CSCI P465/565 (Software Engineering I)

360° Peer Evaluation Form

PURPOSE OF PEER EVALUATION

The purpose of peer evaluation is to provide SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely) feedback to the instructor on project activities. This observation is but one method to strengthen the effectiveness of course project to achieve course goals.

GENERAL INFORMATION			
Student Name:	Soham Atul Pingat		
Group Number:	21		

SELF-EVALUATION					
Criterion	Strongly Agree / Excellent	Agree / Good	Disagree / Not Good	Strongly Disagree / Poor	N/A
Did you find the course project challenging?	Yes				
Do you feel that the experience of working on the project (<i>from an idea to the product</i>) will help you in your career?	Yes				
Did you enjoy working on the course project?	Yes				

Additional Comments:

CUSTOMER	R/AIEV	ALUATIO	ON		
Criterion	Strongly Agree / Excellent	Agree / Good	Disagree / Not Good	Strongly Disagree / Poor	N/A
Based on your interaction with the customer, rate the following:					
The clarity of requirements	Yes				
Helpfulness / Timely Responsiveness	Yes				
Availability for meetings	Yes				
The level of Coding Support / Guidance provided	Yes				
The level of Non-Coding Support / Guidance provided	Yes				
Others (Identify)	Yes				
Others (Identify)					
		T			
Will you like to work with the customer again? If not, (in comments below) highlight why.	Yes				
Addit None	tional Comm	ents:			

OVERALL GROUP EFFORT EVALUATION			
If you were rewarded \$21 for your hard work this week and had to distribute this among your teammates, how much would you give to each member? (Your justifications will be shared with the respective teammate.)			
Group Member Name	Amount	Justification (REQUIRED)	
Sai Charan	6	Saicharan created an attractive account page, he learned react faster than I expected. His progress was above and beyond that's why extra points than others	
Nihal Shetty	5	Nihal took care of Test plan documentation single handedly. He also worked with Owen to migrate the backend to React	
Rohith	5	Rohith took care of Weekly status report by himself. He worked with saicharan at an impressive scale to learn everything	
Owen	5	Owen took care of both the videos. Edited them and also worked on the backend. Despite being busy he took initiative to work on the project.	
Additional Comments (Optional):			

OVERALL GROUP EVALUATION					
Criterion	Strongly Agree / Excellent	Agree / Good	Disagree / Not Good	Strongly Disagree / Poor	N/A
Do you feel the size of the group was appropriate?	Yes				
Do you feel that each group must have the following expertise / qualities:					
Databases		Yes			
Programming Language	Yes				
Web Design / Web Programming	Yes				
Industrial Experience	Yes				
Leadership / Management Experience		Yes			
Team work Experience	Yes				
Good Communication / Writing Skills	Yes				
Interpersonal (Social) Skills	Yes				
Others (Identify)					
Others (Identify)					
Do you feel you chose the right group members? <i>If</i> not, (in comments below) highlight why.	Yes				

	Additional Comments:	
None		

Individual Peer Evaluation			
Group Member Name:			
Sai Charan			
Criterion	Rating: 1 V	Yery Poor – 2 Fair – 3 Average – 4 Good – 5 Outstanding	
Competency / Knowledge / Experience	5		
Technical skills (Programming, Web, etc.)	5		
Non-technical skills (social, interpersonal, etc.)	5		
Motivation / Enthusiasm	5		
Overall Attitude	5		
Leadership / Management Skills	5		
Reliability & Trustworthiness	5		
Total Score	35	Maximum: 35	
Additional Comments (required):			

INDIVIDUAL PEER EVALUATION			
Group Member Name:			
Rohith			
Criterion	Rating: 1 Vet	ry Poor – 2 Fair – 3 Average – 4 Good – 5 Outstanding	
Competency / Knowledge / Experience	5		
Technical skills (Programming, Web, etc.)	5		
Non-technical skills (social, interpersonal, etc.)	5		
Motivation / Enthusiasm	5		
Overall Attitude	5		
Leadership / Management Skills	5		
Reliability & Trustworthiness	5		
Total Score	35	Maximum: 35	

Additional Comments (required):			

INDIVIDUAL PEER EVALUATION			
Group Member Name:			
Nihal Shetty			
Criterion Rating: 1 Very Poor – 2 Fair – 3 Average – 4 Good – 5 Outstandin			
Competency / Knowledge / Experience	5		
Technical skills (Programming, Web, etc.)	5		
Non-technical skills (social, interpersonal, etc.)	5		
Motivation / Enthusiasm	5		
Overall Attitude	5		
Leadership / Management Skills	5		
Reliability & Trustworthiness	5		
Total Score	35	Maximum: 35	
Additional Comments (usering d)			

Additional Comments (required):

INDIVIDUAL PEER EVALUATION			
Group Member Name:			
Owen			
Criterion	Rating: 1 Very	Poor – 2 Fair – 3 Average – 4 Good – 5 Outstanding	
Competency / Knowledge / Experience	5		
Technical skills (Programming, Web, etc.)	5		
Non-technical skills (social, interpersonal, etc.)	5		
Motivation / Enthusiasm	5		
Overall Attitude	5		
Leadership / Management Skills	5		
Reliability & Trustworthiness	5		

Total Score	35	
Addit	ional Comments	(required):
Individ	UAL PEER E	VALUATION
Group Member Name:	CILL I LEX L	VILLETTION (
Group Wember Wante.		
Criterion	Rating: 1 Very	Poor – 2 Fair – 3 Average – 4 Good – 5 Outstanding
Competency / Knowledge / Experience		
Technical skills (Programming, Web, etc.)		
Non-technical skills (social, interpersonal, etc.)		
Motivation / Enthusiasm		
Overall Attitude		
Leadership / Management Skills		
Reliability & Trustworthiness		
Total Score		
Addi	tional Comments (required):

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS	
SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS	

