

Peer Assessment Scoring Example

The marking scheme for this group work is based on 50% for the group presentation and 50% for the peer assessment. This is to reassure people that they would not feel all their marks are reliant on their peers' marks.

The actual peer assessment scheme is based on previous published research to avoid any discrepancies in the way each member of the group assesses each other. The scheme therefore allows for undermarking each other, overmarking and any other permutation.

In actual fact, most groups tend to mark very fairly and after consultation of your work, individual feedback and evidence of collaboration on Blackboard most marks may not need to be normalised. In the few cases where there were discrepancies, the model can be applied.

An example of the model is given below, where one student deliberately gives the rest of the group low marks. The model allows for this. At the opposite end of the scale, if someone is over-generous to the rest of the group, their marks actually end up lower, so the model also compensates for this by adjusting the results more fairly.

Group Mark 60

| | Peter | | | | John | | | | Mary | | | | Janet | | | | IER | IWF | FM | CIM |
|------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | d | | | | |
| Peter | | | | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 49 | 1.25 | 87.4 | |
| John | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 34 | 0.87 | 60.6 | |
| Mary | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | | | | | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 39 | 0.99 | 69.6 | |
| Janet | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | | | | | 35 | 0.89 | 62.4 | |
| Average effort rating | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 39 | | | |
| Rating given to others | | | | 12 | | | | 50 | | | | 46 | | | | 49 | | | | |
| Bias Factor | | | | 0.31 | | | | 0.79 | | | | 0.85 | | | | 0.8 | | | | |
| Normalisation factor | | | | 3.27 | | | | 0.79 | | | | 0.85 | | | | 0.8 | | | | |
| Peter | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 3.41 | 3.41 | 3.41 | 3.41 | 3.2 | 4.01 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 39.8 | 1.01 | 71 | -16.4 |
| John | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.41 | 2.56 | 4.27 | 3.41 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 37.9 | 0.97 | 67.7 | 7 |
| Mary | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.14 | 3.93 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.01 | 4.01 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 40.8 | 1.04 | 72.8 | 3.3 |
| Janet | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.27 | 3.14 | 3.93 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 4.27 | 1.71 | 3.41 | 2.56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38.4 | 0.98 | 68.4 | 6 |
| Average effort rating | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 39.3 | | | |

IER= individual effort rating

IWF= individual weighting factor

FM= final
mark

CIM= change in
mark

The example above is taken from a paper by Li, which discusses the marking system in detail.

Reference

Li, L. K. Y. 2001 'Some Refinements on Peer Assessment of Group Projects.' *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 26: Carfax Publishing Company.