



360° BSS AROUND

“360 Degrees” Evaluation powered by BSS Around
Corporate Cross-Assessment Report
12.14.2009, 26 pages

Welcome Inc

Corporate Assessment



© BSSL, 2005-2009
All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. RATING OF EMPLOYEES BY COMPETENCE	4
2.1. MANAGING PEOPLE	6
2.2. LEADERSHIP	6
2.3. STRATEGIC THINKING	7
2.4. ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK	7
2.5. EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE	8
2.6. CUSTOMER ORIENTATION	8
2.7. WELCOME INC COMPETENCE	9
2.8. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	9
3. DEGREE OF CRITICISM	11
4. TYPICALITY OF OPINIONS	13
5. INDIVIDUAL RESULTS	15
6. ASSESSMENT STATISTICS BY DEPARTMENT	23

1.

INTRODUCTION

As you know, Welcome Inc has carried out a “360 Degrees” Assessment. The purpose of this assessment was to appraise employee performance based on a comprehensive evaluation from a variety of stakeholders. Within the framework of the survey, participants were to answer a number of questions about themselves and their colleagues and to assess each person according to a predetermined set of criteria.

Below you will find the Corporate Report that includes individual evaluation summaries and corporate tendencies.

For your convenience, we have included hyperlinks throughout the report. Anywhere in the document, you can click on a competence or factor, and it will take you to the rating of this competence. If you click on an employee name, you will be taken to that person’s individual results.

To view the report, you will need an Adobe Acrobat Reader. If your computer does not have it installed, it can be downloaded at:

<http://www.adobe.com/products/reader/>.

For easier navigation between hyperlinks in the text, we recommend adding the Navigation Bar. To do so, go to *View*, select *Tool Bars*, and click on *Navigation (Page Navigation)*.

Please note that all average scores and ratings included in this report are based on the number of people that completed this assessment and the questions they answered. May the number of people, number of questions or any of the answers change, results may change accordingly.

This report was created on 12.14.2009.

2.

RATING OF EMPLOYEES BY COMPETENCE

COMPETENCE	Competence is a skill, quality or ability that considerably influences a person's work efficiency. The "360 Degrees" assessment evaluates participants according to a number of predetermined competences. In the text of the report, competence names are in capital letters.
------------	--

Two indicators were used in assessing employee competences:

SCORE	Score is an absolute value that depends only on the scores given to an employee by his/her colleagues. It is based on a 5-point scale, where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest score.
-------	--

RATING	Rating is a relative measure and is expressed as a percentage. It compares one person's scores to his/her colleague's. Rating shows the participant's place on the scale. Unlike the score, rating helps to estimate whether one person's result is significantly different from that of his/her co-workers and to what extent. The more considerable the deviation is from the average the more significant the result is. In specialized literature this indicator is also referred to as "percentile".
--------	---

Lets assume that one of the employee's competences was assessed as 4.2 on the 5-point scale. Is this a good score? Without knowing how his/her score compares to other participants' results, we would not know the answer. If the average score is 3.6, the result is pretty good; however, if the average result is 4.5, the result is not so good. In order to have a full understanding of the results, we need to take into the account both the rating and its degree of significance.

To illustrate the importance of rating, let's pick a competence. Now, let's graph the scores of all survey participants, placing them in an ascending order with low scores on the left and high scores on the right.



To determine the degree of significance of a particular assessment, look at the

4

deviation of each person's result from the median. The farther it is from the median, the more significant the difference is.

The median rating is always 50. The rating of those who are placed closer to the beginning of the scale (those with fewer points) is always less than 50; the rating point of those who are placed closer to the right-hand end of the scale (those with more points) is always more than 50.

A higher rating point does not always mean a better result. For example, optimal score for Criticality is 50. It would be achieved by those who were neither too critical nor too loyal when assessing their co-workers.

To help illustrate the significance of rating, we bring you red and blue triangles.

- ▲ A blue triangle stands for significantly positive results. This means that the result is among the highest 15%.
- ▼ A red triangle stands for low results. This means that the result is among the lowest 15%.

The charts below rank the assessed employees by competences included in this evaluation.

2.1. MANAGING PEOPLE

Ability to clearly formulate tasks and set realistic deadlines, delegate responsibilities and monitor the processes and results.

- ! Ratings for this indicator are approximate due to low number of participants. When reading the results, we recommend that you focus on the score rather than rating.

