Peer evaluation template

Use this form in the stated units of your module to assess your team members' performance,including your own, in the group/team assignments. This feedback will not be shared with your team members. However, it will be considered for your final grade for the unit assignments. The full guidance is on the Department page.

Name	Michael Geiger	
Group/Team number or name	Group 2	

Team evaluation

Write the name of each of your group members in a separate column. For each person, indicate the score to which you agree with the statement using the rating scale below. Extreme scores (1 and 5) will need to be justified with comments as they are reserved for extraordinary events (lack of participation or going above and beyond, respectively).

Rating Scale 1 - Did not contribute in this way 2 - Willing but not very successful 3 - Average 4 - Above Average 5 - Outstanding

Peer evaluation template

Evaluation Criteria	Team member: Muhammad Nasim Akabary	Team member: Adrian Boscu	Team member: Haroun Fujah	Team member: Gurkan Huray	Team member: Zihaad Khan
Attends team meetings regularly and arrives on time.	3	3	3	3	3
Contributes meaningfully to team discussions.	3	3	3	3	3
Completes team assignments on time.	3	3	3	3	3
Prepares work in a quality manner.	3	3	3	3	4
Demonstrates a cooperative and supportive attitude.	3	3	3	3	4
Contributes significantly to the success of the project.	3	3	3	3	4

Feedback on team dynamics

1. How effectively did your team work?

Overall the team worked well together. At the beginning, however, wrong decisions were made in the structural planning of the division of labour, which made the work more difficult. Subtasks were divided among the team members, which made it difficult to create the design document smoothly. Since the creation of the AD tree requires vulnerabilities and mitigation approaches and this was initially the responsibility of individual team members, the development process was sluggish. Some team members had to take the initiative and also work on the tasks in order to stay on schedule. Furthermore, it turned out that the division meant that the results were not coordinated with one another.

Adapted from Carnegie Mellon University.

Peer evaluation template

2. Were there any behaviours of your team members which were particularly valuable or detrimental to the team? Explain.

No negative behaviour from team members was observed. Wrong decisions that were made have been decided in the team. One team member who was willing to take on more work and take the initiative showed positive behaviour that should be emphasized.

3. What did you learn about working in a team from this project that you will carry into your next group/team experience?

Wrong decisions made in the team regarding the division of labour had a negative impact on time management. Since this was only determined at a relatively late point in time, this wrong decision could not be remedied, but only reduced. In the future, there should be better and more reflective planning of the division of team resources. There are process structures that can be used as a guide, such as the Agile Scrum approach of the SDLC. More time should be spent at the beginning of a project to plan an appropriate course and place the individual tasks in the overall context, as this can save time throughout the project and lead to a better end product.

Adapted from Carnegie Mellon University.

Peer evaluation template

Self-evaluation

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements, using the same scale shown on the first page. Provide a self-evaluation total.

Contributed good ideas	4
Listened to and respected the ideas of others	3
Compromised and cooperated	4
Took initiative where needed	4
Came to meetings prepared	4
Communicated effectively with teammates	3
Did my share of the work	4
TOTAL	**26**

My greatest strengths as a team member are:
- Took initiative where necessary
- Willingness to take on more work
- Willingness to share and process information and academic articles

The group work skills I plan to work to improve are:
- More reflective project planning
- More critical questioning of team contributions and solutions

Adapted from Carnegie Mellon University.