Grades for Sean Gordon

Course

E E 491 Section 1 (Spring ∨

Arrange By

Due Date ∨

Apply

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF	
Lab Safety Procedures Document Assignments	Jan 26 by 11:59pm		10	10	
QZ1 Attendance	Jan 28 by 4pm		2	2	
Bi-weekly Status Report #1 (B1) Bi-weekly Reports	Feb 2 by 11:59pm		10	10	📋

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

B1

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Bi-weekly Summary	**2 pts** **Satisfactory** A one-paragraph summary that includes (1) the overall project status, and (2) the team accomplishments over the reporting period.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No summary.		2 / 2 pts
Individual Contributions	**3 pts** **Outstanding** Detailed report on the accomplishment of each team member, and how each member	**2 pts** **Good** Some report on individual contributions, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No report on individual contributions.	3 / 3 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
B1				

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
	contributes to the overall progress of the project. Includes the "Hours Worked for the Week" and the "Total Cumulative Hours" for each member. Each member's individual weekly hours should be at a minimum of 6-8 hours for 491.			

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

B1

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Pending Issues	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Detailed report on pending issues (if applicable). ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks** No discussion of pending issues.		2 / 2 pts
Plans	**3 pts** **Outstanding** Detailed plans for the next reporting period. ▲	**2 pts** **Good** Some plans for the next reporting period, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No plans for the next reporting period.	3 / 3 pts

Total Points: 10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF	
Reflection #1 (R1) Assignments	Feb 2 by 11:59pm		10	10	📋

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "R1: TEAM EXPECTATIONS AND SETTING ROLES"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q1	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Clearly outlines the expected results for their team on each the four areas. ▲	**1.5 pts** **Good** Provides few expected results for their team based on the four areas. Not clear on what their expected results are.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not Answered	2 / 2 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "R1: TEAM EXPECTATIONS AND SETTING ROLES"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q2	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Provides concise performance indicators, well-defined individual contributions and team processes for one of the four areas. ▲	**1.5 pts** **Good** Examples provided are not well defined.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not Answered	2 / 2 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "R1: TEAM EXPECTATIONS AND SETTING ROLES"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q3	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Outlines responsibilities and identifies roles on individual responsibilities and managing team processes. ▲	**1.5 pts** **Good** Provides few roles on individual responsibilities. Managing team processes not clearly identified.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not Answered	2 / 2 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "R1: TEAM EXPECTATIONS AND SETTING ROLES"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q4	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Clearly discusses and reflects their roles for the project, and how they are fit and/or not fit for the roles. ▲	**1.5 pts** **Good** Vague reflection on their roles. Lack of justification or no justification provided.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not Answered	2 / 2 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "R1: TEAM EXPECTATIONS AND SETTING ROLES"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q5	**2 pts** **Outstanding** States concisely at least three strategies for team inclusiveness. Makes a clear argument for or against team role rotation. ▲	**1.5 pts** **Good** At least one strategy for team inclusiveness. Answer for team role rotation not focused.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not Answered.		2 / 2 pts

Total Points: 10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF		
Lightening Talk #1 (L1) Lightening Talks	Feb 9 by 11:59pm	(LATE)	10	10	🗨	📋

COMMENTS

CLOSE

Forgot to have the slides auto-continue when narrations complete. This presentation is otherwise identical to the previously submitted one.

Sean Gordon, Feb 10 at 4:44pm

Make use of the notes section on each slide to provide a transcript of what is being said. This helps the person who is speaking by simply having to read what is written, the team as a whole by allowing for proofreading, and allows me to follow along with any technical discussion that is not on the slide.

Theodore Mathews, Feb 13 at 8:23pm

Good presentation!

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

LIGHTENING TALK #1

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Content	**5 pts** **Outstanding** Explains all relevant requirements and discussed relevant engineering standards. ▲	**3 pts** **Good** Discusses some but not all relevant requirements and engineering standards.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No discussion on requirements or engineering standards.	5 / 5 pts

LIGHTENING TALK #1

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Participation	**5 pts** **Outstanding** All team members participate in the talk	**3 pts** **Good** Some but not all team members participate in the talk.	**1 pts** **Poor** A single team member narrates the entire presentation.	5 / 5 pts
	▲ **Comments** Even if everyone has already spoken, someone needs to draw the short straw and voice extra slides.			