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
1. Nancy Phillips	35	4.2	97%	
2. Paresh Singh	39	4.2	87%	
3. Chris Young	32	4	69%	
4. Vivian Chen	41	3.9	57%	
5. Robert Atherton	38	3.7	41%	
6. Luis Garcia	38	3.6	32%	
7. Richard Bloomquist	28	3.4	18%	
8. Mark Rogers	21	3.1	6.4%	

2.2. LEADERSHIP

Being enthusiastic, inspiring others and leading by example.

- ! Ratings for this indicator are approximate due to low number of participants. When reading the results, we recommend that you focus on the score rather than rating.

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
1. Nancy Phillips	38	4.6	97%	
2. Paresh Singh	39	4.6	97%	
3. Robert Atherton	42	4.2	69%	
4. Chris Young	40	4.2	56%	
5. Vivian Chen	45	4	44%	
6. Luis Garcia	42	3.9	31%	
7. Richard Bloomquist	34	3.3	18%	
8. Mark Rogers	35	3.1	3.1%	

2.3. STRATEGIC THINKING

Understanding company's long-term development tendencies in particular and industry's in general, understanding key success factors, and making effective decisions during times of uncertainty.

- ! Ratings for this indicator are approximate due to low number of participants.
- When reading the results, we recommend that you focus on the score rather than rating.

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
1. <u>Paresh Singh</u>	38	4.4	97%	
2. <u>Chris Young</u>	33	4.2	81%	
3. <u>Nancy Phillips</u>	33	4.1	70%	
4. <u>Mark Rogers</u>	25	4	58%	
5. <u>Robert Atherton</u>	37	3.9	47%	
6. <u>Luis Garcia</u>	36	3.9	34%	
7. <u>Vivian Chen</u>	39	3.8	20%	
8. <u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	26	3.6	3.1%	

2.4. ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK

Efficient use of staff's potential, facilitating team work among employees, building long-term partnerships with external stakeholders.

- ! Ratings for this indicator are approximate due to low number of participants.
- When reading the results, we recommend that you focus on the score rather than rating.









	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
1. <u>Nancy Phillips</u>	37	4.3	97%	
2. <u>Paresh Singh</u>	39	4.2	83%	
3. <u>Chris Young</u>	33	4	69%	
4. <u>Robert Atherton</u>	37	3.9	55%	
5. <u>Vivian Chen</u>	39	3.8	44%	
6. <u>Luis Garcia</u>	38	3.6	31%	

7.	<u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	30	3.4	18%	
8.	<u>Mark Rogers</u>	29	3	3.1%	

2.5. EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE

Viewing the company as a long-term employer, being aware of company's organizational structure, embracing corporate values, and following corporate guidelines.

- ! Ratings for this indicator are approximate due to low number of participants. When reading the results, we recommend that you focus on the score rather than rating.







	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating		
1.	<u>Vivian Chen</u>	47	4.7	97%	
2.	<u>Nancy Phillips</u>	38	4.7	84%	
3.	<u>Chris Young</u>	37	4.6	71%	
4.	<u>Paresh Singh</u>	39	4.6	59%	
5.	<u>Robert Atherton</u>	41	4.5	43%	
6.	<u>Luis Garcia</u>	42	4.2	21%	
7.	<u>Mark Rogers</u>	37	4.2	18%	
8.	<u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	36	3.9	3.1%	

2.6. CUSTOMER ORIENTATION

Ability to perceive issues from the customers' point of view, aptitude to skillfully resolve them, and ability to maintain mutually beneficial long term relationships with the customers.

- ! Ratings for this indicator are approximate due to low number of participants. When reading the results, we recommend that you focus on the score rather than rating.









	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating		
1.	<u>Robert Atherton</u>	36	4.4	97%	
2.	<u>Paresh Singh</u>	39	4.4	97%	

3.	<u>Nancy Phillips</u>	37	4.3	70%	
4.	<u>Vivian Chen</u>	39	4.2	49%	
5.	<u>Chris Young</u>	32	4.2	43%	
6.	<u>Mark Rogers</u>	20	4	31%	
7.	<u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	30	3.8	16%	
8.	<u>Luis Garcia</u>	36	3.8	12%	

2.7. WELCOME INC COMPETENCE

Alignment with the Welcome Inc values

- ! Ratings for this indicator are approximate due to low number of participants. When reading the results, we recommend that you focus on the score rather than rating.

