

Project Review Board #2

Capstone Group: _____

Advisor: _____

1. Project Motivation: Are the motivation, constraints, and evaluation metrics appropriately summarized?

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Score: | 0 Missing or very poor | 2 Poor | 3 Acceptable | 4 Good | 5 Excellent |
|--------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|

2. Design Description: Is the design fully described?

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Score: | 0 Not described or no final design picked | 2 Not described or no final design picked | 3 Design somewhat clear | 4 Design sufficiently described | 5 Design clearly and thoroughly described |
|--------|--|--|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|

3. Evaluation: Was the design evaluated using appropriate engineering analysis?

*Computer Science: Has the team tested early version to validate design choices and gather feedback? Were codes reviewed by peers to catch flaws?

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Score: | 0 No evaluations present | 2 Poor evaluation, lacking engineering | 3 Design somewhat evaluated | 4 Sufficient evaluations of design | 5 Appropriate and thorough evaluations of design |
|--------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|

4. Evaluation: Are the design decisions to date convincingly presented?

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Score: | 0 No justification given | 2 Decisions poorly justified | 3 Decisions somewhat justified | 4 Decisions sufficiently justified | 5 Decisions thoroughly justified |
|--------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

5. Budget*: Have cost-saving measures been considered?

*Computer Science: Has the team leveraged existing code, modules, or libraries to avoid redundant work?

| | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Score: | 0 Not addressed | 2 Minimally or poorly addressed | 3 Some measures considered | 4 Cost-saving measures sufficiently considered | 5 Cost-saving measures thoroughly considered |
|--------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|

6. Budget*: Is the group ready to commit resources to the project?

*Computer Science: Has the team demonstrated sufficient progress to greenlight the remainder of the project?

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Score: | 0 Not addressed or very little progress | 2 Not ready to commit resources | 3 Ready to commit some resources | 4 Ready to commit most resources | 5 Completely ready to commit resources |
|--------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|

7. Schedule*: Does the detailed 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)

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

8. Citations: Were appropriate citations/references given?

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

9. Questions: Were questions answered well?

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

10. Was the presentation well-organized? (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions.)

| | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------|-----------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Score: | 0 Not at all | 2 Poor | 3 Intermittently observable | 4 Clearly and consistently observable | 5 Clearly and consistently observable; skillfully makes the content cohesive |
|--------|-----------------|-----------|--------------------------------|--|---|

11. Were the delivery techniques effective? (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness make the presentation _____.)

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|---|--|---|---|
| Score: | 0 Incomprehensible; speakers appear uninterested or detract from presentation | 2 Somewhat understandable; speakers appear uncomfortable | 3 Understandable; speakers appear tentative | 4 Interesting; speakers appear comfortable | 5 Captivating; speakers are polished and confident |
|--------|--|---|--|---|---|

Printed name of evaluator: _____

Please write your comments on the back of this sheet

Project Review Board #2

Comments: