

Radio Telescope Team Final Peer Evaluations

Name: _____

Please evaluate your team members, **and yourself**, using the following *ratings* (8-0). Also *rank* EVERY member of the Radio Telescope project (NOT just your team members) from 1 (highest) to 9 (lowest) for their combined effort and effectiveness (**ties are NOT allowed for rankings**). Your response should reflect each individual's dedication to the team and support of the project's goals, not their academic ability. Provide appropriate comments for each team member.

The individual ratings and rankings you assign will remain anonymous. You will be provided with your own composite average rating and ranking; you will NOT see the ratings and rankings that your team members received.

The purpose of this exercise is to provide each team member with their rating and relative ranking with respect to their peers on the 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. The mid-term peer evaluations are used to inform you 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 effort factor for your contribution to the team portion of your course grade will be calculated from the results of the two peer evaluations (midterm and final) that you and your teammates provide through this process.

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 (8-0)</u>	<u>Rank (1-9)</u>	<u>Comments (required)</u>
Anthony	Beddia			
Lucas	Gartrell			
Quintin	Herb			
Dakota	Hilbert			
Vince	Maresca			
David	McHugh			
Patrick	Nelson			
Dan	Palmieri			
Jon	Steck			