Team Work Products Being Evaluated: **Project 1 (Assignment #L3-C)**

1. Work Evaluated by Assessment Symbol/Color Date
2. Work Evaluated by Assessment Symbol/Color Date
3. Work Evaluated by Assessment Symbol/Color Date

**This Checklist must be completed (self assessed) before submit ion for assessment**

| **Yes** | **No** | **Expected Features** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | The work meets expectations for the Presentation of Technical Work. (the **checklist** is included) |
|  |  | The TOC has been updated to reflect the new work. (Page numbers are shown for all tasks and sub tasks; page numbers are right justified; only the page number for first page of work is shown.) |
|  |  | There is a completed KTDA Table with at least 3 feasible (satisfies all **musts**) artifacts. |
|  |  | There is a completed Adverse Consequences Table for at least the top two artifacts in the KTDA Table. |
|  |  | There are no errors in the calculations required for each table. |
|  |  | There is a detailed cost estimate for the implementation process of at least the top two artifacts in the KTDA Table. |
|  |  | There is an **explicit** statement defining the team’s selected artifact. |
| **Comments on Expected Features and how any problems might be resolved** | | |

| **Wow** | **Ok** | **Weak** | **Revealed Features** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Rate the readability of the work (i.e., the level of communication "noise," which consists of grammatical, spelling, syntax, etc., errors that hinder communication) |
|  |  |  | Rate the quality of the notebook organization (e.g., use of unique page numbers, reference to other work in the notebook, sense of continuous work on a single large project consisting of numerous tasks, etc.) |
|  |  |  | Rate the quality of the effort shown in generating the KTDA and the Adverse Consequences Tables (e.g., amount and type of discussion used in filling in the two tables, the rationale in defining the relative weights of the desires, i.e., **wants**, the rationale for the selection of the artifact) |
|  |  |  | Rate the quality of the Discussion (e.g., how good was the reflection?) |
|  |  |  | Rate the quality of team meeting material (e.g., explicit roles, agendas, meeting minutes, team processing, etc.) |

| **Yes** | **Exciting Features** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

**Results of Initial Assessment**

| **E** | **M** | **NI** | **NCE**  **NS** | **E**, **all** Yes’s for the Expected Features, **no** Weak for the Revealed Features, AND **at least two** Wow’s and/or Exciting Features  **M**, **all** Yes’s for the Expected Features AND **no** Weak for the Revealed Features  **NI**, **one or two** No’s for Expected Requirements OR **one or two** Weak for the Revealed Features  **NCE**, more than **two** No’s for Expected Requirements OR more than **two** Weak for the Revealed Features.  **NS**, no work to be assessed. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |