Team Self-Critique		
	Score: 1-5** **(low to high)**	**Plan to Address (or how it was addressed)**
Major Issues Encountered*	**5**	**No major issues**
Norms & values:		
- Team dynamics: conflict, leadership/control, communication	5	Overall fair democratic group, no resentment
- Individual behavior/performance/participation	5	Everyone did a fair share
Logistics: scheduling meetings, scheduling work	5	Very good communication with email, texts, meetings
Skills gap?	5	Considering where we came to where were at with concrete I think we caught up rather quickly by talking to experts.
Customer requirements: access to customer, clarity of rqmts, behavior (support, commitment, attitude)	5	Customer Req. clear and attainable.
Engineering requirements: quality, completeness, flowdown to subsystems, traceability	4	Some req. applied to entire arborloo which made it unclear at first. Test in place for all req. Could of updated engineering req. to make them more applicable.
Risk assessment and mitigation plans: missed important risks, focus on minor issues, ineffecitve mitigation plans, etc.	5	No major risks occurred.
Project planning & tracking: unrealistic schedule, poor tracking, not proactive, no accountability	5	Tracked by 3 week increments and able to attain them
Systems design: benchmarking inadequate, limited concepts, functional decomposition gaps, mapping between functional and physical architecture, interface complexity, etc.	4	Design was kept simple and not to complicated. This drove to limited concepts.
Engineering analysis & feasbility: analysis gaps or prioritization, appropriateness of analysis, timing, etc.	4	Confirmed analysis by Professors. Everything was used to determine outcome, unfortunatly majority of analysis is based off experiments.
Detailed design: scope, complexity, resources, time, etc.	4	Able to exceed customer requirements.
Test planning: ambiguity, implementation difficulty, resources, ownership	5	Test planning is pretty straight forward. Need to get surveys to sarah before her trip.
Design reviews: participation, value-add	5	Were able to get a lot of useful information out of review but also a lot of discussion on non critical areas.
Self-Assessment		**Comments**
Knowledge: Consider team members knowledge, and ability to learn tools, procedures, methods, equipment and materials.	5	Everyone learned a lot about concrete and how to work effectively in multidisciplinary group.
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	Able to use ANSYS/MATLAB/Solidworks/MS Project to help team.
Creativity: Consider the team members creativity with regards to contributions such as design, assembly, testing, debug, documentation, presentations, etc.	4	Design/Testing was pretty stright forward but we presented documentation rather well with different charts.
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.	4	Our documents usually required little feedback for improvement.
*Edit issues list as appropriate		
** Give your team a score on how effectively you dealt with the issue or assessed yourselves		