CSCI P465/565 (Software Engineering I)

360º Peer Evaluation Form

PURPOSE OF PEER EVALUATION
The purpose of peer evaluation is to provide SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely) feedback to the instructor on project activities. This observation is but one method to strengthen the effectiveness of course project to achieve course goals.

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Student Name:	Mohit Murali Alumullithody
Group Number:	13

SELF-EVALUATION					
Criterion	*Strongly Agree / Excellent*	*Agree / Good*	*Disagree / Not Good*	*Strongly Disagree / Poor*	*N/A*
Did you find the course project challenging?	*Strongly Agree*				
Do you feel that the experience of working on the project (*from an idea to the product*) will help you in your career?	*Strongly Agree*				
Did you enjoy working on the course project?	*Strongly Agree*				

<u>Additional Comments:</u>

CUSTOMER / AI EVALUATION

Criterion	Strongly Agree /	Agree / Good	Disagree / Not Good	Strongly Disagree / Poor	N/A
Based on your interaction with the customer, rate the following:					
The clarity of requirements	*Strongly Agree*				
Helpfulness / Timely Responsiveness	*Strongly Agree*				
Availability for meetings	*Strongly Agree*				
The level of Coding Support / Guidance provided		*Good*			
The level of Non-Coding Support / Guidance provided		*Good*			
Others (Identify)					
Others (Identify)					
Will you like to work with the customer again? *If not, (in comments below) highlight why.*	*Strongly Agree*				

Additional Comments:

OVERALL GROUP EFFORT EVALUATION

If you were rewarded $21 for your hard work this week and had to distribute this among your teammates, how much would you give to each member?

Group Member Name	Amount	Justification (REQUIRED)
Tony Dattolo	$7	Worked on Posts functionality for the sprint and completed it on time.
Rushikesh Pharate	$7	Made the code base for posts functionality.
Rahul Shamdasani	$7	Worked on Hosting functionality for the sprint and also identified QC defects in the system.

Additional Comments (Optional):

OVERALL GROUP EVALUATION					
Criterion	*Strongly Agree / Excellent*	*Agree / Good*	*Disagree / Not Good*	*Strongly Disagree / Poor*	*N/A*
Do you feel the size of the group was appropriate?		*Agree*			
Do you feel that each group must have the following expertise / qualities:					
Databases		*Agree*			
Programming Language	*Strongly Agree*				
Web Design / Web Programming	*Strongly Agree*				
Industrial Experience		*Good*			
Leadership / Management Experience		*Good*			
Team work Experience	*Strongly Agree*				
Good Communication / Writing Skills	*Strongly Agree*				
Interpersonal (Social) Skills	*Strongly Agree*				
Others (Identify)					
Others (Identify)					
Do you feel you chose the right group members? *If not, (in comments below) highlight why.*					

INDIVIDUAL PEER EVALUATION

Group Member Name: *Tony Dattolo*

Criterion		Rating: 1 Very Poor – 2 Fair – 3 Average – 4 Good – 5 Outstanding
Competency / Knowledge / Experience		5
Technical skills (Programming, Web, ...)		5
Non-technical skills (social, interpersonal, ...)		5
Motivation / Enthusiasm		5
Overall Attitude		5
Leadership / Management Skills		5
Reliability & Trustworthiness		5
Total Score		Maximum: 35

Additional Comments:
Worked on Posts functionality for the sprint and completed it on time.

INDIVIDUAL PEER EVALUATION

Group Member Name: *Rushikesh Pharate*

Criterion		Rating: 1 Very Poor – 2 Fair – 3 Average – 4 Good – 5 Outstanding
Competency / Knowledge / Experience		5
Technical skills (Programming, Web, ...)		5
Non-technical skills (social, interpersonal, ...)		5

Criterion		Rating
Motivation / Enthusiasm		5
Overall Attitude		5
Leadership / Management Skills		5
Reliability & Trustworthiness		5
Total Score		Maximum: 35

Additional Comments:

Made the code base for posts functionality.

INDIVIDUAL PEER EVALUATION

Group Member Name: *Rahul Shamdasani*

Criterion	Rating: 1 Very Poor – 2 Fair – 3 Average – 4 Good – 5 Outstanding	
Competency / Knowledge / Experience		5
Technical skills (Programming, Web, …)		5
Non-technical skills (social, interpersonal, …)		5
Motivation / Enthusiasm		5
Overall Attitude		5
Leadership / Management Skills		5
Reliability & Trustworthiness		5
Total Score		Maximum: 35

Additional Comments:

Worked on Hosting functionality for the sprint and also identified QC defects in the system.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS