CS 493 Final Project Presentation and Demo Evaluation Form

Evaluator: **Team:**

		Unacceptable	Below Standard	Acceptable	Competent	Superior
1	Was the presentation organized effectively?	1 The presentation addressed few of the specified content areas. The presentation's flow was chaotic. Material does not support the topic.	2 The presentation addressed some of the specified content areas. The presentation flowed from one section to another in a jump fashion. Material barely supports the topic.	3 The presentation addressed many of the specified content areas. The presentation flowed from one section to another in many cases well. Material somewhat supports the topic.	4 The presentation addressed most of the specified content areas. The presentation flowed from one section to another in most cases well. Material generally supports the topic.	5 The presentation addressed all the specified content areas. The presentation flowed from one section to another well. Material abundantly supports the topic.
2	Did the slides enhance the presentation?	1 Text is not readable, or no slides or visual aids. Graphics used are mostly off topic. Slide composition does not have a professional look and the look mostly distracts from the presentation.	2 Text is readable with effort. Graphics used are often off topic. Slide composition does not have a professional look and the look sometimes distracts from the presentation.	3 Text is mostly readable. Graphics used somewhat support the topic. Slide composition has an acceptable look; does not distract from the presentation.	4 Text is readable. Graphics used mostly support the topic. Slide composition has a professional look and somewhat enhances the presentation.	5 Text is easily readable. Graphics used consistently support the topic. Slide composition has a professional look that enhances the presentation.
3	Did the presenters speak in a clear and concise manner?	1 Students read from cards with little to no interaction with the audience. Students were largely incoherent, difficult to hear, and hard to understand.	2 Students often read from cards with minimal interaction with the audience. Students were often incoherent, difficult to hear, and hard to understand.	3 Students looked down at the cards often, but attempted to interact with the audience. Students were rarely incoherent, difficult to hear or hard to understand.	4 Students mostly addressed the audience, looking down occasionally at notes. Students mostly spoke clearly and at an appropriate volume, and were usually understood.	5 Students presented the material clearly without the need to refer to notes at all. Students consistently spoke clearly and at an appropriate volume, and were well understood.
4	Did the team answer questions fully and effectively?	1 The team demonstrated little knowledge of the material. They were not able to explain coherently or elaborate on any of the questions.	2 The team demonstrated some knowledge of the material. They had difficulty explaining and elaborating on the majority of the questions.	3 The team demonstrated reasonable knowledge of the material. They explained and elaborated on many of the questions.	4 The team demonstrated significant knowledge of the material. They explained and elaborated on most questions.	5 The team demonstrated full knowledge of the material. They explained and elaborated on all questions.

		Unacceptable	Below Standard	Acceptable	Competent	Superior
5	Is the need for the product compelling?	1 The product does not address any real need.	2 The product addresses a minor problem that affects few users.	3 The product addresses a significant problem that affects a significant number of users.	4 The product addresses a major problem that affects many users.	5 The product addresses a very hard problem that affects a very large number of users.
6	Did the team research alternate products?	1 The team did not research alternate products.	2 The team researched few alternate products, listed them, and did not explain the pros and cons.	3 The team researched some alternate products, listed them, and did not explain their pros and cons.	4 The team researched some alternate products, listed them, and explained their pros and cons.	5 The team researched many alternative products, listed them, and explained their pros and cons.
7	Can the product have significant impact?	1 A successful implementation of this project will have no positive impact for its target users.	2 A successful implementation of this project will have a minor positive impact for its target users.	3 A successful implementation of this project will have a positive impact on some of its target users.	4 A successful implementation of this project will have a reasonably major positive impact for its target users.	5 A successful implementation of this project will have a major positive impact for its target users.
8	Was the product well-specified?	1 The presentation barely details the user's expectation of the product. The scope and nature of the project are hard to discern.	2 The presentation somewhat details the user's expectation of the product. The scope and nature of the project are confusing at times.	3 The presentation reasonably details the user's expectation of the product. The scope and nature of the project are reasonably laid out.	4 The presentation mostly details the user's expectation of the product. The scope and nature of the project are mostly laid out.	5 The presentation completely details the user's expectation of the product. The scope and nature of the project are completely laid out.

