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**Project Evaluation**

Please provide ratings and comments on the following project criteria:

Ratings: 1=low and 5=high

1 2 3 **4** 5 Information gathering document contains sufficient information about a budget application.

**Comments: 4 - I think they did a good job outlining the key features they need and leaving room for the possibility of a stretch goal if time allows. The team outline and designated responsibilities seem to line up with their current strengths as well. Could have gone into a bit more detail on the features.**

1 2 3 4 **5** Planning document contains quality sitemap, wireframes, and database ERD. **Comments: 5 - Database ERD seemed very reasonable for this type of application. Wireframe gets the core components of the app across. Sitemap seems to be consistent with ERD and wireframe as well.**

1 2 **3** 4 5 Prototype/Functional prototype shows levels of creativity and functionality. **Comments: 3- App seems to be fairly functional for a prototype. Some forms I used didn’t validate very well but that is the only major issue I found during my time walking through. Does look like some of the functionality discussed in plan have not been implemented however. The features that are there however I think look good and mesh well together.**

1 2 3 **4** 5 Quality of elements making up the frontend of the project. **Comments: Overall look of the app is quite nice. The green gradient on the left nav bar is nice and the colors used throughout the app highlight the key components. Majority of icons/font look good with the app. Minor css/html fixes but for the most part looking good.**

1 2 3 **4** 5 Quality of elements making up the backend of the project. **Comments: I went through the backend code mostly focusing on the models and views defined in the app. Overall the models seem to be fairly small and concise. Not all the models outlined in the planning document show up as models in Django which is not a negative if a design decision was made to do it this way.  
  
The views in the app seem to be fairly straight forward. I was able to parse through the functions and capture the main purpose of the functions which I think is a good sign. The variable names seem to be fairly reasonable as well.**

1 2 3 **4** 5 Overall Project Quality

**Comments:**

Circle the grade that best reflects the success of the student’s work on their capstone project: A **B** C D E

**B  
I think this project had good aspects of design, frontend, and backend engineering work. It does look like they weren't able to finish all their planned features, and they had some remaining polish to do on the project that I looked at. Due to that fact I am going to go with a B as the work they did have seems to be good.**

What are the main strengths of the project?

**Comments: This app seems to be fairly well organized from a design perspective as well as an engineering perspective. I wasn’t shocked or put off by anything I found while using the app or digging through the code.**

What are the main things that could be improved with the project?

**Comments**: **One thing that could be improved was the form validation. The success messages or failure messages did not show up for me on a couple of forms. I wasn’t sure if the process had worked or not without doing a refresh.**