**Team Member Evaluation Form**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Your Name: **Muttaki Islam Bismoy** | | | | |  | |
|  |  |  | | |  | |
| **How many hours did you work on the project?**  Approximately 40 hours in total from phase 0 till date. | | | | |  | |
|  |  |  | | |  | |
| **Instructions:** For each attribute below, assign a number 1-5 (or an X) to describe each team member's contribution to this project. Your responses will remain confidential. These ratings are used to assess the overall team skills of GVSU students. | | | **Scale** | | | | | **Description** | |
| 5 | | | | | Strongly agree | |
| 4 | | | | | Agree | |
| 3 | | | | | Neutral | |
| 2 | | | | | Disagree | |
| 1 | | | | | Strongly disagree | |
| X | | | | | No basis for judgment | |
|  | | | | |  | |
|  |  |  | | |  | |
| **Team member** | | | | #1 | | #2 | | #3 | |
| Write member name --> | | | | Rashmita | | Meher | | Muttaki (Me) | |
| Contributes to group discussions | | | | 5 | | 4 | | 5 | |
| Is dependable | | | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | |
| Takes initiative | | | | 4 | | 3 | | 5 | |
| Is easy to work with | | | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | |
| Contributes fair share of work | | | | 5 | | 4 | | 5 | |
| Communicates effectively in writing | | | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | |
| Communicates well when speaking | | | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | |
| Behaves in an ethical manner | | | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | |
| When leading the team, listened and treated everybody with respect | | | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | |
| When leading the team, helped to develop and follow through with realistic goals, and helped clarify what is expected of each team member | | | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | |
| Was effective as a team leader, i.e., helped the team to reach their goals on time and with high quality results | | | | 5 | | 3 | | 5 | |
| Given the choice, I would work with this person again | | | | 5 | | 4 | | 4 | |
|  |  |  | | |  | |
| **Other Questions** |  |  | | |  | |
|  |  |  | | |  | |
|  |  |  | | |  | |
| Suggest ways the team project process can be improved  The Team Project could have been better if the original paper had a more substantial more precise dataset, went into more depth about everything, and made the rubric steps easier to understand. Coming from a background that isn't biology, working on these things is also really challenging. They involve computers, but we don't know much about the R code, PubMed, or Paper format. It might have been easier to write the paper if those were more detailed. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |