CSCI/CINF/ITEC 4838 - Senior Projects

SPRING 2016

Midterm Peer Evaluation Form

Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_khoa tran\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Team: \_\_\_\_\_Card Game Simulator\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

In the space provided below, list the names of your team members **including yourself**. Rank each member’s contribution in each of the categories listed. Use 10 for the team member whom has contributed the **most** or deserves the best rating on the category, 9 for the next most deserving one, down to 1 for a team member who deserves a really bad rating in that category. **NOTE**: **You are NOT allowed to have more than two members with the same score in each category**. i.e., you can rate 10, 10, 9, 8 or 10, 9, 9, 7 or 7, 8, 8, 9 or 10,10,9,9,8 but not 10,10,10,10.

Please also comment on each team member’s overall contribution in page 2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teammate Name: 🡪** | **Jon**  **O’neil** | **Thomas** | **Bishnu** | **Cody** | **khoa** |
| **Categories to be rated \/** |  |  |  |  |  |
| On time for all group meetings and stayed for their duration. | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 |
| Coordinated schedule with group so meetings were easy to schedule. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| Promptness in meeting task deadlines set by group. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| Ability to focus on purpose of meetings. | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 6 |
| Attitude toward team. | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 8 |
| Leadership skills. | 6 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 |
| Following skills. | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| Quality of research contribution. | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 |
| Quantity of research contribution. | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Quality of writing and editing contribution. | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| Quantity of writing and editing contribution. | 6 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 6 |
| Quality of design contribution. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 6 |
| Quantity of design contribution. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| Quality of coding contribution. | 8 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 7 |
| Quantity of coding contribution. | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| Kept the group organized, cohesive and progressing toward completion of the group’s goals. | 6 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 6 |

Circle the number that best describes each team member’s **overall contribution**, including your own contribution to the team project so far, using the scale below:

Name Score Comments

1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_khoa\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 0 2 4 (**6)** 8 10

2. \_\_\_\_\_\_bishnu\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 0 2 4 (**6)** 8 10

3. \_\_\_\_\_\_cody\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 0 2 4 6 (**8**) 10

4. \_\_\_\_\_jon\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 0 2 4 (**6)** 8 10

5. \_\_\_\_\_\_thomas\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 0 2 4 (**6)**  8 10

6. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 0 2 4 6 8 10

SCALE:

10 Full participation. This individual was a true team player; he/she made significant content and process contributions throughout the semester and was clearly committed to making the whole project a success.

8 Strong selective participation. This individual made a significant contribution to the project, but within a clearly defined scope; he/she limited participation to a particular content or process role – and showed initiative in that area- but did not view the overall project as his/her responsibility.

6 Selective participation. This individual made a contribution to the project, but the contribution was rather narrow; her/his work was of good quality, but of minimum quantity.

4 Weak participation. This individual attended project meetings but made little substantive contribution to the content or the process of the project; he/she showed little initiative and contributed only what was specifically requested.

2 Virtually absent. This individual frequently missed project meetings, often came unprepared, or contributed substandard work that required correction by fellow team members; she/he exhibited very little effort and made minimal contribution to the project.

0 Totally absent. This individual was totally absent from the project, and the end product in no way will reflect a contribution on his/her part.