

Peer Feedback Form

Last Updated: 9/30/2012

Evaluator:

Phil Stahlfeld

Month: September

Please rank your entire team with regard to performance *since the last evaluation*. Include an explanation for your ranking and concentrate on each member's project contributions, personal commendations, and criticisms. Explain how these items have affected the project, both positively and negatively. Please use additional space as needed.

Rating system:

Excellent	(Very positive) Consistently performs at a level above and beyond. Thorough task execution.
Very Good	(Positive) Consistently performs his/her role. Prepared and cooperative. Consistently meets expectations and occasionally exceeds them.
Satisfactory	(Indifferent) Consistently meets expectations. Accomplishes tasks but does not go beyond what is expected. Does not negatively impact the project, but does not work harder than needed, either.
Deficient	(Negative) Occasionally fails to show up and/or complete a task. Needs "supervision" to with regard to getting work done. Occasionally unprepared.
Unsatisfactory	(Very negative) Often fails to show up. Has a negative impact on the project's progress. Uncooperative. Little to no participation.

Self-ranking: Satisfactory

Explain the rationale for your ranking. Include your contributions to the project and candid commendations and criticisms with regard to the project.

After the first week of deliverables, I cannot put myself in the Very Good category since someone in that category would not let his group get a 60%. I feel that I have worked hard and led the team to get back on track and even start working ahead a bit.

My personal contributions have been: creation of deliverable document template, problem statement for background document, technical specifications versions 1 and 2, and delegation. The delegation deserves to be emphasized in my mind because nothing would have gotten done in the past three weeks if I had not specifically told my group members exactly what they were supposed to be working on and when it was due.

(more on back)

Team Member: Colin Madigan

Ranking: Satisfactory

Explain the rationale for your ranking. Include contributions to the project, commendations, and criticisms in the context of the project.

Colin understands what is expected of him and he goes out and does it. He does not go above expectations for leading the group and looking ahead, but the work he has done on the background document is beyond what I expected.

Contributions:

Researched the Microsoft paper and summarized it in the background document. Setup the meetings with clients and wrote the agendas.

Commendations:

Excellent work on researching and summarizing. Well written professional emails to clients.

Criticisms:

Needs to be more proactive in accomplishing tasks.

Team Member: Griffin Dunn

Ranking: Satisfactory/Deficient

Explain the rationale for your ranking. Include contributions to the project, commendations, and criticisms in the context of the project.

Griffin has been ready to go to the implementation phase since the beginning of the project. It has been hard to get him to focus on the tasks at hand. When he puts effort into the work it is at or above my expectations.

Contributions:

Research into related products and technologies. Initial rough comparison of capture devices.

Commendations:

Proactive approach to making the website look more professional.

Criticisms:

It has been a handholding experience to get him to focus on the tasks at hand and produce the level of work this project demands.