Team Member Evaluations - Submit this form for each team member including yourself.

| Evaluated Person: Erik Metzner Evalua | Evaluated Person: Erik Metzner Evaluator: Jonathan Giacomelli | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Team: Date: | | | | | | | | |
| Category | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Planning | | | | | X | | | |
| Decision Making | | | | | X | | | |
| Communication | | | | | X | | | |
| Organizational Skill including Time Management | | | | X | | | | |
| Ability to meet deadlines and punctuality. | | | | X | | | | |
| Flexibility to discuss ideas and form alternate approaches | | | | X | | | | |
| Responsiveness to shifting project priorities | | | | X | | | | |
| Problem solving, willingness to brain storm and form a range of possi | ble | | | | X | | | |
| solutions | | | | | | | | |
| Teamwork including working team priorities, ability to integrate person | onal | | | | x | | | |
| goals into the project's requirements to enhance the project. | | | | | | | | |
| Leadership including the ability to bring out the best in team mates, | | | | | x | | | |
| willingness to search to pathways to keep the project on track and usir | ng | | | | | | | |
| initiative to self-start and help others to stay focused on appropriate | | | | | | | | |
| tasks. | | | | | | | | |
| Professionalism – ability to complete the project despite the normal da | aily | | | X | | | | |
| buzz of competing schedules and priorities. | | | | | | | | |
| Technical knowledge as defined by the needs of your senior design | | | | | x | | | |
| project. | | | | | | | | |
| Contribution of this person – Hardware aspects | | | | | X | | | |
| Contribution of this person – Software aspects | | | X | | | | | |
| Contribution of this person – Mechanical aspects | | | | X | | | | |

Rating Scale

| 0 | |
|---|--|
| 0 | The person either did not contribute any useful effort or the category does not apply to this person (must |
| | be justified in the comments section). |
| 1 | The person is perceived as supplying the absolute minimum in effort in this category to complete the |
| | project at the lowest acceptable level. |
| 2 | The person is perceived as supplying minimal effort in this category as long as other conflicts such as |
| | their academic schedule are not impacting the person. |
| 3 | The person is perceived as striving complete the project but, in this category, needs frequent orientation |
| | or other direction to stay on track and be a successful contributor. |
| 4 | The person is perceived as capable, and able to work independently in this category. The team |
| | members can rely on this person to stay on track, be focused, and coordinate all aspects necessary of |
| | this category. |
| 5 | The person is perceived as being the role model of an engineer with unmatchable skills, endless |
| | enthusiasm, limitless energy and capable of completing any relevant task required by the project. |

| T) 1 | | | 1.4 | - | • | | | | C | .1 . | |
|---------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|------|------|------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| Please | comment | on | ดเเลโเริง | ot | Siin | nort | VOII | receive | trom | this | nerson |
| 1 10000 | COMMITTEE | 011 | quarte | O . | Sub | POIL | , | 1000110 | 11 0111 | CITIO | person. |

What are his/her greatest strengths?

If not for the ridiculous requirement forcing us to change group leaders, Erik would have remain group leader for the entirely of both semesters. He has a talent for managing technical personnel and getting ideas standardized and transmitted.

What areas need attention?

I would have liked to have seen Erik more, although I completely understand his issue with punctuality, since I also had the same issues.