

PHYS 6260 Term Project: Peer Evaluation Form for Group Work at the Midterm

Your name: C. Michael Haynes

Write the name of each of your group members in a separate column. For each person, 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: Neil Baker	Group member: Kenneth Thompson	Group member: Corinne Hill	Group member: Eden Schapera	Group member: N/A (Group of 5)
Attends group meetings regularly and arrives on time.	4	4	2	1	
Contributes meaningfully to group discussions.	4	4	3	1	
Completes group assignments on time.	4	3	2	2	
Prepares work in a quality manner.	4	4	3	3	
Demonstrates a cooperative and supportive attitude.	4	3	4	2	

Contributes significantly to the success of the project.	4	4	2	1	
TOTALS	24	22	16	10	

Feedback on team dynamics:

1. How effectively did your group work?

By & large we were able to obtain results (regarding sub-tasks of deliverables) on a reasonable timescale. However, the distribution of effort and contributions is *heavily* skewed. Most meetings that contribute to the code base itself consist only of Kenneth Thompson, Neil Baker, and I (CMH). All group communication is in a shared forum, and the other group members are frequently absent.

2. Were the behaviors of any of your team members particularly valuable or detrimental to the team? Explain.

The space plasma background of NEB and CMH combined with the nuclear physics and reactor plasma understanding offered by Kenneth and Corinne have combined to form a team with a well-balanced expertise. Eden Schapera specifically will often fail to even provide justification for deciding not to attend meetings. At the one meeting they attended, they were largely distracted and on their phone. Corinne has been sick for the past couple weeks, so part of the lack of attendance can be attributed to that for her.