App Proposal Draft Peer Eval Instructions

Overview

- You will critique another team's P1 - App Proposal DRAFT as a group
- **REVIEWER** = your group doing the review
- **REVIEWEE** = the group whose proposal you're reviewing

Critical Requirement

⚠️ **THIS IS A GROUP DISCUSSION ACTIVITY**

- Dividing questions among members = automatic zero
- ALL questions must be discussed together before writing answers
- ONE person types while EVERYONE contributes ideas
- I will be monitoring groups during class
- You will be completing 2 reviews; I expect you to finish one today and post it. The second can be completed before the deadline shown in MyCourses

Ready/Set/Go

Ready/Set/Go

1. **Elect a scribe** - This person types while everyone discusses
2. **Create a new Google Doc** and share with all of RIT
3. **Copy the template below** into your document
4. **Work through each section TOGETHER:**
   - Read the question aloud
   - Discuss as a group
   - Reach consensus
   - Scribe types the agreed answer
5. **When finished:** Post link in Slack channel (look for "P1 Drafts - Peer Evals" thread)

****** PEER EVAL QUESTIONS TEMPLATE ******

***************** FOR COPYING IS *****************

***** ↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓ BELOW ↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓↓ *****

REVIEW OF Fried Phish

Section number: 2

REVIEWER group number: 2

REVIEWER group members:

- 1. Alex Felton
- 2. Manpreet Singh
- 3. Auden Beaudette
- 4. Junhyun Kim

Who is your scribe: Auden Beaudette

REVIEWEE group number: 4

REVIEWEE product name: Fried Phish

⚠️ **GROUP WORK AGREEMENT**

By typing WE AGREE below, we confirm:

- We will discuss EVERY question as a group
- We will NOT divide questions individually
- Our scribe will type only what we agree on together
- We understand that breaking these rules = a grade of zero

Does your team agree to the terms above?: *YES*

REVIEWERS will answer the following questions about the REVIEWEE project proposal

0 - Mechanics

→ **Indicate YES or NO for each of the following:**

	Yes or No
Title of document has team number and app/product name?	**No**
Title text at top of doc includes team number and product name?	**No**
All template instructions and boilerplate text removed?	**No**
Proper formatting? - ex. headings, subheadings, reasonable length paragraphs(no "walls of text"), lists	**Yes**

→ If any NO's above, specify what needs fixing:

1. Title of the document is the default template name
2. No group number in the document
3. Template instructions are still there

1 - Executive Summary

You will evaluate the Executive Summary based on Clarity, Conciseness, and Engagement. Does the app solve a key problem? Does it have unique features and benefits?

- **The Shark Tank First Impression:** As a group, imagine you're a Shark Tank panel with 30 seconds to decide whether to back the project. Discuss and come to consensus.
  → **Write:** IN or OUT (as a group), and the ONE missing piece that would change your collective mind

  IN - We all liked the idea of an automatic scam detector, and the product description was very clear.

- **The Grandma Test:** Pick someone's grandma or a less tech-savvy relative - could they understand this app/product/service if they were told about it? Discuss as a group.
  → **Write:** What would confuse them and how to make it clearer

  The grandma may be confused by the setup, and if the grandma is exposed to scam pop-ups, she may be confused by the conflicting messages between Fried Phish and the scammer. Once the app is set up, however, it would be very easy to use; all the grandma would have to do is listen to the pop-ups (which people vulnerable to scams already do), so it would be incredibly easy and straightforward.

- **The "So What?" Factor:** Quick group vote: How many think 'Wow!' vs 'Meh'? Discuss why you differ and try to reach agreement.
  → **Write:** Vote count (e.g., 3=Wow, 2=Good 1=Meh) and ONE change you all agree would make it more compelling
  We decided on a "2": this product would be very helpful to a certain group of people

(those vulnerable to scams), but Fried Phish could become an incredible product if it *also* doubled as an antivirus; all-in-one security would expand the Fried Phish's market.

- **One-Line Wonder:** Each person writes a one-sentence description that captures what this product is and why it matters. Then combine the best elements into one you all support.
  → **Write:** Your group's consensus for a new one-line description
- Fried Phish is a new scam-prevention tool which targets vulnerabilities that other products (such as antivirus software) does not.

2 - Market Research and Need Analysis.

You will evaluate the market research and need analysis based on the data used to support claims, the relevance to the proposal, and the depth of the research done.