Total Points: 10

B2
Bi-weekly Reports | Feb 16 by 11:59pm | | 8 | 10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

Make sure to get your team's webpage setup. Everyone will have received an email a few weeks ago with details on how to access the backend for the website. If assistance is needed, please reach out.

Theodore Mathews, Feb 19 at 5:17pm

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

B2

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Bi-weekly Summary	**2 pts** **Satisfactory** A one-paragraph summary that includes (1) the overall project status, and (2) the team accomplishments over the reporting period.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No summary.		2 / 2 pts
Individual Contributions	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Detailed report on the accomplishment of each team member, and how each member	**1 pts** **Good** Some report on individual contributions, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No report on individual contributions.	2 / 2 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
B2				

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
	contributes to the overall progress of the project. Includes the "Hours Worked for the Week" and the "Total Cumulative Hours" for each member. Each member's individual weekly hours should be at a minimum of 6-8 hours for 491. ▲			

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

B2

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Pending Issues	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Detailed report on pending issues (if applicable). ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks** No discussion of pending issues.		2 / 2 pts
Plans	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Detailed plans for the next reporting period. ▲	**1 pts** **Good** Some plans for the next reporting period, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No plans for the next reporting period.	2 / 2 pts
Team Website	**2 pts** **Outstanding** Team website up and running, with	**1 pts** **Good** Team website up and running with	**0 pts** **No Marks** Project information not	0 / 2 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
B2				

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
	complete project information, such as personnel information, project description, properly-linked bi-weekly status reports and project documents, etc.	some but incomplete project information.	provided on the team website. ▲	
	Comments Website not setup. If you need assistance, please reach out.			

Total Points: 8

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF		
QZ2 Attendance	Feb 18 by 3:35pm		2	2		
DesignDoc v1 DesignDoc v1	Feb 23 by 11:59pm		10	10	💬	📋

COMMENTS   *CLOSE*

Good job, I do not have much in the way of specific comments as everything is there for the most part. I would suggest additional revision and expansion of all of the details.

Theodore Mathews, Feb 27 at 10:37pm

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V1

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
Format Issues view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
Executive Summary view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
1.1 Acknowledgment view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V1

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
1.2 Problem and Project Statement view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
1.3 Operational Environment view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
1.4 Requirements view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts

DESIGNDOC V1

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
1.5 Intended Users and Uses view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
1.6 Assumptions and Limitations view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
1.7 Expected End Product and Deliverables view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V1

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
2.1 Proposed Approach view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
2.2 Design Analysis view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
2.3 Development Process view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V1

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
2.4 Conceptual Sketch view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
			Total Points: 10

B3
Bi-weekly Reports   Mar 1 by 11:59pm   10   10

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

B3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
Bi-weekly Summary	**2 pts** **Satisfactory** A one-paragraph summary that includes (1) the overall project status, and (2) the team accomplishments over the reporting period.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No summary.	2 / 2 pts
	Comments Make sure have some sort of paragraph for this section per the rubric.		

| Individual | **3 pts** | **2 pts** | **0 pts** | 3 / 3 pts |

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
B3 Contributions				

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
	Excellent Detailed report on the accomplishment of each team member, and how each member contributes to the overall progress of the project. Includes the "Hours Worked for the Week" and the "Total Cumulative Hours" for each	**Good** Some report on individual contributions, but lack details.	**No Marks** No report on individual contributions.	

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
B3				

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
	member. Each member's individual weekly hours should be at a minimum of 6-8 hours for 491. ▲			
Pending Issues	**2 pts** **Satisfactory** Detailed report on pending issues (if applicable). ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks** No discussion of pending issues.		2 / 2 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

B3

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Plans	**3 pts** **Excellent** Detailed plans for the next reporting period. ▲	**2 pts** **Good** Some plans for the next reporting period, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No plans for the next reporting period.	3 / 3 pts
			Total Points: 10	

