

## CS 493 Final Project Presentation and Demo Evaluation Form

**Evaluator:**

**Team:**

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

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

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

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