

## Project Review Board #1

Capstone Group: \_\_\_\_\_

Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

### 1. Project Motivation: Is the importance of the project clearly articulated?

0 Importance not addressed	2 Importance minimally or poorly addressed	3 Some importance established	4 Project importance established	5 Project importance well-established
-------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

### 2. Constraints: Are the project constraints clearly defined, justified, and measurable?

0 Constraints not addressed	2 Constraints minimally or poorly addressed	3 A few constraints given, or of modest quality	4 Constraints sufficient, measurable list	5 Thorough, well-defined list of constraints
--------------------------------	--	--	--	---

### 3. Evaluation Metrics: Are the project evaluation metrics clearly defined, justified, and measurable?

0 Metrics not addressed	2 Metrics minimally or poorly addressed	3 A few metrics given, or of modest quality	4 Metrics sufficient, measurable list	5 Metrics thorough, well-defined, prioritized list
----------------------------	--	--	--	---

### 4. State of the art: Are available solutions thoroughly described?

0 Not addressed	2 Minimally or poorly addressed	3 Several items mentioned but not described	4 Descriptive, reasonably complete list	5 Thorough, defined list with available cost
--------------------	------------------------------------	--	--	---

### 5. Design Concepts: Are alternative possible solutions considered?

0 No other alternatives provided	2 Only one or two alternatives shown	3 Several alternatives shown but not well described	4 Sufficient list of alternatives, reasonably well described	5 Thorough, highlights features of each alternative
-------------------------------------	---	--	---	--

### 6. Concept Selection: Is the chosen alternative justified and supported by the use of decision making tools?

0 Not addressed	2 Chosen alternative not clear	3 Alternative chosen with little justification	4 Alternative chosen with sufficient justification	5 Alternative chosen with thorough justification
--------------------	-----------------------------------	---	---	---

### 7. Budget\*: Is the estimated budget justified?

\*Computer Science Projects: Are the total hours needed to complete the project estimated?

0 Not addressed	2 Poorly prepared and/or poorly justified	3 Mediocre presentation and justification	4 Sufficient presentation and justification	5 Thorough presentation and justification
--------------------	--	--	--	--

### 8. Schedule\*: Does the tentative full-year project schedule include project-specific milestones and not course due dates?

\*Computer Science: Are design sprints planned? Are specific product goals & backlog presented? (i.e. Initiation + planning & estimating phases)

0 No schedule provided	2 Poor schedule and/or presentation	3 Mediocre presentation, perhaps unrealistic	4 Sufficient presentation	5 Thorough schedule
---------------------------	--	---	------------------------------	------------------------

### 9. Citations: Were appropriate citations/references given?

0 None	2 Poorly done	3 Some missing citations	4 Sufficient	5 Thorough
-----------	------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	---------------

### 10. Questions: Were questions answered well?

0 No answers, or hostile/defensive attitude	2 Poorly	3 Neutral	4 Sufficiently, demonstrating good understanding	5 Thorough, clear and concise
--	-------------	--------------	---	----------------------------------

### 11. Was the presentation effective? (Style, pacing, delivery, structure, visual aids, entire team participated.)

0 Not at all	2 Poor	3 Neutral	4 Good	5 Outstanding
-----------------	-----------	--------------	-----------	------------------

Printed name of evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please write your comments on the back of this sheet**

## Project Review Board #1

Capstone Group: \_\_\_\_\_

Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

Printed name of evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_