Instructions for students: Copy and paste this entire form into your private note for your adviser to see. To cut-and-paste HTML notes, please make sure you are using the "rich text editor" in Piazza, otherwise your post may just appear as plain text.  Title your note "Peer Evaluation 2 of <Target Project Group>" Peer teams should have provided their project README and log post by Monday 30 Jun 2014 for you to view. You should complete this form with useful feedback to the target team (addressed only to your adviser) by Monday 7 Jul 2014.  
Instructions for advisers: Append this feedback to the team's project README and log after 7 Jul 2014 as a follow-up discussion to the target team's original README and log. Make sure to excise Section 5 (Overall Evaluation) from the pasted version, and separately paste Section 4 (Negative Feedback) into an anonymized follow-up.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Target Project Group (and Project Title, when different): | NFCuiz |
| Evaluating Project Group: | C-DOTA |
| Original post with the Project README and log | @815 |

## Acceptance Testing (Section 1 of 6)

|  |
| --- |
| 1.1) For each of the user stories already implemented   * Describe whether you would accept the feature as an acceptance tester (does it adequately do what was specified?). * If it is not adequate, describe what should be done it make it acceptable by the end of the project.   Please write a minimum of 1-2 sentences.  (please use a short descriptive phrase for each user story and then answer each question) |
| There is no actual user story.  Software part is not demonstrated and thus not accepted.  Hardware is accepted. |

## Features for the next sprint (Section 2 of 6)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In this section, we are evaluating the team's planning for features for the next and final sprint (July, up to Milestone 3).  2.1) For each feature (user story) that is being proposed for this sprint (minimum of 2-3):   * Is the user role (e.g. public, member, admin) well specified? * Is the desired outcome (user goal) clear? * (Optional) Is the benefit clear?   You may choose to put multiple 'X's; one for each feature proposed, or put a single 'X' to summarize for all features proposed. | | | | | | |
|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |  |
| The user stories are clearly specified and I will have not trouble deciding whether to accept the features at the end of the sprint. |  |  | X |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | |
| 2.2) Please give written feedback to explain your rating for whether the features (user stories) have been clearly specified for this final sprint.  At the end, will you accept that the team has accomplished the necessary requirements for their aimed level of achievement (with respect to project implementation and depth)? Please write a minimum of 1-2 sentences and a maximum of 500 words (approximately 1 page). | | | | | | |
| We wish the team to polish their features and come up with truly **original** efforts other than piecing up the bits already available as software packages. | | | | | | |

## User Experience/Interface & Testing (Section 3 of 6)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3.1) How usable is the proposed / implemented user interface for novices (ability to reach a reasonable level of performance rapidly)? | | | | |
|  | Hard to figure out for new users. | Adequate for most novices. | Excellent. Clear and easy to understand for novices. |  |
| Novices | X |  |  |  |
|  | | | | |
| 3.2) How usable is the proposed / implemented user interface for experts (efficiency in doing common tasks that an expert user has to do)? | | | | |
|  | Poor. The expert has to repeat unnecessary steps for each use. | Adequate. An expert would be comfortable using this. | Excellent. Long time user would enjoy using this. |  |
| Experts |  | X |  |  |
|  | | | | |
| 3.3) Is it easy for a user to remember how to use the system? | | | | |
|  | Poor. The design of the workflow should be improved. | Adequate. An average user should have no problem using the system and remembering how to use it. | Excellent. The system is easy to use and remember. |  |
| Memorability/Experience |  | X |  |  |
|  | | | | |
| 3.4) Does the current project implementation have adequate functionality to satisfy an average user from a utilitarian perspective? Does it contain adequate error messages and error prevention mechanisms and documentation to help the user achieve the user stories' objective?  (It is important to remember that when designing services that the end user may not be you and as such, what you expect users to do and know will almost always be different than what you think.  In reality, testing and development often are scheduled as part of each sprint, so that teams get constant feedback during the development process.) | | | | |
|  | Insufficient. A user may get lost and be unable to figure out how to use the functions. | Adequate. An average user would be able to figure out how to use the functions. | Excellent. Almost all users will be able to figure out how to use the functions. |  |
| System Utiity | X |  |  |  |
|  | | | | |
| 3.5) What types of methods did the team use to evaluate the suitability of their solution (if any)? Check all that apply.  (Teams looking for Apollo 11 achievement must evaluate part of their solution with potential real users by the end of the project; Project Gemini teams are highly encouraged to at least apply [Heuristic evaluation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heuristic_evaluation) or [cognitive walkthroughs](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cognitive_walkthrough) for their project evaluation.) | | | | |
|  | | Yes | No |  |
| Expert / Self evaluation | | X |  |  |
| Cognitive Walkthrough / Heuristic Evaluation / User stories | |  | X |  |
| Simulated User Focus Group | |  | X |  |
| Actual User Focus Group / Interview | |  | X |  |
| Usability Testing with Potential Users on Low-Fidelity artefacts (e.g., Powerpoint mockup) | |  | X |  |
| Survey of Potential Users | |  | X |  |
| Usability Testing with Potential Users with High-Fidelity artefacts (e.g., working prototype, App Engine prototype) | |  | X |  |
|  | | | | |
| 3.6) Describe how the team might work towards better and more comprehensive testing.  If you know of methods that the team might employ to find suitable evaluation subjects, please share this with them here as well.  Please write a minimum of 1-2 sentences and a maximum of 500 words (approximately 1 page). | | | | |
| There is no software graphcial demonstration and presence of user stories. | | | | |