- **The Competition Crusher:** As a group, pretend you're their biggest competitor. What weakness in their market research would you exploit to steal their customers?
  → **Write:** The specific weakness and how a competitor would attack it
  While Fried Phish targets all kinds of scams, they do not specify that their AI-detection tools are top-notch; therefore, if we train our AI models to be better and more accurate, the market will purchase our product instead.

- **The Missing Piece:** Is there *specific evidence* cited for all of the claims made in this section? Discuss what evidence would make their case bulletproof. Come to agreement on the most significant gap.
  → **Write:** At least ONE statistic or piece of evidence that's missing (be specific - e.g., 'survey data showing X% of college students experience Y')
- Survey data showing how knowledgeable the average person is about phishing scams - are most people capable of fighting phishing scams on their own?

- **Reality Check:** Go around the group - does anyone actually know someone with this problem? How real does this need *feel*? Is it a solution in search of a problem?
  → **Write:**
  - # of group members who know someone with this problem (X out of 4)
  - Group's consensus: does this feel like a real problem or manufactured?
    (Scale: 1 = totally manufactured/fake need, 10 = desperate real need)
  - 1/4 group members know someone who they feel could be vulnerable to phishing scams.
  - Need: 5/10. Our group is in agreement that there are many people who could benefit from this product, but not many of us know people who would fall for phishing scams (which is okay! It's targeted towards a small specific audience) .One group member does know several people who have been targeted by

- **The Investor's Question:** If you were skeptical investors, come to a consensus on the first hard question you'd ask? Check if they answered it. (If you can't come up with a question, *"How does it make money?"* is often a good one to start with)
  → **Write:** The question you'd ask AND whether they addressed it (fully/partially/not at all)

  How would the web extension target apps (such as social media)? The market research indicates that the product could prevent e-mail scams, but if Fried Phish is just a browser extension, how would it work if the user prefers a Mail app instead?
- **The Visual Aesthetics Question:** Are the charts and graphs relevant and do they improve the proposal? Are they visually appealing? Could any of them be moved to the appendix?
- → **Write:** The answers to the above questions - and be sure to justify your NO answers!
- The chart is relevant to the proposal - it shows a direct need for scam prevention. It isn't particularly appealing, and the market research could use some more graphs showcasing how aware the average person is of scam prevention.

3 - Product Description

You will evaluate the product description based on the clarity of the description, the feasibility of production, and the uniqueness or innovativeness of the product.

- **The Feature Graveyard:** Discuss as a group: which feature seems unnecessary or overcomplicated? What obvious feature(s) are they missing?
  → **Write:** Feature to kill (and why) AND a missing feature that seems obvious
- We do not see any unnecessary features; Fried Phish is a very streamlined product. However, it would be nice if the user could choose to report sites that Fried Phish does not detect, which should help improve the product's scam-detection over time.

- **The Confusion Award:** Together, identify the most confusing part of how their product works. Collaborate on a clearer explanation.
  → **Write:** What's confusing AND your group's 2-sentence clearer version
- It isn't clear how exactly Fried Phish alerts the user of a scam. We imagine that there is a pop-up in the corner of the screen that displays a message like "alert: potential scam", but it isn't clear from the product mockups how this works.

- **Would You Use It?** Go around the group - who would actually download/buy/use this? For those who said no, agree on the ONE change that would convert the most skeptics.
  → **Write:**
  - How many would use it (ex: 3/5)
  - ONE change that would win over the no's
  - How much would your group be willing to pay for this, or what do you think it would be worth?

- **The "Wait, This Exists!" Check:** Does this remind you of any existing product or service they didn't mention as a competitor?
  → **Write:** Product it reminds you of AND why this matters for their proposal
- There are already many adblockers out there that also prevent access to suspicious websites.

4 - Problems and Counterarguments

You will evaluate the problems and counterarguments based on how well problems are identified, the proposed counterarguments to the problems, and the balance of how everything is presented.

- **The Elephant Hunter:** Discuss what obvious major issue they're avoiding or not addressing. Come to consensus on the biggest one.
  → **Write:** The "elephant in the room" they're not talking about
- This group does not discuss how their AI-detection model actually works - where are they getting the data from? How do they know which websites are scams or not?

- **Devil's Devil's Advocate:** Review their counterarguments section as a group. Which concern did they handle weakly or completely miss?
  → **Write:** Concern they addressed poorly (and why it's weak) OR major concern they missed entirely
- Privacy is a huge concern when it comes to this product, but the counterargument section does not explain why giving up certain information is important for the product's functionality, as well as addressing concerns of how exactly the company uses this information (does Fried Phish just sell the user's information?).

