COSC 603

Software Testing and Maintenance

Spring 2016

**Final Project Personal Effort Peer Review Form**

Name: Henry Paredes Jr

Indicate the percent contribution of each group member (include yourself).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Name |  | % contribution |
| Member 1 | Henry Paredes Jr |  | 100% |
| Member 2 | Daniel Ford |  |  |
| Member 3 |  |  |  |
| Total | ------ |  | 100% |

Complete the following for each project team member. Bold the appropriate entry.

**Member 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor | Below average | Average | Above average | Great | Na |
| Communication - participation in group meetings, keeping group members up to date on work status | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| reliability - does tasks on time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| quality of work product | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| willingness to do fair share (or more) of the work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| team player - able to compromise and think win-win | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| technical contribution | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| Overall grade **relative to the rest of the team** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |

Comments, special issues both good and bad:

**Member 2 Daniel Ford**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor | Below average | Average | Above average | Great | Na |
| Communication - participation in group meetings, keeping group members up to date on work status | **1** | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| reliability - does tasks on time | **1** | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| quality of work product | **1** | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| willingness to do fair share (or more) of the work | **1** | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| team player - able to compromise and think win-win | **1** | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| technical contribution | **1** | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| Overall grade **relative to the rest of the team** | **1** | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |

Comments, special issues both good and bad: **I pretty much did the work, and we took too long to decide on which project to work on. Which is pretty much the reason the dynamic portion of the testing was not implemented.**

**Member 3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor | Below average | Average | Above average | Great | Na |
| Communication - participation in group meetings, keeping group members up to date on work status | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| reliability - does tasks on time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| quality of work product | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| willingness to do fair share (or more) of the work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| team player - able to compromise and think win-win | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| technical contribution | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |
| Overall grade **relative to the rest of the team** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Na |

Comments, special issues both good and bad: