

# **CS200 Written Assignment # 5**

## **Due Friday December 12, 2014 at 9:00AM**

### **NO LATE PERIOD**

Nearly all significant software development is done as part of a team. For many of you, these assignments may have been your first experience in team programming. Being on a team means contributing to achieving a common goal – getting a good grade on the assignments and learning new material. This assignment asks you to assess how well you and your partners have worked together.

This assignment will require you to evaluate yourself and your programming partners. The purpose of the assignment is to 1) encourage you to think about what makes a good team and each person a good team member and 2) to give you the opportunity to provide feedback on how well your teams worked, above and beyond how well you did on your programs.

For each team, you will be asked to honestly assess how that team did and how each person contributed to it. Although you will be asked to assign specific scores to **both** you and your partners, the important part is the justification for the scores. Your grade on this assignment will be based in part on how well (honestly, thoroughly, appropriately) you evaluate team performance as well as on how your partners assessed you.

### **Guidelines for Evaluation**

We will not offer a checklist that produces a quantitative assessment of how much each person was worth. Instead, what follows are suggestions of points to consider.

**Objectivity and Responsibility:** When one is required to evaluate another person, one wields power over the other; with this power comes the responsibility to make well-considered judgments. You need to evaluate others as objectively as possible considering what was done in light of what was expected.

**Concrete Justification:** You need to provide information that would help someone improve or justify your numeric evaluation for them. Use examples of what was done well and poorly for each person. It is ok to have encountered problems *if* you and your teammate recovered from them.

**Criticism Should be Constructive:** Webster defines *criticize* (first definition) as: "To judge the merits and faults of; analyze and evaluate." Note that "criticism" can include praise. It is your chance to recognize the efforts of your partner, especially if you had a particularly good one.

**The Most Important Attribute: Fairness** Nothing is gained by an arbitrary or capricious evaluation. No one will believe it. Fairness requires putting aside personal preferences, e.g., don't ding someone simply because they prefer different music than

you or like to work late at night. Differentiate between relevant and irrelevant evaluation criteria. Examples of *irrelevant* criteria include (but are not limited to) age, gender, race, ethnic group, religious affiliation, marital status, height, weight, hair color, liking or not liking them, choice in laptops (yes, not even if they don't use a Mac ☺), etc. Conversely, *relevant* criteria concern a person's **performance** and **achievements!**

**Ability/Potential Vs. Performance/Achievement:** A person who has high ability or potential is *not* necessarily a person who has performed, has achieved or has been a successful partner. No matter how much (or how little) ability/capability/potential a person may have, they should be evaluated based on how they contributed to the team and its achievements.

**Balancing Criteria for Evaluating:** Think about what you are evaluating and how important each criterion is (and its interconnection to other criteria). Key skills for successful teams include: flexibility, communication, willingness to contribute, knowing when and when not to lead, taking responsibility for your tasks, and understanding each partner's strengths and weaknesses. Some specifics you might consider are:

- Accuracy & correctness of the work.
- Reliability (e.g., on time for meetings, work on time, can be reached when needed, etc.),
- Technical skills,
- Creativity,
- Communication,
- Interpersonal skills (e.g., can work together, tries to get along, etc.)
- Enthusiasm & willingness to contribute to the best of their abilities.

## What To Hand In

You will be submitting via RamCT. You must turn in two files: a justification and a spreadsheet with scores. The justification document should have multiple parts: one for each assignment (PA2, PA3, PA4 and PA5). The spreadsheet has columns indicating your name and your partners' names as well as scores. The spreadsheet template is available via the assignment page. For each assignment, you have a total of 25 points to allocate to you and your partner **combined**<sup>1</sup>. The total points over the four assignments must sum to 100. Provide a score for each person in the spreadsheet as well as a justification (at least 2 good sized paragraphs) for each score in the document. If you worked together on more than one assignment, you can write one justification for each pairing.

Your justifications submissions may be printed out for comparison with what your partners have said so **the document you submit should have your name on it!** Please submit a pdf document. Use a format that looks like what is listed on the next page. The spreadsheet is being provided in both xlsx and csv forms; submit the one that works best for you.

---

<sup>1</sup> If you were in a group of three, divide the points between the three of you.

All evaluations are completely confidential between you and Dr. Howe and will not be seen by anyone else. If someone questions the grade they receive on this assignment, Dr. Howe will summarize the justification from both partners without indicating what scores were assigned by whom.

#### CS200 Team Evaluation

NAME:

PA2

Partner name:

Justification:

PA3

Partner name:

Justification:

PA4

Partner name:

Justification:

PA5

Partner name:

Justification: