**ITEC 201 Semester Project: Phase 3**

*Project Evaluation*

Name: Nathan Ketterlinus

Group Name: Arbiter

**Instructions:**

For each of the evaluations of the other groups, please answer the following questions. You should be able to access the files for other groups via blackboard in the discussion tab – look for the forum labeled “Phase 3”. Be as descriptive as possible in your evaluations. Your evaluations will help other groups to make better decisions and improvements. Your grade for phase 3 is individual and based on the detail of your evaluation. You should Review at least 3 projects from the other groups. The table below lists which groups you should be reviewing.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your Group** | **Review the following Groups** |
| **Arbiter** | **Improved Tech Systems, CitySmartsTechnology,** CQRE- EYE |
| **Roar Space Solutions** | Arbiter, **CitySmartsTechnology,** CQRE- EYE |
| **Improved Tech Systems** | Arbiter, Roar Space Solutions, CQRE- EYE |
| **CitySmartsTechnology** | Arbiter, Roar Space Solutions, **Improved Tech Systems** |
| CQRE- EYE | Roar Space Solutions, Improved Tech Sytems**, CitySmartsTechnology** |

**Evaluation 1:**

1. What is the name of the company that you are evaluating? What is the main mission of the company? What area in Maryland will this company be working in primarily?

This first evaluation considers Improved Tech System’s proposed app, “P’s & T’s”, designed to connect parents with their kid’s teachers in the Baltimore area. ITS’s mission is to “meet the ever-evolving needs of communities in the face of new advancements in technology” (Raitano et al., 2024, Business Description).

2. What is your overall impression of the company’s proposal? What do you like and dislike? Are you able to understand what the company is about?

I think the idea of P’s and T’s is a good one, and the implementation that IPT suggests is certainly high quality. I think the focus on parent-teacher communication will be critical to the app’s success. However, I am a bit worried that the project will fail to pickup a userbase, as a large portion of their potential userbase are already a part of the Klassly, Classting, or Class Dojo ecosystem. Why would a family want to learn an additional app, when they could just push for these existing applications to update to their needs? As such, I am worried that the program may not receive the funding it needs, as investors may not see it as having a good ROI (however that may look).

3. What are some of the main objectives that the company is planning to implement in order to improve their target area?

The document does not go into too many specifics. The most I can gather is that the app “P’s & T’s” will be constructed with parent-teacher communication at the forefront of its design. New features will be implemented according to feedback from parents and teachers. Additional servers will be provided in the event of too many users.

4. Do you feel that these planned objectives are justified based on the information that they provided? Is the proposal well supported? Explain.

I feel that the planned objectives are almost the bare minimum for a project like this. While it’s great that ITC wants to have such a feedback-oriented approach to design, I would have liked a more concrete feature list for the initial build than “parents talk to teachers”. In this way, from a technical standpoint, the proposal is not very well supported.

5. Do you have any suggested improvements for their proposal?

Firstly, flesh out the ideas of the initial build: is the project just instant messaging with a narrow scope, or can it report a student’s grades with their parent like other apps? What other features does the app have that makes parents and teachers want to use it. Secondly, building off the previous point, make a case for why someone would want to use Ps & Ts. As it stands, my family used Class Dojo to help my younger brother through elementary school. The communication it provided both his parents and teachers given that he has special needs in the classroom was invaluable. I do not see why my family should ever switch to P’s & T’s if it’s essentially a watered-down version of Class Dojo already. Finally, a lot of proposed costs are not thoroughly explained. What kind of IT equipment costs $50,000/year? What materials cost a combined $140,000/year? What is the difference between direct and indirect materials?

6. Assuming that you were the person in charge of funding this company based on the proposal alone, would you support the project? Explain.

I would not support the project in its entirety. I believe my money would be better spent investing in an existing company like Class Dojo to integrate their existing platform into BCPS for the reasons above.

7. If this were a real company would you find it credible, based on the information provided in the proposal?

I find the research that the company did credible. However, I am not sure I find their application of their research into P’s & T’s credible. It seems like a well-intended project, but misguided by a lack of primary experiences to draw from and an unclear idea of what the project should be in the first place.

8. Did the company accurately explain the technology needed to achieve their goal? Do you feel that it was well supported and justified?

Needed technology was lightly touched on. All I know is that the project needs a server (possibly more with enough users), $140,000/year in “materials”, and $55,000/year in IT equipment and repairs.

9. On a scale of 1 to 10 (where 10 is the highest) how would you rate this company based on the proposal? Explain.

Overall, I’d give the company a 6/10. As stated above, I think their proposal is well intended, but misguided in its proposed execution. Their product did not convince me that it would be a better alternative to existing products, the document did not adequately flesh out an image of what their app would look like besides a narrow instant-messaging service, and prices seemed arbitrary and unrealistic for such a small project.

10. Any additional comments?

I really like the logo!

**Evaluation 2:**

1. What is the name of the company that you are evaluating? What is the main mission of the company? What area in Maryland will this company be working in primarily?

This second evaluation looks at City Smarts Technology’s proposed ParkSmart project for the city of Baltimore. Their mission is to “help cities transform into the smart cities of the future by upgrading transportation infrastructure to include smart technology” (2024, Executive Summary).

2. What is your overall impression of the company’s proposal? What do you like and dislike? Are you able to understand what the company is about?

Personally, I really like the proposed ParkSmart project. The product itself is extremely well fleshed-out, and it clearly differentiates itself from its competitors by positioning itself as an “all-in-one” solution. The one thing I am a bit concerned about is a lack of tangibles concerning the setup of a project of such large scope. The company is clearly about integrating smart technology into the city’s transportation network.

3. What are some of the main objectives that the company is planning to implement in order to improve their target area?

ParkSmart aims to implement sensors across the city to monitor available parking spots. This real-time info will be relayed to motorists to an app. The app will use the driver’s GPS data and preferences to calculate the best spot for them to park in, as well as provide directions to get to said spot. The app can also handle autopayments from a linked wallet for parking meters. Finally, app users will receive reminders about important events, such as street cleaning days and other events that limit parking.

4. Do you feel that these planned objectives are justified based on the information that they provided? Is the proposal well supported? Explain.

I believe these planned objectives are justified based on provided information. The project aims to compile useful features from various applications in a way that provides the most benefits for consumers in an accessible manner.

5. Do you have any suggested improvements for their proposal?

I would go into more detail of the specifics of hardware implementations. For example, how will placed cameras be powered? How does the company expect to integrate auto payment functionality across parking spots that may use differing existing infrastructure? In addition, I would consider writing about expanding the project to areas other than just Baltimore. This has the potential to be in every major metropolitan area, and such an opportunity should not be passed up.

6. Assuming that you were the person in charge of funding this company based on the proposal alone, would you support the project? Explain.

I would support the project. The document clearly outlines both the financial and environmental benefits of the project. These benefits would position Baltimore to become a much more efficient city.

7. If this were a real company would you find it credible, based on the information provided in the proposal?

I would find the company credible based on provided info. It appears to provide a wholistic view of information relevant to their solution, and is realistic with many assumptions.

8. Did the company accurately explain the technology needed to achieve their goal? Do you feel that it was well support and justified?

This is probably one of the weaker areas of the proposal. While it outlines that traffic info will be collected by sensors, sent to and processed by a central database, and sent out to consumers on a streamlined app, I am worried about the plausibility of implementing such a system. Keeping a city-wide grid of cameras on every single parking spot powered will certainly be challenging.

9. On a scale of 1 to 10 (where 10 is the highest) how would you rate this company based on the proposal? Explain.

10/10. The project has a clear goal, a clear scope, and clear steps to reach its goal. No assumption made seems unrealistic, and everything is well researched.

10. Any additional comments?

I really appreciate how concrete everything felt in this proposal.

**Evaluation 3:**

1. What is the name of the company that you are evaluating? What is the main mission of the company? What area in Maryland will this company be working in primarily?

CQRE-EYE is a company “committed to enhancing safety and security within the dynamic city of Baltimore” (Wyatt et al., 2024, Business Description).

2. What is your overall impression of the company’s proposal? What do you like and dislike? Are you able to understand what the company is about?

Overall, I am not too enthused by the proposal. While I appreciate that the company acknowledges that crime rates are a major issue in the Baltimore area, I do not believe that the solution they propose is sensitive enough to the needs of the people that they serve. Specifically, surveillance systems are inherently designed to fix a symptom of a larger problem, rather than the root cause itself. While these solutions can be helpful, it needs to be implemented carefully. Unfortunately, the “AI powered threat detection” that CQRE-EYE proposes can easily be used to reinforce harmful racial stereotypes that are ravaging the African American population in Baltimore. Surveillance, above all else, should be sources of info, not ways to preemptively stop crime. False positives can be detrimental to the average person.

3. What are some of the main objectives that the company is planning to implement in order to improve their target area?

Security cameras are high resolution, even in adverse conditions. Cameras can detect suspicious behavior preemptively using AI technology. New cameras can be seamlessly integrated to any existing infrastructure in a variety of ways.

4. Do you feel that these planned objectives are justified based on the information that they provided? Is the proposal well supported? Explain.

Surveillance tech is justified, but the use of AI on captured data to preemptively stop crime is not. Unfortunately, that is arguable the most critical part of their proposed solution. While cameras can be used to deter crime just through their presence, and are an invaluable tool in catching criminals, they should not be used to preemptively profile people and alert authorities just for walking down the street at night.

5. Do you have any suggested improvements for their proposal?

Remove the AI so that the system is not prescriptive. In addition, I’m 99% sure that Fit Lapse is the name of the product from the demo assignment, you might want to change that. It seems that a lot of the later sections of the report are copy pasted from the example without being changed.

6. Assuming that you were the person in charge of funding this company based on the proposal alone, would you support the project? Explain.

No, it is dangerous to the people of Baltimore for the reasons listed above.

7. If this were a real company would you find it credible, based on the information provided in the proposal?

No, it does not adequately account for nuance that exists within the city.

8. Did the company accurately explain the technology needed to achieve their goal? Do you feel that it was well support and justified?

Needed technology is well explained, however I am a bit dubious of claims of seamless integration with existing infrastructure.

9. On a scale of 1 to 10 (where 10 is the highest) how would you rate this company based on the proposal? Explain.

4/10, the proposal is founded on a shaky premise, and seems to shift between authors who are too lazy to change the original document or haven’t adequately researched the needs of the city

10. Any additional comments?

Sorry for the harsh words, I hope that something in there is at least worth considering!
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