

REVIEW OF RIT Foodie

Section number:8

REVIEWER group number: Group 2

REVIEWER group members:

- 1. Caleb Harsche
- 2. Brayden Waiters
- 3. Will Amey
- 4. Ziheng Lei

Who is your scribe: **Will Amey**

REVIEWEE group number: Group 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?: **WE AGREE**

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	No

→ **If any NO's above, specify what needs fixing:** For the title of document and text doc, they don't have their team number. At the bottom of the document there are still template instructions. Formatting is mostly good aside from some images cutting into the text.

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: We are OUT, this project needs more unique things to distinguish itself in comparison to the RIT App in case that gets fixed.**
- **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: For less tech-savvy relatives, they would struggle with having to input their schedule and deal with AI deciding what they get to eat. They would mainly struggle with online ordering.**
- **The "So What?" Factor:** Quick group vote: How many think 'Wow!' vs 'Meh'? Discuss why you differ and try to reach agreement.
→ **Write: 1 - Good, 3 - Meh.**
- **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:** Caleb: This app is an assistant that tries to get you food so you don't accidentally starve and die!

Brayden: This app is a personalized eating schedule that decides when, where, and what you eat.

Ziheng : This is an app that organizes your daily scheduled meal and gets you to your food immediately after class.

Will: Rit Foodie will decide what you want to eat for you in advance, so you don't have to worry about it!

Final: **Rit Foodie is a personalized eating schedule that decides when and where you eat after class so you don't accidentally starve and die!**

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 weakness being exploited is the use of AI in the app and lack of full human choice, we would advertise our service as AI free as it uses an algorithm tied to restaurant time data that recommends places instead of deciding for you, for indecisive people, they could limit these recommendations as low to 1 every time they need to eat.
- **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:** They **USE** a statistic but they don't link to any articles or sources for it so I don't know if they came up with those statistics or if they are real.
- **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 group members who know someone with this problem .
 - On a scale of 1 - 10 of this solution solving an actual problem, we decided on 3. This problem doesn't seem that realistic and if it is maybe go see a doctor?
- **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:** "What if the RIT App becomes usable again?" This question goes unaddressed
- **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:** No charts and graphs but there are images of the app itself. The App itself is on the bland side, it may be appealing for people who like minimalistic design. These images probably couldn't be moved to the appendix.

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
- **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
- **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

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
- **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
- **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)

- **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

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
- **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 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)
- **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

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 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)
- **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)

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**
- **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**