R2
Assignments   Mar 1 by 11:59pm   8.5   10

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "DESIGN THINKING"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q1	**1 pts** **Excellent** Clearly identifies their views on design thinking. ▲	**0.5 pts** **Good** Views are loosely identified.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not answered.	1 / 1 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "DESIGN THINKING"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q2	**2.5 pts** **Excellent** Provides examples that clearly demonstrate connections between the design thinking process and their work. ▲	**1.5 pts** **Good** Does not provide examples, or lists examples without explanation.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not answered.	2.5 / 2.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "DESIGN THINKING"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q3	**2.5 pts** **Excellent** Provides reasons, examples, and is well thought out. ▲	**1.5 pts** **Good** Reasons are provided, but are loosely supported.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not answered.	2.5 / 2.5 pts

RUBRIC FOR "DESIGN THINKING"

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Q4	**4 pts** **Excellent** Organizes a diagram illustrating the process, provides details for each step.	**2.5 pts** **Good** Process diagram is provided, but could use more details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** Not answered.	2.5 / 4 pts
	Comments Should be your own work, additionally, provide more details.			

Total Points: 8.5

L2
Lightening Talks   Mar 8 by 11:59pm   10   10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

LIGHTENING TALK #2

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Content	**5 pts** **Excellent** Discusses all the required components: the project's key technical goals, primary conceptual sketch or system block diagram, and project timeline. ▲	**3 pts** **Good** Discusses some but not all the required components.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No discussion on any required components.	5 / 5 pts

LIGHTENING TALK #2

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Participation	**5 pts** **Excellent** All team members participate in the talk. ▲	**3 pts** **Good** Some but not all team members participate in the talk.	**1 pts** **Poor** A single team member narrates the entire presentation.	5 / 5 pts

Total Points: 10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
B4 Bi-weekly Reports	Mar 15 by 11:59pm		9	10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

COMMENTS

Most of the information in this report is identical to that of the previous one. Please ensure that you have new content in your reports.

Also, it is expected that 6-8 hours per week are being put in during the first semester of senior design.

Theodore Mathews, Mar 21 at 11:33am

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

B4

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
Bi-weekly Summary	**2 pts** **Satisfactory** A one-paragraph summary that includes (1) the overall project status, and (2) the team accomplishments over the reporting period. ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks** No summary.	2 / 2 pts
	Comments This needs to be a paragraph, not just some bullets.		
Individual Contributions	**3 pts** **Excellent** Detailed report on the accomplishment of each team member, and	**2 pts** **Good** Some report on individual contributions, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No report on individual contributions.	2 / 3 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
B4				

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
	how each member contributes to the overall progress of the project. Includes the "Hours Worked for the Week" and the "Total Cumulative Hours" for each member. Each member's individual weekly hours should be at a minimum of 6-8 hours for 491.			

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

B4

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Pending Issues	**Comments** 2 pts Need details, you should have a running total of hours per person in addition to their bi-weekly hours. **Satisfactory** Detailed report on pending issues (if applicable).	**0 pts** **No Marks** No discussion of pending issues.		2 / 2 pts
Plans	**3 pts** **Excellent** Detailed plans for the next reporting period.	**2 pts** **Good** Some plans for the next reporting period, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No plans for the next reporting period.	3 / 3 pts
			Total Points: 9	

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF	
R3 Assignments	Mar 15 by 11:59pm		10	10	🗒

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY"

CRITERIA	RATINGS	PTS

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY"

CRITERIA	RATINGS				PTS
Overall effort (Q1-Q4)	**3 pts Exemplary** Addresses questions with reasonable effort; indicates having read and engaged with assigned Codes of Ethics; indicates team discussion.	**2 pts Competent**	**1 pts Developing**	**0 pts Unsatisfactory**	3 / 3 pts

NAME		DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY"

CRITERIA	RATINGS				PTS
Demonstrated strength of an area of responsibility (Q5)	**3.5 pts Exemplary** Impressive grasp of responsibility, insightful details/examples, strategic use of area in project, substantial documented impacts.	**2 pts Competent** Sound grasp of responsibility, details/examples relevant to the responsibility, responsibility applied purposefully, clear positive impacts.	**1 pts Developing** Moderate grasp of responsibility, some relevant detail, not very purposeful or direct, some good impacts.	**0 pts Unsatisfactory** Little or no explanation of any elements related to the area, little or no use of elements, no impacts cited.	3.5 / 3.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY"