## Project README and log (Section 4 of 6)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.1) The written project README clearly explain the purpose of the project and each of the feature to be implemented in the next sprint, and have a draft plan for the remaining sprints. | | | | | |
|  | I still have no idea what the project is supposed to do. | I have a reasonable idea of what the project does but not of the features. | I have a reasonable idea of what the project does and a rough idea of the features. | I have a good idea of what the project does and a reasonable idea of the features to be implemented. | Excellent! |
| After viewing the README... |  |  | X |  |  |
|  | | | | | |
| 4.2) The 3-minute video demonstration (referenced in the README) should clearly showcase the project's purpose, scope and features implemented so far.  It should assist you as an evaluating team in the peer evaluation process. | | | | | |
|  | I couldn't view the video, or there were too many problems with the submitted video. (0 out of 3) | The video makes minimal effort to document their project's work and features, and/or just repeats information from the README and log. (1 out of 3) | The video is mostly complete.  I have some sense of the purpose, scope and features of the project, but some aspects are not clear. (2 out of 3) | The video was complete and I have a good sense of the goals, scope and features of the project. (3 out of 3) | Excellent! The video was as complete as could be given the 3-minute time limit. It was well-produced and I also learned from it how to improve my own work.   (bonus point) |
| After viewing the project's video... |  | X |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | |
| 4.3) The log (appended at the end of the README) should clearly document how much time the team (and its individual students, where applicable) have spent on their Orbital work so far. | | | | | |
|  | I still have no idea of how much time the team members have invested in their project. | I have a reasonable idea of how much time the team members have invested in their project and some vague notion of what they have spent it on. | I have a reasonable idea of both how much time the team members have invested in their project and what they have spent it on. | I have a good idea of how much time the team members have invested in their project and what they have spent it on. | Excellent! I learned from this group's log and what I can do in my own project for logging. |
| After viewing the project log... |  |  | X |  |  |
|  | | | | | |
| 4.4) Please point out any problems with the README, video and log and give suggestions on how they can be improved. Please write a minimum of 1-2 sentences and a maximum of 500 words (approximately 1 page). | | | | | |
| Please write out user features clearly. The project has great potential. They need more work done in software. | | | | | |

## Critical Feedback (Section 5 of 6)

|  |
| --- |
| If there is any critical feedback that you do not want associated with your team, but feel would be helpful to the team to know, please provide it here. Your adviser will cut this section out of the original post and post it separately, under his/her name. ADVISERS - please remove this section from the note before pasting it to as a follow up of the original group's project README and log. Paste it to a separate follow up that combines all of the (anonymized) negative feedback received from any group. Optional. (Maximum 500 words - approximately 1 page). |
| (Fill in your feedback here) |

## Overall Evaluation (Section 6 of 6)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Please give your overall rating for the project submission for this iteration. This score is specific to this iteration and you should not be influenced by the previous score you assigned to the previous This will be used to help us eventually decide whether the team passes and what level of achievement is obtained. This section will only be viewed by the advisors and not by the target group.  ADVISERS - please remove this section from the note. This section is for the adviser's and faciltator's reference only. | | | | | | |
|  | 1 of 4 stars. Likely to fail Orbital | 2 of 4 stars. Sufficient to pass the beginner level (Vostok), maybe good enough for intermediate level (Gemini) | 3 of 4 stars. Definitely intermediate level (Gemini). Maybe good enough for advanced level (Apollo 11) | 4 of 4 stars. Definitely good enough for advanced level (Apollo 11). | 5. Wow! (Bonus point) |  |
| Overall rating for this round of submission. | X |  |  |  |  |  |