

REVIEW OF RIT Foodie

Section number: 8

REVIEWER group number: Team 1

REVIEWER group members:

- 1. Evan Safko
- 2. Jimmy Turner
- 3. Colin Gaul
- 4. AJ Breitkopf

Who is your scribe: Evan Safko

REVIEWEE group number: 4

REVIEWEE product name: RIT Foodie

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

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

Include Team number in both title of document and title of text. Instructions and other requirements for market research are still left in the proposal. Some walls of text that could be broken up with paragraphing, and images overlap the product description

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:** Out. We believe the problem that the app is supposed to solve is too specific and too miniscule to require a solution. On top of this, we think that, although the prospect of being able to customize it is nice, sometimes preferences for eating change throughout the day multiple times.
- **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:** Yes, it is simple, straightforward, and concise
- **The "So What?" Factor:** Quick group vote: How many think 'Wow!' vs 'Meh'? Discuss why you differ and try to reach agreement.
→ **Write: 4=Meh.** In-app food ordering might make it even easier for time-stressed students.
- **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. Food-scheduling app for time-stressed RIT students.

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:** They don't address how they avoid the same line-length problems. All problems are spoken about but have no research saying how they would be successful
- **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:** All sources are accounted for
- **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:**
 - 0 of our group members know someone with this problem
 - Group's consensus: 4/10 (Not a necessary solution, but it doesn't feel manufactured. We don't doubt that there are people who have this problem)
- **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:** We would ask 'How does it make money?' It is not addressed.
- **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:** There are no graphs or charts, so no, they are not visually appealing.

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: All features are necessary to the app's purpose**
- **The Confusion Award:** Together, identify the most confusing part of how their product works. Collaborate on a clearer explanation.

→ **Write:** Nothing is outwardly confusing, and everything is explained thoroughly so you understand it all.

- **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:**

- No, we would not use it. We would not pay for this app, simply because the solution is something very easy for anyone to do instead of having an app automate it.
- **The "Wait, This Exists!" Check:** Does this remind you of any existing product or service they didn't mention as a competitor?
→ **Write:** RIT Dining exists, which they did mention, this product just wishes to be a better version of it.

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:** **We don't trust that an app would be able to suggest the correct option even with the ability to change the dining location, humans can just change their mind all the time.**
- **Devil's Devil's Advocate:** Review their counterarguments section as a group. Which concern did they handle weakly or completely miss?
→ **Write:** Their AI challenge. It seems more like the 'AI' is more like an algorithm rather than actual intelligence, and even their solution mentions this.
- **The Achilles' Heel:** If this product crashes and burns, what will be the cause? Discuss and agree on the most likely failure point.
→ **Write:** Line inaccuracy. Even the designers admit that the issue will still persist if students don't update the information
- **The Ethics Check:** Brainstorm potential ethical issues as a group (privacy, addiction, discrimination, manipulation, etc.).
→ **Write:** They mentioned the ethical issues but didn't go too in depth into their solutions

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:** We all chose to invest \$100, because we do not believe the app is necessary or profitable
- **The Memorable Moment:** What's the ONE thing from their conclusion you'll all remember tomorrow? Agree on what stuck with you most.
→ **Write:** It seems fairly basic and harmless, but not the most memorable
- **The Call to Action:** If their proposal convinced you, what would you actually DO next? Is this clear from their recommendations?
→ **Write:** I think the only option their providing is to invest into it, and any other option seems unclear
- **The Passion Check:** Does their conclusion show genuine excitement or does it feel flat? Discuss and rate as a group.
→ **Write:** 6/10. You could tell there was passion there, just not as much as I would think.

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:** No sources
- **The Visual Vote:** Look at all their images, charts, and mockups together. Which visual element helps or hurts their case?
→ **Write:** No visuals
- **What's Missing?** Discuss what additional evidence or visuals would strengthen their proposal.
→ **Write:** Nothing in the appendix

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: Solidifying the concept/describing the concise idea at the beginning**
- **The Surprise Factor:** Share what surprised each of you, then agree on which surprise was biggest for the group overall.
→ **Write: There wasn't any real surprising factor in the proposal**