

Radio Telescope Self / Peer Evaluations

Name: _____

Sub-Team: _____

Please evaluate *every* Radio Telescope team member, including *yourself* (and all independent study students that are participating on the project) using the following **ratings: 8 (highest) to 0 (lowest)**. Also **rank** every member of the Radio Telescope team, including *yourself* (and all independent study students) from **1 (highest) to 16 (lowest)** for their combined effort and effectiveness. Although multiple team members will receive the *same rating*, **ties are NOT allowed for rankings: each team member must receive a unique rank**). Your responses should reflect each individual's dedication to the team and support of the project's goal, not their academic ability. Provide appropriate comments for each team member.

The purpose of this exercise is to provide each team member with their rating and relative ranking with respect to their peers on the overall Radio Telescope team. This type of system is similar to what many companies use as part of their annual review process. It is important for each of you to comprehend how your fellow teammates perceive your effort on the project, even if they are not part of your sub-team. In industry, you are always being observed and evaluated – even by people you don't work with, and even by people you don't know. This is an exercise in recognizing that those evaluations happen, whether you are aware of them or not.

The individual ratings, rankings, and comments that you provide will remain anonymous. You will be provided with your own composite average rating and ranking, and the individual numeric ratings and rankings distribution in sorted order, but you will not be able to determine who assigned those values.

The MIDTERM peer evaluations are used to inform you (and me) of where you stand at the midpoint in the semester so that you can take any corrective action you deem necessary, based on the outcome of the peer evaluation ratings and rankings.

The FINAL peer evaluations will be used to determine an effort factor for your portion of your overall course grade based on the results of the evaluations that you and your teammates provided through this process.

In regards to assigning ratings and rankings, and providing comments, please also take into account any leadership and/or cross-team functions that the team-member is providing.

NOTE: Email the completed form in *PDF form* to Professor Hake by the assigned due date.

Ratings

Excellent (8 pts)	Consistently went above and beyond, tutored teammates, carried more than his/her fair share of the load.
Very good (7 pts)	Consistently did what he/she was supposed to do, very well prepared and cooperative.
Satisfactory (6 pts)	Usually did what he/she was supposed to do, acceptably prepared and cooperative.
Ordinary (5 pts)	Often did what he/she was supposed to do, minimally prepared and cooperative.
Marginal (4 pts)	Sometimes failed to show up or complete assignments, rarely prepared.
Deficient (3 pts)	Often failed to show up or complete assignments, rarely prepared.
Unsatisfactory (2 pts)	Consistently failed to show or complete assignments, unprepared.
Superficial (1 pts)	Practically no participation.
No show (0 pts)	No participation at all

<u>Name of Team Member</u>	<u>Rating (0-8)</u>	<u>Rank (1-16)</u>	<u>Comments (required – justify your rating/rank)</u>
Jason	Constantine		
Kyle	Eidson		
Lucas	Gartrell		
Andrew	Georgiou		
Nolan	Hamilton		
Quintin	Herb		
Dakota	Hilbert		
Joel	Horne		
Kate	Kennelly		
Marie	Kiley		
Joe	Landau		
Alyssa	McDevitt		

Jon	Myer			
Patrick	Nelson			
Phil	Norris			
Greg	Plachno			