Progress report

Name	Corporate e-mail
Carrasco Núñez, Alejandro	alecarnun@alum.us.es
Durán Terrero, Andrés	anddurter@alum.us.es
López Benítez, Pablo Delfín	pablopben@alum.us.es
Núñez Moreno, Pablo	pabnunmor@alum.us.es
Robledo Campa, Pablo José	pabrobcam@alum.us.es
Vázquez Monge, Francisco Javier	fravazmon@alum.us.es

Table of Contents

Executive summary

The following document contains an evaluation of the work performed by the workgroup members, according to the procedures expressed in the Workgroup report, and a brief description of the rewards and punishments the members must endure.

Revision table

Revision number	Date	Description
v1	2022/03/14	Initial version

Introduction

The contents of the paper focus on evaluating the performance of the team members using as base the definitions agreed upon on the Workgroup report, and later explain the rewards or punishments the team will be accountable for depending on their score.

Contents

To better understand the performance of the different members of the team we will start by reminding the definition of Good Work and Bad Work stated in the Workgroup report delivered in the last sprint.

A member of the team may be considered to have performed a good job if he/she fulfills the following conditions:

- They must complete all their tasks and committing them within a reasonable period of time

- They must have a fluid and good communication with the rest of the team

- They must respect the decisions of the team manager

On the other hand a member of the team may be considered to performed badly if he/she falls under the following criteria:

- They do not respect or communicate efficiently with the other members of the group

- They do not complete the tasks or achieve the specified deadlines and periods of time

- They made other team members overwork because of the unfinished tasks

Using the following definitions we can now evaluate the members of the team properly. They will be evaluated with a binary evolution in mind whether their work is Good or Bad, let's proceed.

Performance evaluation:

Member	Evaluation
Alejandro Carrasco Núñez	Good
Andrés Durán Terrero	Good
Pablo Delfín López Benítez	Good
Pablo Núñez Moreno	Good
Pablo José Robledo Campa	Good
Francisco Javier Vázquez Monge	Good

Regarding the different rewards and punishments the team is accountable to, and following the indications in the Workgroup report, a jackpot was created into which each member deposited 2.50 euros. As stated in this report, this jackpot money is to be used by the members of the team that has performed well during the sprint and not by the members that have performed badly. In the particular case, the current sprint the money will be used by all the members of the team.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the development of the progress report for the current delivery has been carried out without any major inconvenients. This has allowed us to follow a great evaluation for this sprint, which has proven to be a great continuation of the previous one, ensuring a work performance that is to be carried out onto the next one.

Bibliography

Intentionally blank.