## PROCESS PEER REVIEW

During this project you have worked together as a group. During this collaboration you may have noticed certain good or bad behaviour from yourself, your group members, or your group as a whole. This process peer review exists out of two parts: 1) Group dynamics with Lewis self-test and reflection, 2) constructive feedback about behaviour during group work.

Be sure to submit the process peer review on time as it will be discussed during the project meeting with you tutor.

1.GROUP DYNAMICS REALTED CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

Include below the *Lewis triangular diagram*, containing plot of all group members, you made during WKS:

Specify below where do you see potential synergies and frictions between group members related to the expectation of PRJ?

As you can see in the triangular diagram, we are four different people. Sometimes this means we don't understand each others ways of working, but after discussing everything we do get the work done.

2. CONSTRUCTIVE FEEDBACK

Below you find a table that is intended for you to convey what your impression is related to the work contribution of each member towards the project. Please indicate in percentages how you perceived the work division was per item.

Item worked on	Lars	Mohammad	Esther	Soleil
Process (making agenda's, minutes, being chairperson, etc.)	32.5%	22.5%	35%	10%
Project plan	10%	10%	70%	10%
URS	25%	25%	35%	15%
Testplan & Testreport	15%	65%	10%	10%
UML Class Diagram	20%	40%	20%	20%
C# application	37.5%	32.5%	25%	5%
Web application	0%	0%	0%	100%

Lastly, below you can find a table that is intended for you to include constructive feedback for your team members. Be sure to at least include one constructive feedback per member and this be about thing to keep and/or to improve at.

	Situation/behaviour	Effect/impact	Need/Way forward
Mohammad	Does everything he needs to do and comes up with new ideas to implement. Sometimes switches up certain functionalities with each other.	Things need to be switched.	Look at the functional requirements document to see what user needs which functionalities.
Lars	Is very good at coding and likes to try new things and challenges, however he cannot type and makes a lot of spelling errors.	We have to go over everything he has written and change everything, which takes a lot of time.	Be more careful when typin, turn on spell check
Esther	Allways on time, good at taking notes. Takes very long to make a piece of the code.	The others that need the code shes working on have to wait and get behind on schedule.	Be more involved with the project.

Below you are expected to assign a grade between 0 and 10 per group member (including yourself) on how well the person contributed to the project, and how proactive this person was.

	Lars	Mohammad	Esther	Soleil
Contribution to project	8	8	7	6
Proactive attitude	7	7	6	5