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	2	Constant discussions during meetings and class time within team and including guide to suppress any potential design issue. Project Lead didn't always comprehend scope of design conflicts until later on. Communication has been lost when it could have helped a lot, talked about .
- Individual behavior/performance/participation	3	Same plans as dynamics: discussions within team have been had and also at the guide level.
Logistics: scheduling meetings, scheduling work	3	Scheduling has been fairly consistent for meetings and work deadlines but not all work has been completed as planned. Project lead has assigned hard deadlines and each member checks communication platform regularly
Presentation Skills	3	Overall good but missed some key concepts during design reviews. Have been correlating prepared material to main deliverables and goals to guidelines for each phase.
Customer requirements: access to customer, clarity of rqmts, behavior (support, commitment, attitude)	3	Customer has been thoroughly engaged in the past few weeks and clarity of requirements has been fleshed out.
Engineering requirements: quality, completeness, flowdown to subsystems, traceability	2	Customer has been thoroughly engaged in the past few weeks and clarity of requirements has been fleshed out.
Risk assessment and mitigation plans: missed important risks, focus on minor issues, ineffecitve mitigation plans, etc.	3	Carefully followed and updated risks with excel sheet and risk graph to show major dates and changing points for MSD I and MSD II.
Project planning & tracking: unrealistic schedule, poor tracking, not proactive, no accountability	3	Moving over project plan to Microsoft Project will be a more accurate way to analyze key deliverable standpoints and see the effect of a delayed task in real time.
Systems design: benchmarking inadequate, limited concepts, functional decomposition gaps, mapping between functional and physical architecture, interface complexity, etc.	2	Concept selection went very well and there are three cases that can be implemented if an issue comes up.
Engineering analysis & feasbility: analysis gaps or prioritization, appropriateness of analysis, timing, etc.	4	Our design has constrained the feasibility of the engineering requirements but with close contact with our guide and customer we have redefined them to fit our design.
Detailed design: scope, complexity, resources, time, etc.	3	Accurate BOM keeping track of cost/spending and project plans in place. All seemingly feasible unless a major issue arises.
Test planning: ambiguity, implementation difficulty, resources, ownership	3	A thorough test plan has been created to capture all major engineering requirements and record data from. Another test plan is being implemented for compensation of the deflection in our design.
Design reviews: participation, value-add	3	Overall good but missed some key concepts during design reviews. Have been correlating prepared material to main deliverables and goals to guidelines for each phase.
Self-Assessment		**Comments**
Knowledge: Consider team members knowledge, and ability to learn tools, procedures, methods, equipment and materials.	3	Our guide has always inspired us to see our higher potential even when we run into a conflict, whether it is team or design related. Each member of this team brings something to the table in the ME & EE departments, functionality, and overall morale. Any time there is a lapse in one of these areas it is never something where the team can't come together and help each other out.
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.	3	
Creativity: Consider the team members creativity with regards to contributions such as design, assembly, testing, debug, documentation, presentations, etc.	4	
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.	3	