

**Team Name: Struggle Bus**

Chris Arpin, Brandon George, Adam Hursey, Noah Lindsey, Tim Ours, Mitch Whedon

**Comments**

- ISD plan
- Comparison to similar meetings in industry
  - On par, very professional
- X: In KTSA, Tim started talking about the recommended alternative before we heard about it
- X: Maybe changing speakers a little too much (in doing the alternatives)
- X: Low discount rate, initial cost for custom build is low (miscalculation?)
- X: Brandon moving around a lot while speaking
- X: in the ERD, DFD's, UX diagrams, the lines and black text were hard to see (dark background).
- X: Conclusion – should summarize key points with a slide
- X: Show assumptions
- Professional dress and demeanor, no-nonsense and serious about the project
- Nice documents; in 3 ring binders
- Good eye contact
- Good explanation of the motivation for the product
- Explained terms such as “non-customer stakeholders”
- In KTSA, started with some concerns:
  - Hurdle of not having customer base
  - Making money might be better later
- Good job explaining what each person was going to talk about
- Alternatives:
  - On one slide, showed a screenshot (some), pros/cons
  - Demonstrated in-depth knowledge of the alternatives
- Team members helped each other answer questions
- Good handoffs between members
- Team members were taking notes
- Slides numbered: good
- KTDA text was way too small, tables in general (e.g. page 21), wireframes
- A few typos (e.g. slide 15 “Gardner’s Exchange”, slide 17 – no development costs)
- Put the recommendation on a slide: good
- Presentation slides: not too much information, contained key points
- SRT and Use Cases: good that you listed only the most important entries to review
- The team knew the material in detail and could answer questions intelligently
- Good job explaining what a Use Case is, what each speaker is going to talk about
- Cross functional process map was good (text too small, though)
- Nice wireframe slides
  - Showing various steps when buttons are pressed (like a simulation)
  - Good graphics

- Non-functional requirements were well thought out
- The system was well thought out
- Team spoke well – clear, easy to understand
- Good job explaining CS terms (e.g. hash code for security, sequel injection)
- Handled suggestions well – acknowledged value of the suggestion without getting defensive