CRITERIA	RATINGS				PTS
Identified weakness of an area of responsibility (Q6)	**3.5 pts Exemplary** Superb explanation of opportunity; insightful on benefits & relevant codes; Impressive plan; likely embraced by all and implemented.	**2 pts Competent** Good explanation of opportunity; good definition of benefits & reference to codes. Clear, strong plan; reasonable to implement well.	**1 pts Developing** Okay description of opportunity; vague benefits; some reference to codes. Reasonable plan; may be possible to implement.	**0 pts Unsatisfactory** Vague description of opportunity; does not see benefits; no reference to codes. No plan or unclear; unreasonable to implement.	3.5 / 3.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

RUBRIC FOR "AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY"

CRITERIA	RATINGS	PTS
		Total Points: 10

DesignDoc v2
DesignDoc v2

	Mar 29 by 11:59pm		20	20

COMMENTS   *CLOSE*

Good start. Go back through and make sure it is readable, check for grammar and spelling issues, and expand on the technical sections.

Theodore Mathews, Apr 11 at 4:59pm

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
Format Issues view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
Executive Summary view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
	Comments Finish this section		
1.1 Acknowledgment view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
1.2 Problem and Project Statement view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
1.3 Operational Environment view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
1.4 Requirements view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts

NAME		DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
1.5 Intended Users and Uses view longer description	**0.5 pts** Full Marks ▲	**0 pts** No Marks	0.5 / 0.5 pts
1.6 Assumptions and Limitations view longer description	**0.5 pts** Full Marks ▲	**0 pts** No Marks	0.5 / 0.5 pts
1.7 Expected End Product and Deliverables view longer description	**1 pts** Full Marks ▲	**0 pts** No Marks	1 / 1 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
2.1 Proposed Approach view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
2.2 Design Analysis view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
2.3 Development Process view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
	Comments If you are going to use that image you need to cite it.		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
2.4 Conceptual Sketch view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
	Comments Try and update this in a non-handwritten form.		
3.1 Previous Work and Literature view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
3.2 Technology Considerations view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
3.3 Task Decomposition view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
	Comments Consider explaining each task a bit more.		
3.4 Possible Risks and Risk Management view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
3.5 Project Proposed Milestones and Evaluation Criteria view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
3.6 Project Tracking Procedures view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
	Comments Explain the procedures that you will use, not just the tool.		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
3.7 Expected Results and Validation view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
4.1 Project Timeline view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
	Comments This is hard to read in this format in a document such as this.		
4.2 Feasibility Assessment view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
	Comments This needs much more explanation and detail.		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
4.3 Personnel Effort Requirements view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
4.4 Other Resource Requirements view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V2

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
4.5 Financial Requirements view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts

Total Points: 20

Contingency Plan
Lightening Talks

Apr 5 by 11:59pm   10   10

L3
Lightening Talks

Apr 5 by 11:59pm   10   10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

Make sure you verify that the presentation works correctly before submitting it. Two of the annotations were sped up many times above normal so I had to extract the audio and slow it down. Apart from that, a good presentation.

Theodore Mathews, Apr 13 at 1:13am

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

LIGHTENING TALK #3

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Content	**5 pts** **Excellent** Discusses all the required components: a technical challenge that your team has faced, and how you have overcome it; a list of other technical challenges. ▲	**3 pts** **Good** Discusses some but not all the required components.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No discussion on any required components.	5 / 5 pts

LIGHTENING TALK #3

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Participation	**5 pts** **Excellent** All team members participate in the talk. ▲	**3 pts** **Good** Some but not all team members participate in the talk.	**1 pts** **Poor** A single team member narrates the entire presentation.	5 / 5 pts
				Total Points: 10

B5
Bi-weekly Reports   Apr 12 by 11:59pm   9   10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

COMMENTS

No cumulative hours, according to the individual contributions, everyone did exactly the same thing...

Theodore Mathews, Apr 16 at 7:49pm

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

B5

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Bi-weekly Summary	**2 pts** **Satisfactory** A one-paragraph summary that includes (1) the overall project status, and (2) the team accomplishments over the reporting period. ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks** No summary.		2 / 2 pts
Individual Contributions	**3 pts** **Excellent** Detailed report on the accomplishment of each team member, and how each member	**2 pts** **Good** Some report on individual contributions, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No report on individual contributions.	2 / 3 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
B5				

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
	contributes to the overall progress of the project. Includes the "Hours Worked for the Week" and the "Total Cumulative Hours" for each member. Each member's individual weekly hours should be at a minimum of 6-8 hours for 491.			

