This form will need to be filled out by each CSCE 3600 student participating in a team for the Major 1 assignment by **11:59 PM on Friday, February 14, 2020**. 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? **No**

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.
  2. 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.
  3. 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.

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: Yafet Kubrom Responsibility: Completed Palindrome.c, made the original menu on major1.c, made the original makefile, made the original major1.h file, edited README.md
   2. Name: James Nicholas Responsibility: Completed power.c, edited major1.c, edited makefile, edited major1.h, made the original README.md
   3. Name: Michael Rakestraw Responsibility: Completed reverse.c, edited major1.c, edited major1.h
   4. Name: Brandon Vojtkofsky Responsibility: Completed replace.c, edited major1.c
2. 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: Yafet Kubrom Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **(5)**
  2. Name: James Nicholas Rating: 0 1 2 3 **(4)** 5
  3. Name: Michael Rakestraw Rating: 0 1 2 3 **(4)** 5
  4. Name: Brandon Vojtkofsky 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: Yafet Kubrom Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **(5)**
  2. Name: James Nicholas Rating: 0 1 2 3 4 **(5)**
  3. Name: Michael Rakestraw Rating: 0 1 2 3 **(4)** 5
  4. Name: Brandon Vojtkofsky 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 completed my part first and begin working on the other parts. I finished them early and pushed the files to gitlab first. James created a way for us to communicate and created the README.md. He was on time for many of the parts. Michael completed his part fast as well and edited .h file. Brandon did his part last and was close to the deadline.

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 has done all of the work, W did not contribute anything, X contributed only a small amount, and Z a little bit more than X. So Y might assign her points in the following manner:*

*W => 0 points*

*X => 10 points*

*Z => 15 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: James Nicholas Points: 45
  2. Name: Michael Rakestraw Points: 40
  3. Name: Brandon Vojtkofsky Points: 30