

## CS 493 Final Project Presentation and Demo Evaluation Form

**Evaluator:**

**Team:**

		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Superior</b>
<b>1</b>	Was the presentation organized effectively?	<p>1 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 The team demonstrated reasonable knowledge of the material.</p> <p>They explained and elaborated on many of the questions.</p>	<p>4 The team demonstrated significant knowledge of the material.</p> <p>They explained and elaborated on most questions.</p>	<p>5 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 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.
<b>6</b>	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.
<b>7</b>	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.
<b>8</b>	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.

		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Superior</b>
<b>9</b>	Was an appropriate architecture selected?	<p>1 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 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 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 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 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>
<b>10</b>	Were alternative designs considered?	<p>1 Alternative designs were not discussed.</p>	<p>2 Alternative designs were explained without much detail with the pros and cons of the design minimally explained.</p>	<p>3 Alternative designs were explained in some detail with the pros and cons of the design somewhat explained.</p>	<p>4 Alternative designs were explained in reasonable detail with the pros and cons of the design mostly explained.</p>	<p>5 Alternative designs were explained in significant detail with the pros and cons of the design completely explained.</p>
<b>11</b>	Was the project carried out efficiently?	<p>1 The project had many problems throughout the development process.</p>	<p>2 The project had intermittent problems throughout the development process.</p>	<p>3 The project had some problems during the development process.</p>	<p>4 The project had few problems during the development process.</p>	<p>5 The project had no real problems during the development process.</p>
<b>12</b>	Did the team use appropriate tools to manage the software development process?	<p>1 No tools were used to manage the software development process.</p>	<p>2 A tool was used to manage an aspect of the software development process.</p>	<p>3 A few tools were used to manage some aspects of the software development process.</p>	<p>4 Tools were used together to manage most aspects of the software development process.</p>	<p>5 Appropriate tools were used together at every level of the software development process.</p>
<b>13</b>	Was an appropriate testing strategy used?	<p>1 The application was not tested.</p>	<p>2 The application was tested only with manual test issues in a mostly non-systematic method.</p>	<p>3 A reasonable amount of tests were documented and systematically performed.</p>	<p>4 A significant amount of tests were documented and systematically performed.</p>	<p>5 A significant amount of tests were documented and systematically performed and shown to be complete.</p>

		<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Superior</b>
<b>14</b>	Did the application function properly?  <b>This score carries triple weight.</b>	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.
<b>15</b>	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.
<b>16</b>	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.
<b>17</b>	Was the project technically challenging?  <b>This score carries double weight.</b>	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.
<b>18</b>	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.