		<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
1.	<u>Nancy Phillips</u>	38	4.1	97%	
2.	<u>Paresh Singh</u>	39	3.9	82%	
3.	<u>Chris Young</u>	39	3.6	68%	
4.	<u>Robert Atherton</u>	42	3.4	50%	
5.	<u>Vivian Chen</u>	47	3.3	36%	
6.	<u>Luis Garcia</u>	42	3.3	30%	
7.	<u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	35	3.1	19%	
8.	<u>Mark Rogers</u>	34	2.6	3.1%	

2.8. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Ability to clearly define corporate goals, introduce business processes and ensure their smooth execution.

- ! Ratings for this indicator are approximate due to low number of participants. When reading the results, we recommend that you focus on the score rather than rating.

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating
--	---------------------------------	-------	--------

1.	<u>Paresh Singh</u>	37	4.4	97%	
2.	<u>Nancy Phillips</u>	37	4.2	82%	
3.	<u>Chris Young</u>	35	4.2	77%	
4.	<u>Vivian Chen</u>	39	3.9	56%	
5.	<u>Robert Atherton</u>	37	3.9	43%	
6.	<u>Luis Garcia</u>	38	3.8	31%	
7.	<u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	31	3.6	18%	
8.	<u>Mark Rogers</u>	24	3.3	6.6%	

3.




DEGREE OF CRITICISM

























DEGREE OF CRITICISM | Degree of Criticism reflects how critical an employee was when assessing his/her colleagues.

Usually, excessive criticism and loyalty are signs of subjective scores. Criticality rating is the only rating in the Corporate Report where the optimal ratings fall close to the center of the scale. People whose ratings are in the center are usually the most objective.

At the top of the scale (with the low scores) are “fierce critics” who were predisposed to underestimate their colleagues. At the bottom (with highest scores) are those who were less critical and most likely overestimated their colleagues.

In the table below, the Score column represents the average score given by an employee to his/her colleagues.

	<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
1. Jen Nakatsukasa	1	2.7	99%	
2. Andrew Polsinelli	8	3.2	98%	
3. Efrem Renfrew	8	3.4	96%	
4. <u>Nancy Phillips</u>	8	3.4	94%	
5. Alex Hildebrand	2	3.4	93%	
6. Josh O'Brien	8	3.5	91%	
7. Adam Brummitt	4	3.6	89%	
8. Ricky Jiang	8	3.6	88%	
9. <u>Mark Rogers</u>	8	3.6	86%	
10. Julie Algieri	1	3.6	84%	
11. <u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	8	3.7	83%	
12. Matthew Middleton	8	3.7	81%	
13. Jason Alger	4	3.7	79%	
14. Shad Oyoung	8	3.7	78%	
15. <u>Paresh Singh</u>	8	3.8	76%	
16. Thomas Hong	8	3.8	74%	
17. Kristin Liao	4	3.8	73%	

18.	Benjamin Hunter	8	3.9	71%	
19.	<u>Luis Garcia</u>	4	3.9	69%	
20.	Luke Dobrin	8	3.9	68%	
21.	<u>Robert Atherton</u>	8	3.9	66%	
22.	<u>Vivian Chen</u>	8	3.9	64%	
23.	Jacob Port	6	3.9	63%	
24.	James Pierson	8	3.9	61%	
25.	Tamara Ruma	8	3.9	59%	
26.	Matthew Raymer	2	3.9	58%	
27.	Colin Martinez	8	3.9	56%	
28.	Frank Li	8	3.9	54%	
29.	Michael Schlichter	6	3.9	53%	
30.	Joohee Grecki	8	3.9	51%	
31.	Blake Huang	4	4	49%	
32.	Bradley Lui	8	4	48%	
33.	David Reintjes	4	4	46%	
34.	<u>Chris Young</u>	8	4	44%	
35.	Yuji Meeker	8	4.1	43%	
36.	Christopher Greenfield	8	4.1	41%	
37.	Creed Crain	8	4.1	39%	
38.	Lingyun Lee	8	4.2	38%	
39.	Brian Cartman	8	4.2	36%	
40.	Robert EricksonIV	7	4.2	34%	
41.	Paul Liou	8	4.2	33%	
42.	Igor Rensi	2	4.2	31%	
43.	Moritz Reed	1	4.3	29%	
44.	Brandon Blackwood	7	4.3	28%	
45.	Eunghyun Johnson	1	4.3	26%	
46.	Roberto Mach	8	4.4	23%	
47.	Mi Hunt	8	4.4	19%	
48.	Bailey Marchand	8	4.4	18%	
49.	Anastasia Porter	6	4.6	16%	
50.	Charles Barnett	8	4.8	5.8%	

12

3. DEGREE OF CRITICISM

Welcome Inc, Corporate Assessment, 12.14.2009

4.


