Comments

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

Needs cumulative hours, members need to actually put what the did into this section.

B5

CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
Pending Issues	**2 pts** **Satisfactory** Detailed report on pending issues (if applicable). ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks** No discussion of pending issues.		2 / 2 pts
Plans	**3 pts** **Excellent** Detailed plans for the next reporting period. ▲	**2 pts** **Good** Some plans for the next reporting period, but lack details.	**0 pts** **No Marks** No plans for the next reporting period.	3 / 3 pts

Total Points: 9

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF		
DesignDoc v3 DesignDoc v3	Apr 26 by 11:59pm		24.4	30	🗩	📋

COMMENTS

The document has not been updated in the older sections since it initial creation and comments for updates were not implemented. Many sections are missing a large number of details, and the required information in different sections from the template was not discussed.

Theodore Mathews, May 3 at 12:59pm

See the rubric for specific details and points breakdown.

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
Format Issues view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
Executive Summary view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.4 / 0.5 pts
	Comments What new skills and knowledge were needed? This was supposed to be finished.		
1.1 Acknowledgment view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
1.2 Problem and Project Statement view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks** ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts
1.3 Operational Environment view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.8 / 1 pts
	Comments What is the operational environment? Indoors, outdoors, classroom, art installation?		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
1.4 Requirements view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.4 / 0.5 pts
	Comments What constitutes a self-explanatory user interface? There should be details for all of these requirements. You base the entire project off of these.		
1.5 Intended Users and Uses view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
1.6 Assumptions and Limitations view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.5 / 0.5 pts
1.7 Expected End Product and Deliverables view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.9 / 1 pts
	Comments The team should be able to describe in detail what will be delivered or at a minimum what would be expected by this point.		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
2.1 Proposed Approach view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.4 / 0.5 pts
	Comments What is this well-documented approach? The budget and schedule are not described in this document. Details, what is this robustly rested and developed first approach, what does it entail, wouldn't that be this entire section?		
2.2 Design Analysis view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.4 / 0.5 pts
	Comments Details are needed, read the template for what is required here.		

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
2.3 Development Process view longer description	**0.5 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.1 / 0.5 pts
	Comments Failed to cite the image after having been told to do it. Minimal information on the actual implementation of the process and what specifically will occur.		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
2.4 Conceptual Sketch view longer description	**1 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	0.9 / 1 pts
	Comments Failed to update the image to something more professional		
3.1 Previous Work and Literature view longer description	**0.5 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	0.5 / 0.5 pts

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
3.2 Technology Considerations view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.8 / 1 pts
	Comments What are the tradeoffs between the different hosting companies, what research has been done into this?		
3.3 Task Decomposition view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.8 / 1 pts
	Comments Failed to update based on previous comments. How can a 2 semester project be completed with 5 tasks?		

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
3.4 Possible Risks and Risk Management view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.7 / 1 pts
	Comments So this section has not been updated in almost two months? How does Covid affect your project? What are you going to do about it? How are you going to mitigate website security concerns?		
3.5 Project Proposed Milestones and Evaluation Criteria view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.7 / 1 pts
	Comments No evaluation criteria. Are these what your advisor/client was looking for as well?		

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
3.6 Project Tracking Procedures view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.7 / 1 pts
	Comments Failed to update information based on comments on the previous version of the document. What specific procedures will be used with Trello to track the progress of the project? Reporting windows? Accountability? Who verifies everything?		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
3.7 Expected Results and Validation view longer description	**1 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	0.7 / 1 pts
	Comments What defines user friendly? What defines a successful validation, using specific criteria that are not open-ended.		
4.1 Project Timeline view longer description	**1 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	0.7 / 1 pts
	Comments No changes to the timeline since the last revision, suggesting no progress has been made. Font size still too small, comment to improve readability was ignored.		

