Clearly not here to learn.
A ccepts Others' Ideas	Fully listened to peers, worked with their ideas to build the best answer. Respected team mates and always had a positive outlook. Kind and supportive of others.		Sometimes listened to peers, but several times were in their own “bubble” or pursuing their own path.		Rejected ideas of others, in pursuit of their own goal; what we would call an “output-only device.”
T imeliness	On time for all meetings, discussions, posts.		Late to some meetings, late to some posts/replies which affected others.		Did not participate at all, fully late on first-post, fully late on all replies, fully late on all discussions that would have helped someone else.