This form will need to be filled out by each CSCE 3600 student participating in a team for the Major 2 assignment by **11:59 PM on Friday, November 19, 2021**. It will be used to help evaluate your participation and contribution to the assignment as part of your team. Failure to submit a completed form will result in a less than satisfactory grade on this assignment and will include a significant reduction penalty for not completing this portion of the assignment.

1. Did your team follow the modified Scrum Process outlined in class? \_\_\_\_\_**Yes**\_\_\_\_\_

If no, go to item 2. Otherwise, answer the following questions.

* 1. Did you and your team members participate in the weekly Sprint Planning (i.e., set milestones, determine next features, etc.)? Please articulate who participated and to what extent as well as how effective this component was.

**Yes, we all team members actively participate in the weekly Sprint planning meetings. Its actually help us to do a very good Start of the project and set our future goals as well as set milestones. We meet and assigned tasks to one another as well.**

* 1. Did you and your team members participate in the Frequent Scrum (i.e., 2 – 4 times/week, 15 minutes, answer 3 questions, etc.)? Please articulate who participated and to what extent as well as how effective this component was.

**Yes, the whole team participated in frequent scrum almost every week. And in that weekly scrum we discuss the weekly progress and how we are approaching our parts.**

* 1. What roles did each team member play (i.e., ScrumMaster, Product Owner, Team)? Did these roles alternate in subsequent sessions? Please articulate who participated and to what extent as well as how effective this component was.

**There are basically 2 parts and then 4 sub parts in each part in the project and we assigned each one part to one group member. Each function is code by each member**

**Ruvail Shahzad:** exit + Piping

**Eric Teo:** myhistory + Alias

**Katherine Aquilone:** cd + I/o redirection

**Elizabeth Tan:** path + Signal handling

1. Did each team member have specific, even unique, responsibilities that helped the team attain its goal(s)? List all team members by name and their individual responsibilities.
   1. Name \_\_\_\_**Ruvail Shahzad** \_\_\_\_\_ Responsibility \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**exit + Piping**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* 1. Name \_\_\_\_\_\_ **Eric Teo** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Responsibility \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **myhistory + Alias** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* 1. Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Katherine Aquilone** \_\_ Responsibility \_\_\_\_\_\_ **cd + I/o redirection** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

* 1. Name \_\_\_\_\_\_ **Elizabeth Tan** \_\_\_\_\_ Responsibility \_\_\_\_ **path + Signal handling** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Identify and rate each team member, including yourself, on their active **participation**. Participation is defined in this context as actively engaging in meetings (either in person or electronically), listening skills, openness to other’s ideas, preparation, and willingness to be a part of the team. Use the 0 – 5 scale defined below for each team member, including yourself.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Missing (0)** | **Unacceptable (1)** | **Needs to Improve (2)** | **Fair (3)** | **Good (4)** | **Excellent (5)** |
| Never showed up and never responded either in person or electronically. | Rarely showed up, but if so, not at all engaged in communication with team. May volunteer, but did not follow through. | Occasionally showed up for some of meetings, but inconsistent and minimally engaged in communication with team. | Regularly showed up and did try to participate, but impact is only somewhat effective. | Consistently showed up and actively participated. Solid and impactful member of the team. | Always showed up and took charge (without overstepping bounds). Exceptional member of the team. |

* 1. Name \_\_\_\_\_**Ruvail Shahazad**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **5**
  2. Name \_\_\_\_\_**Eric Teo**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **5**
  3. Name \_\_\_\_\_ **Katherine Aquilone** \_\_ Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **5**
  4. Name \_\_\_\_\_ **Elizabeth Tan** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 5

1. Identify and rate each team member, including yourself, on their active **contribution**. Contribution is defined in this context as actively impacting the success of the project, especially in writing code and supporting documentation. Use the 0 – 5 scale defined below for each team member, including yourself.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Missing (0)** | **Unacceptable (1)** | **Needs to Improve (2)** | **Fair (3)** | **Good (4)** | **Excellent (5)** |
| Did not contribute anything to the project. | Assigned a portion of the project, but never followed through or just gave up with minimal, if anything, completed. Contributions, if any, often peripheral or irrelevant. | Assigned a portion of the project, but was not able to complete their portion of the assignment (i.e., they tried, but required either too much help or another member was forced to take over). Quality of contributions was inconsistent. | Assigned a portion of the project and completed basic functionality (i.e., perhaps was “buggy” or did not meet all of the requirements). Quality of contributions was fair. | Assigned and completed their portion of the project effectively (with no or minimal errors). Able to help out other team members. Quality of contributions was solid. | Assigned and completed their portion of the project effectively (with no or minimal errors). Able to help out other team members and helped to guide the solution of the project. Quality of contributions was exceptional. |

* 1. Name \_\_\_\_\_**Ruvail Shahazad**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **5**
  2. Name \_\_\_\_\_**Eric Teo**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **5**
  3. Name \_\_\_\_\_ **Katherine Aquilone** \_\_ Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **5**
  4. Name \_\_\_\_\_ **Elizabeth Tan** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 5

1. *Qualitative*: Provide some evidence of justification for your ratings of you and your team members. Just an outline is sufficient, but you may give specific examples of something (i.e., a skill, expertise, etc.) that each member brought to the project, how well the members functioned as a team, what projects each member had interacting as a team, etc.

**I give my all group members 5 rating because all members did their work really well. No problem found while I run the code and it’s working perfectly. Also, their behavior was very professional towards group meetings and coding. All are super experts in their works.**

1. *Quantitative*: Assign specific points for the ***performance quality*** of your teammates. For each team member, not including yourself, assign a value from 0 to 50, inclusively. If, for example, all team members’ performance quality was great, you may assign all team members a score of 50.

Consider the following extreme case:

*Case 1: Team members W, X, Y, and Z. From Y’s point of view, Y feels that she and Z did the bulk of the work, while W did not contribute anything and X contributed only a small portion. So Y might assign her points in the following manner:*

*W => 0 points*

*X => 20 points*

*Z => 50 points*

*Notice that Y does not need to assign the total sum of 150 points.*

Please be as fair as possible. We will use the information collected in this survey to objectively assign points for this assignment and will consider what is written here as well as what is on GitLab based on commits and submitted code.

* 1. Name \_\_\_\_**Eric Teo**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_**50**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
  2. Name \_\_\_\_**Katherine Aquilone** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_**50**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
  3. Name \_\_\_\_ **Elizabeth Tan** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_**50**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_