Project Review Board #1

Capstone Group:_____   Advisor:_____

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Design Concepts: Are alternative possible solutions considered?

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

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

0	2	3	4	5
Not addressed	Chosen alternative not clear	Alternative chosen with little justification	Alternative chosen with sufficient justification	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	2	3	4	5
Not addressed	Poorly prepared and/or poorly justified	Mediocre presentation and justification	Sufficient presentation and justification	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	2	3	4	5
No schedule provided	Poor schedule and/or presentation	Mediocre presentation, perhaps unrealistic	Sufficient presentation	Thorough schedule

9. Citations: Were appropriate citations/references given?

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

10. Questions: Were questions answered well?

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

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

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

Printed name of evaluator:_____

Please write your comments on the back of this sheet

Project Review Board #1

Capstone Group:_____   Advisor:_____

<u>Comments:</u>

Capstone Group:_____   Advisor:_____

Printed name of evaluator:_____