## **OPEN-ENDED PEER EVALUATION: FORM PEER2**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Haris Kureishy | |  |  |
| Team | Team Z | | Instructor | Dr. Honig |
| Date | **10/25/20** |  |  |  |

# **PEER2 – TEAM PDCA**

PDCA = Plan, Do, Check, Act. It is the basic quality improvement process. Take a moment to reflect on your team’s work, then answer the following questions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TEAM FEEDBACK | YOUR ANSWERS (USE AS MUCH SPACE AS NEEDED) |
| What did my team do best? | I think we did a really good job at planning out how we would do the project and keeping each other updated after making any changes. I also think we did pretty well at divvying our roles as well. |
| What do we need to change or do better? | The only thing I really think we need to change is to try to follow the guidelines you set better, or at least access them better, as we usually could not find specific a standard guidelines, like with the requirements. |
| What other suggestions for improvement do you recommend? | even though we did nd up divvying the roles up I feel as though because of the nature of cycle one some people ended up having to do more or less work than others, though the others will most likely be more active in cycles 2-3z |

# **PEER2 – TEAM MEMBER PDCA**

Please give some thought to each team member and your experiences working with them. Provide some feedback and make some helpful suggestions to improve the future performance of the person. One idea for thinking about improvement suggestions is to ask yourself “What do I wish the team member had done MORE of during the cycle?” and “What do I wish the team member had done LESS of during the cycle?”

Please make at least one improvement suggestion for each of your teammates.

Replace the letters in the TEAM MEMBER column with the team member’s names. Rating code (1 = inadequate to 5 = superior, the step or increment is 0.5. For example: 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5….. ). Each team member will give a rating to all other team members. Each rating will be a different number between 5 and 0.5. Everyone should not be a 5.0! Give at least one improvement suggestion to each team member. You do NOT rate yourself

YOUR RATING WILL NOT IMPACT THEIR GRADES IN ANYWAY. USE THIS TO HELP YOUR TEAM MATES LEARN ABOUT THEMSELVES.

GIVING INCOMPLETE OR NON THOUGHTFUL FEEDBACK **WILL IMPACT \*YOUR GRADE\*.** Please take time to do this well.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TEAM MEMBER | OVERALL RATING | YOUR SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (USE AS MUCH SPACE AS NEEDED) |
| KELVIN BUI | 3.5 | WAS HELPFUL AND PUNCTUAL DOING WORK SUGGESTED TO HIM, BUT DIDN’T TAKE MUCH INITIATIVE TO DO TASKS ON HIS OWN. WOULD PROBABLY BENEFIT FROM ATTEMPTING MORE RANDOM TASKS |
| KENDALL PHILIPS | 4 | HELPFUL DURING ORGANIZATIONAL STAGES AND PLANNING, THEN CONTINUED LATER ON. COULD PROBABLY WORRY LESS ABOUT TAKING INITIATIVE AND MAKING CHANGES WHEN SHE DOES SO. |
| KAYLIN LUCK | 4.5 | ALWAYS SEEMED TO BE THINKING OF WHAT TO DO NEXT OR HOW TO IMPLEMENT THE PROJECT, OVERALL WAS VERY HELPFUL. COULD PROBABLY DELEGATE TASKS MORE OFTEN TO HER OWN BENEFIT. |
| KIERAN TAYLOR | 3.5 | HELPED DURING THE PLANNING AND HAD GOOD SUGGESTIONS DURING THE MEETINGS, AS WELL AS BEING HELPFUL DURING ANY OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL STEPS. WILL PROBABLY BE ABLE TO DO MORE DURING A STAGE WHEN WE CAN BEGIN IMPLEMENTING GUI ELEMENTS. |
| E |  |  |
| F |  |  |
| G |  |  |
| L |  |  |
| I |  |  |
| J |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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