TYPICALITY OF OPINIONS

TYPICALITY OF OPINIONS

Typicality indicator reflects how “typical” the scores that an employee gave to his/her colleagues are. In other words, to what extent these scores are similar to those of other survey participants. The more similar the scores are to those of the majority of participants the higher the Typicality Indicator is. High Typicality Indicator signifies that employee’s opinions are similar to those he/she works with, which in turn creates a more coherent and productive work environment.

Another way to look at the results of this indicator is to assume that the leaders (high scores) of this rating express “the voice of the people” and perhaps are more objective (if we admit that the opinion of the majority is more objective).

	<i>Has assessed</i>		Score	Rating
1. Efrem Renfrew	8	*	79	
2. Shad Oyoung	8	*	78	
3. Ricky Jiang	8	*	76	
4. Blake Huang	4	*	75	
5. Brian Cartman	8	*	75	
6. Bailey Marchand	8	*	73	
7. James Pierson	8	*	71	
8. Colin Martinez	8	*	71	
9. Frank Li	8	*	71	
10. Adam Brummitt	4	*	70	
11. Josh O'Brien	8	*	69	
12. Paul Liou	8	*	68	
13. Christopher Greenfield	8	*	67	
14. Thomas Hong	8	*	67	
15. Robert EricksonIV	7	*	67	
16. Lingyun Lee	8	*	67	
17. David Reintjes	4	*	66	
18. <u>Mark Rogers</u>	8	*	65	
19. Joohee Grecki	8	*	64	
20. Creed Crain	8	*	64	
21. <u>Nancy Phillips</u>	8	*	64	

22.	Roberto Mach	8	*	63	
23.	<u>Vivian Chen</u>	8	*	63	
24.	Benjamin Hunter	8	*	62	
25.	Tamara Ruma	8	*	62	
26.	Jason Alger	4	*	60	
27.	<u>Robert Atherton</u>	8	*	60	
28.	<u>Chris Young</u>	8	*	58	
29.	Luke Dobrin	8	*	57	
30.	Yuji Meeker	8	*	57	
31.	Mi Hunt	8	*	56	
32.	Jacob Port	6	*	54	
33.	Brandon Blackwood	7	*	54	
34.	Anastasia Porter	6	*	54	
35.	Andrew Polsinelli	8	*	54	
36.	Michael Schlichter	6	*	51	
37.	<u>Luis Garcia</u>	4	*	51	
38.	<u>Paresb Singh</u>	8	*	48	
39.	Matthew Middleton	8	*	47	
40.	Bradley Lui	8	*	45	
41.	Kristin Liao	4	*	42	
42.	Charles Barnett	8	*	37	
43.	<u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	8	*	36	

5.

INDIVIDUAL RESULTS

Chris Young

Key Manager

Chris Young & subordinates

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>MANAGING PEOPLE</u>	32	4	69%	
<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	40	4.2	56%	
<u>STRATEGIC THINKING</u>	33	4.2	81%	
<u>ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK</u>	33	4	69%	
<u>EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE</u>	37	4.6	71%	
<u>CUSTOMER ORIENTATION</u>	32	4.2	43%	
<u>WELCOME INC COMPETENCE</u>	39	3.6	68%	
<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>	35	4.2	77%	

	<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>Degree of Criticism</u>	8	4	44%	
<u>Typicality of Opinion</u>	8	*	58	

Luis Garcia

Key Manager

Luis Garcia & subordinates

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>MANAGING PEOPLE</u>	38	3.6	32%	
<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	42	3.9	31%	
<u>STRATEGIC THINKING</u>	36	3.9	34%	
<u>ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK</u>	38	3.6	31%	
<u>EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE</u>	42	4.2	21%	
<u>CUSTOMER ORIENTATION</u>	36	3.8	12%	
<u>WELCOME INC COMPETENCE</u>	42	3.3	30%	
<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>	38	3.8	31%	

	<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>Degree of Criticism</u>	4	3.9	69%	
<u>Typicality of Opinion</u>	4	*	51	

