By: Rozie Yeghiazarian

Team Self-Critique

	Score: 1-5 (not good to good)	**Plan to Address (or how it was addressed)**
Major Issues Encountered*		
Norms & values:		
- Team dynamics: conflict, leadership/control, communication	5	Conflicts not frequently encountered, but when they were they were thoroughly addressed and issues mitigated with all team members taking accountability for the project elements in question, moving forward, and all decision made thereof (which were relevant).
- Individual behavior/performance/participation	3	Workflow doesnot seem entirely balanced, taking initiative to ensure those assignments that are within any one individual's capabilities addressed.
Logistics: scheduling meetings, scheduling work	4	Where deadlines were not met, or team members pushed deadlines, suggestions have been made in improving workflow from peer evaluations to just occasional reminders of approaching deadlines.
Skills gap?	5	No apparent gap.
Customer requirements: access to customer, clarity of rqmts, behavior (support, commitment, attitude)	5	Client is consistently looped in on progress and requests from the client are heeded in a timely manner. When a matter was deemed outside of the scope of the project, the team professionally informed the client of this change to the project.
Engineering requirements: quality, completeness, flowdown to subsystems, traceability	4	A notable work in progress, this element of MSD has been consistently updated and iterated upon, but that is to be expected.
Risk assessment and mitigation plans: missed important risks, focus on minor issues, ineffecitve mitigation plans, etc.	5	Minor formatting issues which were addressed within the first two phases. Otherwise, thorough and continuously updated.
Project planning & tracking: unrealistic schedule, poor tracking, not proactive, no accountability	5	Planning and tracking handled clearly and thoroughly. Progress is clearly articulated to client and guide.
Systems design: benchmarking inadequate, limited concepts, functional decomposition gaps, mapping between functional and physical architecture, interface complexity, etc.	5	System complexity handled consistently throughout all aspects of the documentation, well broken down. Any lapses or gaps that were brought up in design reviews have been or will be addressed and respective documentation live on EDGE updated. (we have a workflow established for this)
Engineering analysis & feasbility: analysis gaps or prioritization, appropriateness of analysis, timing, etc.	4	Analysis has been done, could be more thorough. Are we exploring all facets of the problem statement at hand?
Detailed design: scope, complexity, resources, time, etc.	4	This was addressed previously in terms of communicating scope changes to the client. No scope creep or other wonky business noted in this area.
Test planning: ambiguity, implementation difficulty, resources, ownership	5	Tests thoroughly written, no identified problem here.
Design reviews: participation, value-add	5	Group pulls together and rallies in terms of ensuring all desired and discussed presentation elements. Presentation skills have progressively and noticeably improved.
Self-Assessment		**Comments**
Knowledge: Consider team members knowledge, and ability to learn tools, procedures, methods, equipment and materials.	5	Well versed in PM tools and progress tracking methods. Quick to adapt to new project contexts and able to help team members communicate project progress through suggested ways of laying out the EDGE site and some individual work. Looked into and learned how to properly set up the human subjects testing proposal documentation (as neededd), just one example of initiative.
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.	5	Learned new software application (Gantter - the shared site application resource) and also became decently versed in EDGE to help with workflow, as needed. Open to and quick at adopting new technical skills.
Creativity: Consider the team members creativity with regards to contributions such as design, assembly, testing, debug, documentation, presentations, etc.	5	Suggested a vast aray of design ideas as well as assembly options of the individual team contributed ideas for overal product options to look at and choose from. Also creative with templetizing how other team members work is clearly, consistently, and concisely expressed (for instance the ergonomics information and the adopted format for depicting the information uncovered). Another example is in the way the overal project and phase vision and direction is expressed in the layout of EDGE.
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	Extremely thorough with work, and consistently so. Where rework is noticed, workflow adjustments are made to mitigate a future instance of the problem moving forward. In that way, adaptive in a progressive and productive way without risking any compromise to produced quality.

*Edit issues list as appropriate
** Give your team a score on how effectively you dealt with the issue or assessed yourselves