**Q1 2020 Performance Reviews**

# **Executive Summary**

## Rubric Assessment

| The radar chart below shows the scores of the [rubric assessment](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1eC25NKTt8fnNsxcJuqrjKXN0jPCNISAswKx6FDZy81A) for each engineer. I do not share the actual scores with the engineers. I have done this previously and it does not allow the engineers to focus on the feedback. It is valuable for assessing the team along with providing more quantitative individual reviews if someone is struggling or excelling in individual areas. |
| --- |

## Chart

## The team generally excels in judgment with an average score of 3.62, but falls short in communication with an average of just 3.2. Interestingly, there is not much of a disparity between engineering levels and any one area. The biggest discrepancy between levels is within the judgment category. Communication seems to have no discrepancy between engineering levels.

## Engineering Levels

| The left table shows what the expected rubric results should be for each position. On the right you will see the assessment for each engineer. This provides a consistent and reliable process for reviewing individuals within the team for promotions or for formal review. |
| --- |

## 

| | **Position** | **Min** | **Max** | | --- | --- | --- | | Intern | 2.25 | 2.75 | | Engineer 1 | 2.75 | 3.25 | | Engineer 2 | 3.25 | 3.75 | | Engineer 3 | 3.75 | 4.25 | | Engineering Lead | 4.25 | 4.75 | | Architect | 4.5 | 5 | | | **Dev** | **Position** | **Assessment** | | --- | --- | --- | | Dev 1 | Engineer 3 | 3.6 | | Dev 2 | Engineer 1 | 3.23 | | Dev 3 | Engineer 3 | 3.8 | | Dev 4 | Engineer 2 | 3.2 | | Dev 5 | Engineer 2 | 3.57 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

The engineering team is largely within their expected ranges with the exception of Dev 1 and Dev 4. In reviewing their performance over the last quarter there are a few easily addressable areas to help these individuals raise to their expected level. One bright spot in the assessment is Dev 2. Because of their quick grasp of the tech stack, willingness to learn, and general positive attitude, they have been promoted to Engineer 2.

## Team Strengths & Weaknesses

| This provides you with a quick review of common themes within the engineering team for both areas they excel in and could use some training. The goal is to identify training or focused coaching for the next quarter or 6 months. |
| --- |

### Strengths

* Problem Solving
* Positive Attitude
* Focus on Quality

The common theme I see within the engineering team is a focus on writing quality code that solves problems for our customers. That seems to drive our team and keep them engaged. We should lean into that when motivating the team.

### Weaknesses

* Communication
* Confidence
* Attendance & Punctuality

The team does seem to struggle with many “soft skills” which is not surprising. Most engineers focus on honing their technical skills and gloss over things like communication and attendance. These areas can make or break teams, so we need to show the engineers the value of becoming more well rounded employees.

## Individual Notes

* Attendance needs to be addressed within the team. It has gotten better, but is still not to the level I would expect.
* The team has identified a lack of focus at times when going over their reviews. There may be an opportunity to work as a management team to ensure the rest of the department is not getting distracted.
* The assessment was only completed with 5 engineers as one engineer 2 recently left and an engineer 1 has just started. There may be outliers due to the small sample size.