

Benjamin Tate
6/12/2017
CS 361 -- Section 400
Project B, Group 6

**Note, since our group only had 4 members including myself, I put the customer, Matthew Weakley, in the Member 4 column. However, I will justify points for him separately from the rest of the group since he had different duties.*

1. **Participation in all group activities:** I awarded points in this section based on approximately what percentage of meetings I recall each member attending, as well as how active each member was in the ongoing group message chain on Hangouts. I gave 5s to myself and Clarence, since I believe we were both at every meeting and were also the most active in the chat, a 4 to Raj, since, while he wasn't at every meeting, he was at most and was quite active in the chat, and a 3.5 to Ted, since he was at about as many meetings as Raj, but less active in the chat in between meetings.
2. **Attitude:** I gave 5s to Raj and Ted, because they remained positive the whole time, but I docked one point from Clarence and myself, because we had one small argument about how to best spend our time when the due date was drawing near. However, even that argument was very civil.
3. **Contribution to group's task functions:** I felt that Clarence and I each pulled at least our share of the work throughout the entire time working on the project, and we took leadership roles (initiated discussions, evaluated things at each step, etc.), so I gave us each 5s. Raj started off kind of slow in the first couple days, but eventually became much more helpful and ended up doing his share of work, so I gave him a 4. I gave Ted a 3.5 because he was helpful, but tended to need to be specifically told to do something in order for him to do it, which limited his contributions to those things that he was asked to do.
4. **Readiness to contribute:** I gave Raj a 5 here, because he always seemed very well-prepared and like he had a good grasp of what was required at each step. I gave Clarence and myself each 4s, because, while we were usually well-prepared, there were one or two meetings where each of us hadn't finished the lectures or something to that effect, which caused us to be a little less helpful than normal during that meeting.
5. **Ability to deal with difficulties:** I gave 5s to everyone here, because the difficulties described don't really apply to our group.
6. **Overall Effectiveness:** I gave myself a 5 here, because I feel I was the only one who was putting in the appropriate amount of effort throughout the entire time we were working on the project, rather than just the second half. Raj and Clarence got 4.5s because, while I had to somewhat push them along for the first bit, they were both extremely effective and helpful for most of the project. Ted got a 3.5 because, once again, he was helpful, but generally only when he was asked to do something. He would have been more effective if he had taken initiative and assigned himself tasks more often.

7. **Customer score justifications:** I gave Matthew mostly 5s, because I felt that he provided what we needed from him. He always responded very quickly to our emails and did what we asked within about a day, he was always positive in our correspondence, and he did his jobs well. The only 4 I gave him was in overall effectiveness, and that was because I wished that in some cases he had provided a little more insight. For the most part, he was very helpful, but sometimes he would just say that something looked good without offering much else, and I felt like we were missing out on his actual opinions.