		Unacceptable	Below Standard	Acceptable	Competent	Superior
9	Was an appropriate architecture selected?	1 The architecture was poorly conveyed barely illustrating the key design decisions. No UML or other supporting diagrams used to illustrate the application's architecture were included. The design choice is inappropriate for the application.	2 The architecture was weakly conveyed somewhat illustrating the key design decisions . The UML/other supporting diagrams used to illustrate the application's architecture were poorly organized and sloppy. The design choice is less than ideal for the application.	3 The architecture was reasonably conveyed adequately illustrating the key design decisions. UML/other supporting diagrams used to illustrate the application's architecture were reasonably organized and clear. The design choice was adequate for the application.	4 The architecture conveyed the key design decisions well illustrating the key design designs clearly and concisely. UML/other supporting diagrams used to illustrate the application's architecture were well organized and clear. The design choice was appropriate for the application.	5 The architecture conveyed the key design decisions extremely well illustrating the key design designs extremely clearly and concisely. UML/other supporting diagrams used to illustrate the application's architecture were very well organized and extremely clear. The design choice was very appropriate for the application.
10	Were alternative designs considered?	1 Alternative designs were not discussed.	2 Alternative designs were explained without much detail with the pros and cons of the design minimally explained.	3 Alternative designs were explained in some detail with the pros and cons of the design somewhat explained.	4 Alternative designs were explained in reasonable detail with the pros and cons of the design mostly explained.	5 Alternative designs were explained in significant detail with the pros and cons of the design completely explained.
11	Was the project carried out efficiently?	1 The project had many problems throughout the development process.	2 The project had intermittent problems throughout the development process.	3 The project had some problems during the development process.	4 The project had few problems during the development process.	5 The project had no real problems during the development process.
12	Did the team use appropriate tools to manage the software development process?	1 No tools were used to manage the software development process.	2 A tool was used to manage an aspect of the software development process.	3 A few tools were used to manage some aspects of the software development process.	4 Tools were used together to manage most aspects of the software development process.	5 Appropriate tools were used together at every level of the software development process.
13	Was an appropriate testing strategy used?	1 The application was not tested.	2 The application was tested only with manual test issues in a mostly non-systematic method.	3 A reasonable amount of tests were documented and systematically performed.	4 A significant amount of tests were documented and systematically performed.	5 A significant amount of tests were documented and systematically performed and shown to be complete.

		Unacceptable	Below Standard	Acceptable	Competent	Superior
14	Did the application function properly? **This score carries triple weight.**	1 The final application did not function well.	2 The final application was demonstrated with some of functionality as dictated by the requirements document. The application performed inconsistently, with an aesthetically unpleasing interface.	3 The final application was demonstrated with a reasonable amount of its functionality as dictated by the requirements document. The application performed smoothly, with a reasonably aesthetically pleasing interface.	4 The final application was demonstrated with most of its functionality complete as dictated by the requirements document. The application performed smoothly, with an aesthetically pleasing interface.	5 The final application was demonstrated with complete functionality as dictated by the requirements document. The application performed smoothly, with an aesthetically pleasing interface.
15	Did the application have a stylish look-and-feel?	1 The application looked poor and was unintuitive.	2 The application looked poor, but was reasonably intuitive.	3 The application looked ok and was reasonably intuitive.	4 The application looked good and was intuitive to use.	5 The application looked excellent and was very intuitive to use.
16	How original is the project's idea?	1 The project's idea was not original and has been solved many times.	2 The project had some original aspects to it, although most of the project has been solved many times.	3 The project was reasonably original.	4 The project was very original.	5 The project's idea was groundbreaking.
17	Was the project technically challenging? **This score carries double weight.**	1 The project was very simple technologically.	2 The project had a few minor technological challenges.	3 The project had a reasonable number of technological challenges.	4 The project had many technological challenges.	5 The project was extremely technologically challenging.
18	Did the team address the societal impact of their project?	1 The team did not address the societal impact in any manner.	2 The team touched upon the societal impact of their project, but did not elaborate.	3 The team addressed some of the direct, indirect, long term and short term societal impact of their project.	4 The team addressed most of the direct, indirect, long term and short term societal impact of their project.	5 The team fully addressed the direct, indirect, long term and short term societal impact of their project.