Mark Rogers

Key Manager

Mark Rogers & subordinates

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>MANAGING PEOPLE</u>	21	3.1	6.4%	
<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	35	3.1	3.1%	
<u>STRATEGIC THINKING</u>	25	4	58%	
<u>ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK</u>	29	3	3.1%	
<u>EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE</u>	37	4.2	18%	
<u>CUSTOMER ORIENTATION</u>	20	4	31%	
<u>WELCOME INC COMPETENCE</u>	34	2.6	3.1%	
<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>	24	3.3	6.6%	

	<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>Degree of Criticism</u>	▼ 8	3.6	86%	
<u>Typicality of Opinion</u>	8	*	65	

Nancy Phillips

Key Manager

Nancy Phillips & subordinates

		<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>MANAGING PEOPLE</u>	▲	35	4.2	97%	
<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	▲	38	4.6	97%	
<u>STRATEGIC THINKING</u>		33	4.1	70%	
<u>ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK</u>	▲	37	4.3	97%	
<u>EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE</u>		38	4.7	84%	
<u>CUSTOMER ORIENTATION</u>		37	4.3	70%	
<u>WELCOME INC COMPETENCE</u>	▲	38	4.1	97%	
<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>		37	4.2	82%	

		<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>Degree of Criticism</u>	▼	8	3.4	94%	
<u>Typicality of Opinion</u>		8	*	64	

Paresh Singh

CEO

Welcome Inc

		<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>MANAGING PEOPLE</u>	▲	39	4.2	87%	
<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	▲	39	4.6	97%	
<u>STRATEGIC THINKING</u>	▲	38	4.4	97%	
<u>ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK</u>		39	4.2	83%	
<u>EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE</u>		39	4.6	59%	
<u>CUSTOMER ORIENTATION</u>	▲	39	4.4	97%	
<u>WELCOME INC COMPETENCE</u>		39	3.9	82%	
<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>	▲	37	4.4	97%	

		<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>Degree of Criticism</u>		8	3.8	76%	
<u>Typicality of Opinion</u>		8	*	48	

Richard Bloomquist

Key Manager

Richard Bloomquist & subordinates

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>MANAGING PEOPLE</u>	28	3.4	18%	
<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	34	3.3	18%	
<u>STRATEGIC THINKING</u>	26	3.6	3.1%	
<u>ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK</u>	30	3.4	18%	
<u>EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE</u>	36	3.9	3.1%	
<u>CUSTOMER ORIENTATION</u>	30	3.8	16%	
<u>WELCOME INC COMPETENCE</u>	35	3.1	19%	
<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>	31	3.6	18%	

	<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>Degree of Criticism</u>	8	3.7	83%	
<u>Typicality of Opinion</u>	8	*	36	

Robert Atherton

Key Manager

Robert Atherton & subordinates



	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>MANAGING PEOPLE</u>	38	3.7	41%	
<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	42	4.2	69%	
<u>STRATEGIC THINKING</u>	37	3.9	47%	
<u>ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK</u>	37	3.9	55%	
<u>EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE</u>	41	4.5	43%	
<u>CUSTOMER ORIENTATION</u>	▲ 36	4.4	97%	
<u>WELCOME INC COMPETENCE</u>	42	3.4	50%	
<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>	37	3.9	43%	

	<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>Degree of Criticism</u>	8	3.9	66%	
<u>Typicality of Opinion</u>	8	*	60	

Vivian Chen

Key Manager

Vivian Chen & subordinates

	<i>Has been assessed by</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>MANAGING PEOPLE</u>	41	3.9	57%	
<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	45	4	44%	
<u>STRATEGIC THINKING</u>	39	3.8	20%	
<u>ENCOURAGEMENT OF TEAMWORK</u>	39	3.8	44%	
<u>EMBRACING CORPORATE CULTURE</u>	▲ 47	4.7	97%	
<u>CUSTOMER ORIENTATION</u>	39	4.2	49%	
<u>WELCOME INC COMPETENCE</u>	47	3.3	36%	
<u>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</u>	39	3.9	56%	




	<i>Has assessed</i>	Score	Rating	
<u>Degree of Criticism</u>	8	3.9	64%	
<u>Typicality of Opinion</u>	8	*	63	

6.





ASSESSMENT STATISTICS BY DEPARTMENT

The table below shows the list of employees and clients by department. It includes information about how many colleagues each person has assessed and also by how many people he/she had been evaluated (when applicable).




