



# Peer Evaluation Examples

Peer evaluation in team-based learning allows students to critically reflect on individual behaviors, develop professional communication skills in giving and receiving feedback, and improve their teamwork behaviors.

There are various methods of peer evaluation divided in three broad categories: qualitative, quantitative and hybrid evaluation. This guide will provide an overview of different evaluation methods along with examples.

# Index

Content	Page
1. Executive Summary .....	1
2. Michaelsen's Method .....	2
3. Fink's Method .....	3
4. UT Austin's Method .....	4
5. Koles' Method .....	5
6. Texas Tech's Method .....	6
7. References .....	7
8. Contact Details .....	8

# Overview

Team-based learning (TBL) educators often face the challenge of finding the most appropriate method of peer evaluation. Some of the commonly used peer evaluation methods are: Michaelsen's or Fink's, which are quantitative or known as the divide up the money methods, UT Austin's, which is a qualitative method, as well as Texas Tech's and Koles', which are hybrid methods.

**Quantitative Methods:** Michaelsen's and Fink's methods both involve assigning points to distribute among team members. Michaelsen's method is useful in highly competitive environments, but it might lead to grade inflation. Fink's method is a fairer method as students do not need to give different scores to their peers. However, this method might require a higher workload for instructors to analyze the feedback.

**Qualitative Method:** UT Austin's method of peer evaluation involves asking students two qualitative questions to assess their teammates. This method does not directly impact grades, but it can be used when the student requests for an extra credit bump at the end of the semester when they are shy of the-next-grade-up.

**Hybrid Methods:** Texas Tech's and Koles' methods of peer evaluation involves both qualitative and quantitative analysis. Texas Tech's method uses twelve criteria for teammate evaluation, and team members are ranked on a five-point likert scale. This method is also useful in a highly competitive environment, but it may lead to grade inflation. Koles' method also uses twelve criteria for teammate evaluation, divided into three categories - cooperative learning skills, self-directed learning skills and interpersonal skills. This method also helps students develop great feedback skills as it requires critical thinking to evaluate teammates qualitatively and quantitatively in these categories. However, this method may require a higher workload for instructors to analyze the feedback as well.

This guide will provide an overview of different evaluation methods along with examples. It is up to the instructor to pick the method which best fits his or her course needs.

# Michaelsen's Method

## How does Michaelsen's method work?

Michaelsen recommends that peer evaluation scores received by students should become an independent component of their course grade. Students are assigned **10 points per team member excluding themselves**. For instance, if there is a team of seven people, each student will receive 60 points to allocate amongst the other students in the group.

A distinctive feature of Michaelsen's approach is that students are required to **discriminate scoring among their team members**, thus they are not able to give the same score to all their teammates. Since students have to give different scores to their peers, this method forces students to thoroughly consider their peers' contributions to the team. This, in turn, translates into **more thoughtful feedback** and a **greater opportunity for all team members to improve**.

Additionally, **qualitative feedback** for the **highest and lowest scores** is encouraged at the end of this activity so that students can provide their rationale for the scores they give to peers.

## Peer Evaluation Form (Michaelsen)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Team: # \_\_\_\_\_

Please assign scores that reflect how you really feel about the extent to which the other members of your team contributed to your learning and/or your team's performance. This will be your only opportunity to reward the members of your team who worked hard on your behalf. **(Note: If you give everyone the same score, you will be hurting those who did the most and helping those who did the least.)**

**Instructions:** In the space below, please rate each of the **other** members of your team. Each member's peer evaluation score should be the average of the points they receive from the other members of the team. To complete the evaluation, you should: 1) List the name of each member of your team in the alphabetical order of their last names and, 2) assign an average of ten points to the **other** members of your team. (Thus, for example, you should assign a total of 50 points in a six-member team; 60 points in a seven-member team; etc.) and, 3) differentiate some in your ratings; for example, you must give at least one score of 11 or higher (maximum=15) and one score of 9 or lower.

Team Member	Score

### Additional Feedback:

Briefly describe your reasons for your highest and lowest ratings. These comments - but not information about who provided them - will be used to provide feedback to students who would like to receive it.

---

---

---

# Fink's Method

## How does Fink's method work?

Fink's method of peer evaluation is similar to Michaelsen's. In both methods, students allocate a given number of points among their peers. However, these approaches differ in the way that they calculate the scores.

First, **each student is given 100 points** which they have to allocate among their team members. Next, the scores each student receives from their peers are **summed up to calculate their "peer score"**. This peer score is **multiplied by the mean of their TRAT** or another group work score to adjust it based on the feedback received in the peer evaluation exercise.

For instance, if a student ends up having a peer score of 95 and their TRAT score is 80, you would multiply the latter by 0.95 arriving at a score of 76. Conversely, if a student achieves a peer score of 105 and their TRAT score is 80, you would multiply the latter by 1.05 arriving at a score of 104. Similar to Michaelsen's approach, qualitative feedback is also encouraged by Fink to explain the rationale behind the scores given.

This way of conducting peer evaluation is sometimes perceived as **fairer than Michaelsen's Method** because students are allowed to give their team members an **equal score** if they think they all contributed equally.

## Peer Evaluation Form (Fink)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Team: # \_\_\_\_\_

At the end of the semester, it is necessary for all members of this class to assess the contributions that each member of the group made to the work of the group. This contribution should presumably reflect your judgment of things such as their level of preparedness before class, contribution to group discussion and work, respect for others' ideas and flexibility when disagreements occurred.

