EOSC 433: OPEN ENDED DESIGN PROBLEM 2: SET BACK DISTANCE - PEER REVIEW

Reviewer: .... Who you are reviewing:...

How to provide effective feedback to a colleague?   You want to contribute BEFORE the final product, so their work will naturally be incomplete.

1. **First** review the criteria upon which their report will be judged: Project specifications, your boss's instructions, the client's requirements, etc. In our case, this is the grading rubric. The form we have below has three parts from the rubric that <u>might</u> be relevant at this stage of your colleague's work.

2. **Second**, what exactly have you got from your colleague? List what parts of the work you have been given here …

3. **Third** highlight parts of the rubric you think are relevant. You are not giving a grade – you are identifying what you see. If you do not have work for some of the rubric's rows, don't highlight anything. Highlighting should be consistent with the list above of what you received from your colleague.

	EXCELLENT (90 – 100%)	GOOD (89 – 72%)	SATISFACTORY (71 – 60%)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (≤59%)
MODELING AND INPUT PARAMETERS	Clearly identifies all the information needed to run the model: o States and describes the software used o Describes the model (Dimensions) o States and briefly *justifies all* the input parameters o Describes any other assumptions, including the water table, external load, and seismic coefficient values	Identifies the information needed to run the model: o States and describes the software used o Describes the model (Dimensions) o States and briefly *justifies some* input parameters o Describes some assumptions (water table, external load, and seismic coefficient values)	Identifies basic information needed to run the model: o States the software used o Describes the model (Dimensions) o *Only states* the input parameters o Describes one or two assumptions (water table, external load, and seismic coefficient values)	Lacks to identify basic information needed to run the model: o Does not state the software or describe the model used o States a few or no input parameters o Does not describe any other assumptions
LIMIT EQUILIBRIUM ANALYSIS	Effectively evaluates the static and pseudo-static case scenarios in the analysis and: o Specifies the methods used o States and *explains* of the limit equilibrium method(s) chosen o Assesses the FoS at different set-backs AND o Clearly explains determination of set-back distance o Effectively interprets the controlling slip surface	Adequately evaluates the static and pseudo-static case scenarios in the analysis and: o Unclear specification of methods used o States the limit equilibrium method(s) chosen o Assesses of the FoS at different set-backs AND o Attempts to explain the determination of set-back distance o Adequately interprets the controlling slip surface	Evaluates the static and pseudo-static case scenarios in the analysis BUT one or two of the following is missing/not clear: o Statement of the limit equilibrium method(s) chosen o Specification of other methods used o Assessment of the FoS at different set-backs AND o Lacks to explain the determination of set-back distance o Vaguely interprets the controlling slip surface	Evaluates the static OR pseudo-static case scenario in the analysis AND two or three of the following are missing: o Statement of the limit equilibrium method(s) chosen o Specification of other methods used o Assessment of the FoS at different set-backs AND o Does not explain the determination of set-back distance o Does not interpret the controlling slip surface
RECOM-MENDATION	Clearly gives a final recommendation based on the controlling slip surface AND o Acknowledges the limitations of the analysis o Recommends other factors to consider for future analysis	Gives a final recommendation based on the controlling slip surface BUT misses one of the following: o Acknowledges the limitations of the analysis o Recommends other factors to consider for future analysis	Only gives a final recommendation based on results	Does not give or clearly state a final recommendation based on the results

4. **Fourth** – and most importantly – offer some recommendations, based on comparing what you see with what you think SHOULD or COULD be included. This is the feedback your colleague will appreciate, and hopefully incorporate, if it's possible and sensible.
NOTE: positive feedback is also important. It helps prevent unnecessary changes, and it might even help you see ideas about how to improve your own work. This is what colleagues helping colleagues is all about.

Feedback here. Be legible. Be brief, but complete. Add additional paper if necessary, but do not write essays.

4a. What's good? …   *[Is this worth highlighting for everyone?   Yes__   No, not really __   ]*

4b. What recommendations for adjustments?

4c. Finally, choose a couple of your colleague's questions. Based on your knowledge and experience, what guidance or alternative approach can you suggest? (Make sure to restate the question with your answer)