Please refer to the key below:

-  — Participant has fully completed the assessment
-  — Participant has commenced the assessment but has not evaluated all proposed colleagues
-  — Assessment participant has not commenced the assessment








Nancy Phillips & subordinates

	Has assessed	Has been assessed by
James Pierson	 8 of 8	—
<u>Nancy Phillips</u>	 7 of 7	38 of 54 page 18
Paul Liou	 8 of 8	—
Ricky Jiang	 8 of 8	—

Chris Young & subordinates




	Has assessed	Has been assessed by
<u>Chris Young</u>	 7 of 7	40 of 54 page 18
Efrem Renfrew	 8 of 8	—
Wenjing Lewis	 0 of 8	—

Clients










	Has assessed	Has been assessed by
Alexander Schwemmer	 2 of 2	—
Alexander Vogler	 0 of 1	—
Calvin Zerick	 1 of 1	—
Dale Trockel	 0 of 1	—
Daniel Woei	 1 of 1	—
David Shott	 1 of 2	—
Edward Stowell	 1 of 1	—

Ernest Watson	 1 of 1	—	
Gregory Sheynis	 1 of 1	—	
Helen Xia	 0 of 1	—	
Jing Wuellner	 1 of 1	—	
Juliette Mirkin	 1 of 1	—	
Mark Skornewski	 0 of 1	—	
Martha Shinault	 0 of 1	—	
Nicholas Travers	 0 of 1	—	
Richard Waagen	 0 of 1	—	
Tyler Sivakoff	 0 of 1	—	
William Tavernetti	 1 of 1	—	
Zeke Tseng	 0 of 1	—	

Mark Rogers & subordinates

		Has assessed		Has been assessed by	
Alex Hildebrand	 2 of 8			—	
Joohee Grecki	 8 of 8			—	
<u>Mark Rogers</u>	 7 of 7			41 of 51	page 17






Robert Atherton & subordinates

		Has assessed		Has been assessed by	
Andrew Polsinelli	 8 of 8			—	
Brandon Blackwood	 8 of 8			—	
Charles Barnett	 8 of 8			—	
David Reintjes	 4 of 8			—	
Frank Li	 8 of 8			—	
Lingyun Lee	 8 of 8			—	
Matthew Raymer	 2 of 8			—	
<u>Robert Atherton</u>	 7 of 7			42 of 54	page 21
Robert EricksonIV	 8 of 8			—	








Vivian Chen & subordinates

		Has assessed		Has been assessed by	
<u>Vivian Chen</u>	 7 of 7			46 of 54	page 22
















Richard Bloomquist & subordinates

	Has assessed	Has been assessed by
Jacob Port	 6 of 8	—
Michael Schlichter	 6 of 8	—
<u>Richard Bloomquist</u>	 7 of 7	35 of 54 page 20
Tamara Ruma	 8 of 8	—
Yuji Meeker	 8 of 8	—

Luis Garcia & subordinates

	Has assessed	Has been assessed by
Brian Cartman	 8 of 8	—
Christopher Greenfield	 8 of 8	—
Jason Alger	 2 of 8	—
Julie Algieri	 1 of 8	—
<u>Luis Garcia</u>	 3 of 7	42 of 54 page 16
Luke Dobrin	 8 of 8	—
Roberto Mach	 8 of 8	—

Others

	Has assessed	Has been assessed by
Adam Brummitt	 3 of 8	—
Anastasia Porter	 6 of 8	—
Bailey Marchand	 8 of 8	—
Blake Huang	 4 of 8	—
Bradley Lui	 8 of 8	—
Colin Martinez	 8 of 8	—
Creed Crain	 8 of 8	—
Eunghyun Johnson	 1 of 8	—
Igor Rensi	 2 of 8	—
Jen Nakatsukasa	 1 of 8	—
Josh O'Brien	 8 of 8	—
Kristin Liao	 3 of 8	—
Matthew Middleton	 8 of 8	—
Mi Hunt	 8 of 8	—
Owen Kwok	 0 of 8	—

Shad Oyoung	 8 of 8	—	
Thomas Hong	 8 of 8	—	
Welcome Inc			
		Has assessed	Has been assessed by
Benjamin Hunter	 8 of 8	—	
Moritz Reed	 1 of 8	—	
<u>Paresh Singh</u>	 7 of 7	39 of 54	<u>page 19</u>