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
4.2 Feasibility Assessment view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.6 / 1 pts
	Comments Comment from previous revision ignored. WHY, what are the details, what led the team to these conclusions, why is it hard to connect the table to a raspberry pi? Details and explanations are required.		
4.3 Personnel Effort Requirements view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.9 / 1 pts
	Comments What do the different difficulty levels relate to? Why does this list have completely different tasks that the task decomposition?		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
4.4 Other Resource Requirements view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.8 / 1 pts
	Comments Why is the tentative, the requirements should be well defined by now. What do you need any of these parts for and why? What are the costs involved.		
4.5 Financial Requirements view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.8 / 1 pts
	Comments Has any of the equipment been purchased? Does the team not know exactly which camera or hosting service meets the criteria of the project?		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
5.1 Interface Specifications view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.9 / 1 pts
	Comments What hardware-software interfaces are you using or going to be using to perform testing?		
5.2 Hardware and Software view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	1 / 1 pts

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
5.3 Functional Testing view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.9 / 1 pts
	Comments This should not be example tests, this should be a detailed list of all of the functional testing that will occur on the project.		
5.4 Non-functional Testing view longer description	**1 pts** **Full Marks**	**0 pts** **No Marks**	0.9 / 1 pts
	Comments See above.		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
5.5 Process view longer description	**1 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	0.6 / 1 pts
	Comments This diagram does not describe any of the testing procedures in detail. If the table is not available, work on UI? That is not a testing process.		
5.6 Results view longer description	**1.5 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	1.2 / 1.5 pts
	Comments Why? What tests have you run or not run. If you were not able to run them why? Challenges, issues, et cetra need to be listed here. Based on the rest of the document, the table has not been received so the pandemic would not have had any effect on the testability of the project. UI testing can be done anywhere.		

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
6.1 Conclusion view longer description	**1 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	0.5 / 1 pts
	Comments This was not proofread and it does not answer the criteria that are described in the template. What have you done so far in the project? What is the end goal and what progress towards that have you made? What issues occurred and have you overcome them? How did you summarize a semester worth of work for an entire team in 3 sentences?		

DESIGNDOC V3

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
6.2 Citations view longer description	**1.5 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	1.4 / 1.5 pts
	Comments Default text left in.		
6.3 Appendicies view longer description	**1 pts** Full Marks	**0 pts** No Marks	1 / 1 pts
			Total Points: 24.4

Final Project Review Materials

FacPanel

	Apr 26 by 11:59pm		19	25	

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

COMMENTS   *CLOSE*

Comments from the faculty panel:

1. Project Plan

The problem is not clear.

The block diagram is not complete.

It is an interesting project with clearly articulated project objectives and the need for the project. The system description and operating environment are clear.

The team should add more specifics about the market and literature of similar products and deliverables.

2. Design & Basic Implementation

There is no current implementation detailed design is missing.

Due to the COVID-19, the team has not had a chance to meet physically since March, which has made it difficult to go further than they have expected. The provided presentation slides and design document did not provide necessary details about the detailed design, nor the evaluation plans or basic implementation.

Daji Qiao, May 2 at 10:47am

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

3. Presentation Quality

The slides were well done, and are clearer than the design document. Participation of each team member should have been clearer and specific.

Peer Team Evaluation Assignments	Apr 26 by 11:59pm		10	10	

Assessment by Theodore Mathews

Close Rubric

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF

PEER TEAM EVALUATION

CRITERIA	RATINGS		PTS
Submit Worksheet on Canvas	**5 pts** **Full Marks** Worksheet is submitted on Canvas, with substantive responses to all questions. ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks** Worksheet is not submitted on Canvas.	5 / 5 pts
Email Worksheet to Faculty Advisor	**5 pts** **Full Marks** Worksheet is emailed to the faculty advisor, and copied to the TAs. ▲	**0 pts** **No Marks** The email is not received by the TAs.	5 / 5 pts
			Total Points: 10

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
Advisor Evaluation FacAdvisor	May 3 by 11:59pm		35	35
BI-WEEKLY REPORTS			**92%**	46.00 / 50.00
LIGHTENING TALKS			**100%**	40.00 / 40.00
ASSIGNMENTS			**97%**	48.50 / 50.00
ATTENDANCE			**100%**	4.00 / 4.00
DESIGNDOC V1			**100%**	10.00 / 10.00
DESIGNDOC V2			**100%**	20.00 / 20.00

NAME	DUE	STATUS	SCORE	OUT OF
DESIGNDOC V3			**81.33%**	24.40 / 30.00
FACPANEL			**76%**	19.00 / 25.00
FACADVISOR			**100%**	35.00 / 35.00
TOTAL			**90.43%**	