

SELF AND PEER EVALUATION RATING SHEET:

Assess each member of your group, including yourself, using the form below. Put your group member's names across the top including your own, and then rate each person in the categories using the number system below. This evaluation is done anonymously; the group will not see the ratings you have given them. Be honest with yourself and in evaluating others. Very few people—including yourself—are all 1's or all 5's.

Rating scale:	Poor 1	Poor- distracted to the progress...
	Below average 2	
	Average 3	
	Above average 4	
	Superior 5	
		Superior- enhanced the performance of the group...

Provide justification for all marks. Provide in a separate PDF file.

You do not need a separate statement for each box, but your statements should justify all marks for that person.

	Questions	Self	Member 1	Member 2	Member 3	Member 4
i	Enter your group number	3				
ii	Enter the Name	David Mednikov	Alexander Yfaimov	Hitesh Varma	Kevin Allen	Michael Johnson
1	Participation in all group activities	5	4	4	4	5
2	Attitude : Open-minded, objective, respected other's ideas, positive, didn't complain	4	5	5	5	4
3	Contribution to the group's task functions: Provides or asks for information and opinions, initiates discussion, clarifies, summarizes, evaluates, energizes, etc.	5	4	5	4	5
4	Readiness to contribute: Well-prepared	4	5	5	5	5
5	Ability to deal with difficulties: Apathy, deviant members, hidden agendas, etc.	5	5	4	5	5
6	Overall Effectiveness	5	5	5	5	5

Over All	4.66666667	4.66666667	4.66666667	4.66666667	4.83333333
----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

David Mednikov

CS361 Summer 2018

Team Member Evaluation

Alexander Yfraimov

- Participation (4) – Alexander was present in all of the meetings and always available on Slack when a message or question was sent to him. He always turned in his part of the weekly assignment on time.
- Attitude (5) – Alexander was always open to the input of other team members and the customer. For example, on one of our user stories the customer had a different idea than what Alexander had envisioned when he created the prototype. Alexander was very open to re-creating his concept to better line up with the customer's request.
- Contribution (4) – Alexander would often bring up intelligent questions during our meetings, both for the team and for the customer. He never had any issues working on whatever tasks were assigned to him, even though he usually didn't choose what he would actually be working on each week.
- Readiness (5) – Every time we met Alexander showed that he had already gone over the lectures and assignment and had a solid understanding of what we would need to complete that week.
- Ability to deal with difficulties (5) – Fortunately this was not tested much, as our group worked together quite smoothly for the entire quarter. Everyone pulled their own weight and no one had any hidden agendas.
- Overall Effectiveness (5) – Alexander was a great member of the group, as he always brought solid insight into our meetings, was always present in the meetings, and always got his tasks done before the deadline.

Hitesh Varma

- Participation (4) – Hitesh was present in all of the meetings up until the last 2 weeks, during which he was traveling. He always was willing to do his fair share of the work and then some.

- Attitude (5) – Hitesh was always very receptive when any other team members or the customer had feedback. Specifically, when he was working on the ERD I asked him to go back and change things several times and he always did it without any issues.
- Contribution (5) – Hitesh was often the first person to volunteer to take on the most difficult or length task in a given weekly assignment. This was much appreciated as some of us were in multiple classes and/or working full time. He also always had detailed questions about his own tasks as well as those of others.
- Readiness (5) – During meetings it was clear that Hitesh had thoroughly reviewed that week's material and come into the meetings with questions and ideas ready to go for the group and our customer.
- Ability to deal with difficulties (4) – With Hitesh traveling the last 2 weeks of the quarter, we had some communication issues where we assigned him more than he felt he could finish due to his lack of access to electricity and internet.
- Overall Effectiveness (5) – Despite his 2-week vacation Hitesh was a very valuable team member, especially since he often volunteered to tackle some of the busier tasks in the weekly assignments. He more than made up for his lack of availability by putting in a lot of work the first 6 weeks.

Kevin Allen

- Participation (4) – Kevin never missed any meetings and always got his work turned in schedule. Likewise he was always available on Slack to answer questions or clarify something.
- Attitude (5) – Both myself and the customer had some feedback for Kevin that required him to go back and change some things, and he always made the changes without any qualms or complaints.
- Contribution (4) – Kevin never had any issues with doing the work that was assigned to him and often had some good questions for the customer regarding details that the rest of us hadn't thought about at all.

- Readiness (5) – Like the rest of the team, every time we had a meeting Kevin showed that he had prepared sufficiently by reviewing that week's lecture material and going over the assignment in advance to know what would be expected.
- Ability to deal with difficulties (5) – There were no issues that came up, no team members brought any drama or issues and everyone was happy to do their share of the work.
- Overall Effectiveness (5) – Just like Hitesh and Alexander, Kevin was a great teammate that was always present and did his tasks on time and well. I couldn't ask for anything more or think of any particular weaknesses in his ability as a teammate.

Michael Johnson

- Participation (5) – Michael always joined our meetings when we asked him to. He was quick to respond to any questions or clarifications and was present for each step of the way.
- Attitude (4) – Michael was a very easy customer to work with, and would often approve design decisions that we agreed upon as a team without him present. Him being open-minded to our interpretation of his vision made it an enjoyable experience to develop his app.
- Contribution (5) – Michael often had detailed feedback and well-thought-out questions for us whenever we shared our work with him, whether it was the writing and documentation from assignments 1-5 or the actual development work in assignments 6 and 7. This helped us design the app so that it aligned closely with his vision.
- Readiness (5) – Every time Michael joined in our meetings he had already reviewed the work we had submitted and was prepared with helpful and easy-to-understand feedback and suggestions.
- Ability to deal with difficulties (5) – Michael was a very easygoing customer. We didn't miss any deadlines and he typically approved of our work as submitted. If there was anything he didn't agree with, he would let us know and give us a more

detailed description of how he envisioned that particular component. Never did I feel like he had any hidden agendas or personal issues with our work.

- Overall Effectiveness (5) – Michael was exactly what you could ask for in a customer – patient and understanding, but also clear in his expectations. He was always willing to explain things we missed as well as provide positive feedback about the things we did right. It was a pleasure working with him.