**Peer Evaluation Form**

Your Name: David Pope

For each group member, indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement on the left, using a scale of 1-4 (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=agree; 4=strongly agree). Total the numbers in each column.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria | Group Member Name:  Nathan Craig | Group Member Name:  Mason Allaman | Group Member Name:  Manthan Kale |
| Attends group meetings regularly and arrives on time. | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Contributes meaningfully to group discussions. | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Completes group assignments on time. | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Prepares work in a quality manner. | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Demonstrates a cooperative and supportive attitude. | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Contributes significantly to the success of the project. | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Effective Scrum Master | 4 | 4 | 1 |

Adapted from a peer evaluation form developed at Johns Hopkins University (October, 2006)

Feedback on team dynamics:

1. How effectively did your group work?

Our team worked together fairly effectively and efficiently. There were places during the development process that we could have done better, but for the most part we worked together well. During the first sprint when I was the Scrum Master, we were able to meet together at least once a week. Manthan did not attend those meetings despite saying he would attend those meetings over voice chat. The meetings with Nathan and Mason went well as they were on top of their tasks and communicated about what they needed to do and what roadblocks were in their way. My task for the first sprint was to create a Barebones UI for our application which I got done on time and committed to GitHub for everyone else to use. Nathan worked on setting up our Database. Using his past experience with databases he was able to complete this task quickly and effectively. He also set up our Back-End application and made sure the UI and Back-End were pointing to each other. This was done on time and effectively as well. Mason and Manthan both worked on researching methods for machine learning and text processing. Mason presented his research to us and showed what he thought would be best to use, while Manthan did not share with us the research he gathered outside of the sprint presentation.

For the second sprint my task was to connect the Database to the Back-End. This was tested and completed on time before the end of the sprint. Nathan was the Scrum Master for the second sprint and organized meetings and completed work effectively. He checked in often to see where we were at on our progress and when we wanted to meet. His task was to create the Twitter Scraper with Twitter4j that would grab the tweets that we needed for the application. He was able to create the Twitter Scraper on time before the end of the sprint. Mason and Manthan were to work on the basic tweet analyzer algorithm. Mason was able to complete this task before the end of the sprint, however Manthan did not contribute to this task or make any attempts to communicate or ask about it.

For the third sprint, Mason was the Scrum Master. He organized very well and made sure we met enough times to get all of the work done that we needed to, that would ensure we were on track to complete our application on time. My task for the third sprint was getting the front-end connected with the back-end. I was able to send the data from Twitter and the back-end to the UI, and create the services that we needed to send data back and forth. I also created the test data screen so that we could send test data to the analyzer and database. This was all completed before the end of the sprint. Mason worked on developing the sentiment analyzer which he completed by the end of the sprint and was able to integrate the analyzer into our back end. He also worked with Nathan to develop the database tables and functions that we would need for sending, pulling, and storing data. They worked together and completed this task before the end of the sprint. Manthan was to develop the text processor but he did not complete this task before the end of the sprint. He communicated to use that he was busy with other classes and did not complete it. He said he would push his incomplete code which he never did. This set us back in our progress quite a bit.

1. Were the behaviors of any of your team members particularly valuable or detrimental to the team? Explain.
2. What did you learn about working in a group from this project that you will carry into your next group experience?
3. Additional comments (Optional)