It is important that you raise the evaluation of people who truly worked hard for the good of the group and lower the evaluation of those you perceived not to be working as hard on group tasks. Those who contributed should receive the full worth of the group's grades; those who did not contribute fully should only receive partial credit. Your assessment will be used mathematically to determine the proportion of the group's points that each member receives.

Evaluate the contributions of each person in your group **except yourself**, by distribution 100 points among them. **Include comments for each person.**

Name:	Points Awarded:
Reason for Evaluation:	
Name:	Points Awarded:
Reason for Evaluation:	
Name:	Points Awarded:
Reason for Evaluation:	

# UT Austin's Method

## How does UT Austin's method work?

UT Austin's method of peer evaluation is the simplest. Students are asked **two qualitative questions** to assess their teammates.

This method **does not impact grades directly**. However, it can be used when the student requests for an **extra credit bump** at the end of the semester when they are shy of the-next-grade-up.

The possibility of the "need" to use evaluations to get the "bump" might **keep them engaged** all semester long.

### Peer Evaluation Form (UT Austin)

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Team: # \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluate each of your team members by answering the questions below. This will not affect your grades, but it can be used for an extra credit bump should it be requested.

1. Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Provide one thing you appreciate about your teammate.

---

---

Provide one thing you request of your teammate.

---

---

2. Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Provide one thing you appreciate about your teammate.

---

---

Provide one thing you request of your teammate.

---

---

3. Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Provide one thing you appreciate about your teammate.

---

---

Provide one thing you request of your teammate.

---

---

# Koles' Method

## How does Koles' method work?

A student's peer evaluation score is both informed by their work across the semester (quantitative component) and the quality of feedback they give their peers. The quality of feedback given is evaluated by the instructor using specific criteria. This method helps students develop feedback skills.

Koles' method of peer evaluation involves students rating their peers based on three key areas: 1) [Cooperative learning skills](#), 2) [Self-directed learning skills](#), and 3) [Interpersonal skills](#).

There are several prompts within these areas which you can be used to create peer evaluation question form. Students are required to rate their peers [on a scale of one through four](#). Furthermore, there is a [qualitative section](#) which students need to complete.

## Peer Evaluation Form (Koles)

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Team: # \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Teammate: \_\_\_\_\_

**Be sure to submit one form for each teammate.**

### PART ONE: QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

#### COOPERATIVE LEARNING SKILLS:

	NEVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS
	0	1	2	3
Arrives on time and remains with team during activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Demonstrates a good balance of active listening and participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Asks useful or probing questions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shares information and personal understanding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING:

	NEVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS
Is well prepared for team activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shows appropriate depth of knowledge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identifies limits of personal knowledge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Is clear when explaining things to others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### INTERPERSONAL SKILLS:

	NEVER	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS
Gives useful feedback to others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accepts useful feedback from others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Is able to listen and understand what others are saying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shows respect for the opinions and feelings of others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### PART TWO: QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

For each item, write **at least one** sentence, but **not more than three** sentences.

1) What is the single most valuable contribution this person makes to your team?

---

---

2) What is the single most important thing this person could do to further your team's effectiveness?

---

---

# Texas Tech's Method

## How does Texas Tech's method work?

Texas Tech's method of peer evaluation is similar to Koles' method because it also has several criteria on which students are evaluated by their peers. There are **twelve criteria** in total, in areas such as promptness, responsibility, respect for others, humility, and others.

Each student is then **ranked on a five-point scale** for each criterion where one is considered to be too little and five too much. Three is the ideal score. This method is also not used to adjust student grades.

### Peer Evaluation Form (Texas Tech)

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Team: # \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Teammate: \_\_\_\_\_

**Be sure to submit one form for each teammate.**

\*There are 12 criteria in total - below is a sample of 3 criteria.

Scale 1 = too little, 5 = too much

Promptness / Reliability				
1	2	3	4	5
Late - group mates always waiting		Routinely punctual - uses time effectively		Wastes time waiting for others to be "on time"
Responsibility / Dependability				
1	2	3	4	5
Lacks of accountability, actively avoids responsibility and seeks easy tasks		Has team as clear priority but can balance own life appropriately		Concerned with performance that other aspects of his/her life are damaged
Respect for others / Teamwork				
1	2	3	4	5
Disrespectful of colleagues or instructors		Respectful of others		Respectful of others to neglect of self-respect (self-regard)

\*Additional domains can be found in Levine, R.E. (2012). Peer evaluation in team-based learning. Team-Based Learning for Health Professions Education: A Guide to Using Small Groups to Improve Learning, pp.103-116.



# References

- Levine, R.E. (2012). Peer evaluation in team-based learning. *Team-Based Learning for Health Professions Education: A Guide to Using Small Groups to Improve Learning*, pp.103-116.
- Michaelsen, et. al. (2004). *Team-based Learning: A transformative Use of Small Groups for College Teaching*. Stylus.
- Sibley, J., & Ostafichuk, P. (2014). *Getting started with team-based learning*. Stylus Publishing.

# Other Useful Resources

- Cestone, C.M., Levine, R.E. and Lane, D.R. (2008). Peer assessment and evaluation in team-based learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2008(116), pp.69-78.
- Goedde, Rick & Sibley, Jim. (2011). *Approaches to Peer Evaluation: Pro's and Con's of Various Methods*. Retrieved from [http://learntbl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Poster\\_TBL\\_peer\\_Feb2011-22nd.pdf](http://learntbl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Poster_TBL_peer_Feb2011-22nd.pdf)

# Curious to learn more? Contact us!

 [marketing@intedashboard.com](mailto:marketing@intedashboard.com)

 <https://www.intedashboard.com>

