

Stat 6021: Peer Evaluation

Peer evaluation written by John Johnson (Group Number 5)

1 Group Evaluation

In general, I thought the group worked well as a whole. Members were generally respectful of each other, were open to sharing ideas, and it was always clear what the assigned tasks were for each member.

What did not work well was that we underestimated the time it took to review and edit the report. It felt that we were rushing through edits and in the future, I would be mindful that more time needs to be set aside for reviews and edits.

2 Self Evaluation

- Overall contributions: My contributions were that I coded and wrote a good portion of the section on data visualization (around 50% of the section). I also reviewed and provided feedback for edits on the summary of findings section. I would assign myself a score of 2 for this component.
- Team role fulfillment: score of 2. I was generally a good and active participant during our meetings and completed the work that was assigned to me.
- Cooperation and communication: score of 2. I made a conscious effort to listen to the opinions of others, and really think about their suggestions. I was also comfortable reviewing the work of others and provided constructive feedback to their work.
- Focus: score of 2. I can be counted upon to complete my task.
- Accuracy of work: score of 1. My teammates pointed out a few mistakes that I had made in my work, which I then had to revise.

3 Peer Evaluation

3.1 Group Member: Adam Adams

- Overall contributions: score of 2. Did his fair share of work. Worked with me on the data visualization section, wrote the summary of findings section, and reviewed and edited the SLR section.
- Team role fulfillment: score of 2. Generally a good participant in our meetings and did most of the assigned work.
- Cooperation and communication: score of 2. Good listener and supported other group members by providing valuable feedback.
- Focus: score of 2. Can be counted upon to complete work without prodding.
- Accuracy of work: score of 2+. Work is complete, well-organized, error free, and done on time.
- General comments: would be very happy to work with Adam again!

3.2 Group Member: Billy Bills

- Overall contributions: score of 2. Did his fair share of work. Wrote the code and wrote the section on SLR.
- Team role fulfillment: score of 2. Generally a good participant in our meetings and did most of the assigned work.
- Cooperation and communication: score of 2. Good listener and supported other group members by providing valuable feedback.
- Focus: score of 2. Can be counted upon to complete work without prodding.
- Accuracy of work: score of 2. Work is generally complete and met the requirements, and done on time.
- General comments: would be very happy to work with Billy again!

3.3 Group Member: Craig Craig

- Overall contributions: score of 1. He mostly just reviewed the report and provided feedback, but I do not think he actually did any or much of the coding or analysis.
- Team role fulfillment: score of 0. Was supposed to work with Billy on the section on SLR but Billy had to do most of it.
- Cooperation and communication: score of 1. Was happy to provide feedback to others but was unwilling to share the progress of his work, which we found was not done at the last minute.
- Focus: score of 0. Was happy to let others do his work.
- Accuracy of work: score of 0. Left his work incomplete.
- General comments: Craig seemed happy to let others do the heavy lifting and only did the easy parts like reviewing our work.