## **Capstone Design: Proposal Evaluation Sheet**

Date: 2021.09.16

Your Team: Fancy (F)

Team to be Evaluated: A

Team Leader: Minji Cha

The table in the next page contains evaluation criteria for a proposal. BG, PS, and PP represent background and related work, problem statement and proposed solution, and project planning, respectively. Please write the scores with a short description (i.e., why do you think so?) per each criterion.

| Criteria | ltems  | Score  |
|----------|--|--------|
| BG       | Does the team thoroughly study prior work/approach/idea?                   | 27/50  |
| (30%)    | 기존 아이디어/접근방식/연구를 빠짐없이 정리했는가?   |        |
|          | Does the team properly understand or classify related work?                | 23/50  |
|          | 기존 아이디어/접근방식/연구에 대해 적절히 이해하고 분류했는가?  |        |
|          | [Description]  | 50/100 |
|          | The team mentioned about prior models but the search was not               |        |
|          | enough. Also, because it is well-known project, there are so many          |        |
|          | study about similar ones.  |        |
| PS       | Is the proposal worth addressing?  | 17/30  |
| (40%)    | 제안한 내용은 충분히 의미 있는 프로젝트인가?  |        |
|          | Does the team clarify the problem?   | 40/40  |
|          | 해당 팀은 문제를 명료하게 정의하고 있는가?   |        |
|          | Is the proposed solution logical and practical?                            | 27/30  |
|          | 제안하는 솔루션은 논리적이고 실용적인가?   |        |
|          | [Description]  |        |
|          | The necessity of this service seems persuasive in terms of                 | 84/100 |
|          | copyright. But there are already lots of similar font making               |        |
|          | projects. So, in order to make this project meaningful, there              |        |
|          | should be different points or additional functions compared to             |        |
|          | other existing projects.   |        |
| PP       | Is it appropriate for a semester-long project as a team? The               | 35/40  |
| (30%)    | proposal must be neither too trivial nor too hard.                         |        |
|          | 한 학기 동안 팀이 수행하기에 적절한 난이도인가?  |        |
|          | Are individual roles and collaboration clearly defined?                    | 30/30  |
|          | 개별 역할 분담과 협업이 명료하게 정의되어 있는가?   |        |
|          | Is the final product meaningful?   | 17/30  |
|          | 최종 결과물이 의미 있는가?  |        |
|          | [Description]  | 82/100 |
|          | The project seems to be focused on a single technical                      |        |
|          | implementation. So it is a little doubtful if this project's difficulty is |        |
|          | at appropriate level. However, The team members' roles are clearly         |        |
|          | divided.   |        |

| Total  | BG * 0.3 + PS * 0.4 + PP * 0.3 =                                  | 73/100 |
|--------|---|--------|
| (종합)   |   |        |
| Review | Overall, there are so many study about similar ones. So, in order |        |
| (총평)   | to make this project meaningful, there should be different points |        |
|        | or additional functions compared to other existing projects. But  |        |
|        | the necessity of this service seems persuasive in terms of        |        |
|        | copyright.  |        |
|        |   |        |
|        |   |        |
|        |   |        |
|        |   |        |
|        |   |        |