

PEER REVIEW · CLASS DISCUSSION

Resolving the flagged cases

A team-by-team discussion of where peer evaluations and reviewer participation diverged from expectations.

Goal: a fair final weighting — not assigning blame.

What we'll do today

- 1 Recap how peer review weighting works
- 2 Explain the two types of flags in your file
- 3 Go through the flagged cases — team by team
- 4 Agree on resolution or follow-up for each case

How peer review affects your project score

$$\text{Final score} = \text{Project score} \times \text{Peer weight } (0 - 1)$$

Peer weight — = $\min(\text{raw mean of peer scores} \div 9, 1)$. Means at or above 9 are capped at 1.0.

Reviewer penalty — Students who gave 0 of their required peer evaluations are assigned weight = 0.

Today's discussion — Some weights raise concerns we want to surface and resolve together before grades are finalized.

Two flags. Two different problems.

RED FONT

on the score column

Did not submit all required peer evaluations.

A reviewer-side issue: the student did not fulfill their role as a peer evaluator.

It is procedural, not a verdict on contribution. A score of 1 with this flag means peers rated the student well, but reviews owed to teammates are missing.

ORANGE ROW

with darker orange on stddev

Peers gave divergent scores. Possible mismatch.

Standard deviation of peer scores received is ≥ 2.0 . Some peers rated highly, others did not.

A signal worth surfacing — possible team-internal context we want to understand before settling the weighting.

Where we are right now

133

students with peer-review records

48

students with at least one flag

10

of 11 teams have a flagged member

Of the 48 flagged students, 12 have BOTH flags — the most concerning category.

How the 48 flagged cases break down

24

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations.

11

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores.

12

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement.

Ground rules for this discussion

- The goal is a fair final weighting, not assigning blame.
- Individual peer ratings remain anonymous — they will not be revealed.
- Each flag has context. We listen first, decide after.
- We separate the two flag types: a reviewer issue is procedural, a mismatch is contextual. They are not interchangeable.

How each team will be addressed

STEP 1

Stand up

All members of the called team stay together for the duration of their discussion.

STEP 2

Most concerning first

Cases with BOTH flags first, then MISMATCH, then REVIEWER-only.

STEP 3

Speak in turn

The flagged student describes their contribution and any context. Then the team adds context.

STEP 4

Decide

Confirm the weight, adjust based on documented circumstances, or note a follow-up.

10 TEAMS, ~48 CASES

Order we'll go in

TEAM	BOTH	MISMATCH	REVIEWER
1. TRUSTWORTHY 3	4	0	8
2. SHAKTAR DONETSK	1	0	7
3. QLearnersPolito	2	1	2
4. TRUSTWORTHY	2	1	2
5. AI Said So	2	0	2

TEAM	BOTH	MISMATCH	REVIEWER
6. JOBLESS	0	3	1
7. Me, Myself, AI	0	2	1
8. DOGTOOTH	0	2	0
9. IN CHATGPT WE TRUST	1	1	0
10. In Vino VeritAI	0	1	1

Counts:  Both  Mismatch  Reviewer

TRUSTWORTHY 3

TYPE 1 · 13 members · 12 flagged

4

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

0

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

8

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

SHAKTAR DONETSK

TYPE 3 · 10 members · 8 flagged

1

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

0

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

7

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

QLearnersPolito

TYPE 3 · 10 members · 5 flagged

2

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

1

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

2

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

TRUSTWORTHY

TYPE 3 · 11 members · 5 flagged

2

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

1

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

2

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

AI Said So

TYPE 1 · 11 members · 4 flagged

2

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

0

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

2

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

JOBLESS

TYPE 2 · 11 members · 4 flagged

0

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

3

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

1

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

Me, Myself, AI

TYPE 1 · 11 members · 3 flagged

0

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

2

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

1

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

DOGTOOTH

TYPE 3 · 10 members · 2 flagged

0

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

2

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

0

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

IN CHATGPT WE TRUST

TYPE 1 · 10 members · 2 flagged

1

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

1

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

0

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

In Vino VeritAI

TYPE 2 · 11 members · 2 flagged

0

BOTH FLAGS

Reviewer issue AND peer disagreement

1

MISMATCH ONLY

Peers gave divergent scores

1

REVIEWER ONLY

Did not complete all peer evaluations

Team is up. Flagged members, please introduce yourselves and walk us through your contribution. The rest of the team can add context after.

AFTER TODAY

What happens next

- Final peer-review weights confirmed once all team discussions close.
- Adjustments only where documented circumstances justify them.
- Anything unresolved today will NOT move to emails.
- Project grades issued after weights are finalized.

Thanks for engaging with this honestly.