Team Self-Critique		
	Score: 1-5** (low to high)	Plan to Address (or how it was addressed)
Major Issues Encountered*		
Norms & values:		
- Team dynamics: conflict, leadership/control, communication	4	Overall there was little to no conflict, when there were issues we were able to talk them out
- Individual behavior/performance/participation	4	Overall everyone behavior was great, under high stress situations it was a little bit difficult, but calmed once the situation was over
Logistics: scheduling meetings, scheduling work	4	Team was fairly flexible and able to find common times or work around scheduling conflicts
Skills gap?	4	We got assistance from faculty/staff experts and were able to solve most issues.
Project planning & tracking: unrealistic schedule, poor tracking, not proactive, no accountability	4	The overall planning was ok, details in the plan were figured out in the shared vision
BOM: lead-time for parts, missing or wroing items (last minute), tracking orders	5	Most parts were ordered ahead of time, parts ordered late were order so that they could be delivered ASAP
Testing: planning, resources, ownership, implementation issues, traceability to engineering requirements	4	Testing matched ERs, most ERs were tested and validated.
Problem solving: no (or poor) system in place, poor tracking & resolution, ownership	3	Problem tracking sheet probably not used as much as it should have been. Problems put on the form were well documented
System integration difficulties: subsystems work but not system, inadequate time	3	Lack of time/people led to issues completing some features. Completed features worked mostly as designed
Demos: preparedness, participation	5	all demos went as smoothly as possible
Hand-off to Customer: readiness, customer satisfaction, documenation	5	The instructables needs to be review by dr day, as well as determining what needs to be done with the stander before we leave
Technical paper &pPoster: ownership, rush-job	5	poster was a big hit with the customer. both the paper and poster were well thought out and not rushed through. everyone contributed their fair share
Project presentation: preparedness, participation	5	The group was always prepared for presenation as we started at least a week ahead of time on the presenation and preparation

Self-Assessment		Comments
Knowledge: Consider team members knowledge, and ability to learn tools, procedures, methods, equipment and materials.	4	We were able to learn and implement a number of things successfully. as with any project there is always more than can be learned
Technical: Consider team members technical competency within application areas required such as mechanical, electrical, software, etc. As necessary, also consider technical competency outside application area.	4	Mechanically the system was sound, due to the lack of electrical engineers the electrical side fell short
Creativity: Consider the team members creativity with regards to contributions such as design, assembly, testing, debug, documentation, presentations, etc.	5	Creativity was present through out the whole project, and can be seen in the stander itself
Quality: Consider the accuracy and thoroughness of team and assess results in terms of errors, rework, and ability to complete tasks correctly the first time.	5	Overall the quality was great, issues were fixed within the week that they were found

*Edit issues list as appropriate

** Give your team a score on how effectively you dealt with the issue or assessed yourselves