- **The Achilles' Heel:** If this product crashes and burns, what will be the cause? Discuss and agree on the most likely failure point.
  → **Write:** Most likely reason for failure AND did they address it? (yes/somewhat/no)
- If the AI-detection model isn't very good, then the web extension will have many false positives or false negatives, which will plummet the product's trustworthiness. This is not really addressed, the proposal only addresses the ethical implications of using AI.

- **The Ethics Check:** Brainstorm potential ethical issues as a group (privacy, addiction, discrimination, manipulation, etc.).
  → **Write:** One ethical concern they haven't considered AND why it matters
- Referencing our earlier concern with privacy, it should be clear how exactly the web extension manages the user's data, and why it is important for it to do so.

5 - Conclusion and Recommendations

You will evaluate the conclusion and recommendations based on overall effectiveness and clarity.

- **The Money Test:** Each person decides: would you invest $100, $1,000, or $10,000 of your own money? Discuss where you each draw the line.
  → **Write:** Group's average investment limit AND main reason for that limit
- Most of the group would invest $100 - there are similar products already on the market so it would be a big risk to invest in Fried Phish if the unique benefits are not communicated properly. Others would invest up to $1,000, the ease of use and simplicity has a shot in the market.

- **The Memorable Moment:** What's the ONE thing from their conclusion you'll all remember tomorrow? Agree on what stuck with you most.
  → **Write:** Most memorable point AND should this be their lead instead? (yes/no and why)
- The most memorable part of the conclusion is the idea that the world of scamming is becoming increasingly hostile and that Fried Phish is a simple and affordable solution. This would be a great lead because it shows a growing problem and an easy fix.

- **The Call to Action:** If their proposal convinced you, what would you actually DO next? Is this clear from their recommendations?
  → **Write:** What action you'd take AND is this clear in their recommendations? (very clear/somewhat clear/unclear)
  We would put a lot into getting the app known and into the development. It's not totally clear what the plan would be to do next in the recommendations other than moving forward in development.

- **The Passion Check:** Does their conclusion show genuine excitement or does it feel flat? Discuss and rate as a group.
  → **Write:** Enthusiasm rating 1-10 (1=sounds bored, 10=infectious excitement) AND one specific example of where they showed (or lacked) passion
  The conclusion does have personality and gives a good sense of urgency. Not super enthusiastic but informative in a not-so bland way; 4/10 enthusiasm.

6 - Appendix

You will evaluate the appendix based on organization and value of the additional materials.

- **The Evidence Test***:* Review their sources as a group. Identify the strongest and weakest pieces of evidence.
  → **Write:** Most convincing source (and why) AND most sketchy/irrelevant source (and why)

- The most convincing source is pewreasarch.org because its a legit research center and has .org which means it's an official organization.
- The least convincing source is probably about-fraud.com because it was made by a group of 4 people as opposed to the other sites which are made and supported by real companies

- **The Visual Vote:** Look at all their images, charts, and mockups together. Which visual element helps or hurts their case?
  → **Write:** Most helpful visual (and why) AND least helpful or confusing visual (and why)
  The most helpful visual is the example photo of the icon next to an email example because it clearly shows what the product will do and I'm able to easily understand it. The least is probably just the icon because it doesn't add a ton.
- **What's Missing?** Discuss what additional evidence or visuals would strengthen their proposal.
  → **Write:** One thing that should be in the appendix but isn't (or write "Nothing missing - comprehensive appendix" if they covered everything)
  Only thing missing is where the Norton image came from.

7 - Overall feedback

Provide additional feedback to support your responses to the previous question, as well as suggestions for improvement:

- **The One Thing:** If they could change just ONE thing about this proposal to dramatically improve it, what should it be? Must reach consensus.
  → **Write: The ONE most important change needed**
  Since Fried Phish is a web extension, a change to be able to apply to online messaging outside of a web browser. For example, I think most users susceptible to phishing scams probably use the email app on their mobile device rather than the web browser version.

- **The Surprise Factor:** Share what surprised each of you, then agree on which surprise was biggest for the group overall.
  → **Write: Most surprising element (good or bad) and why your group found it surprising**

The most surprising element of the proposal was the statistics research. 73% of people have fallen victim to online scams, which is shockingly high.