2018 Fall CS408(E/F) Project Pitch Evaluation Sheet

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Criteria** | **clear definition of the problem** |
|  | **convincing argument of why the problem is important and/or interesting** |
| **overall presentation quality, including the slides** |
| **passion** |
| **presentation teamwork** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team** | **Students** | **Score** | **Comments** |
| 1  automaTA | 이창윤 | 46/50 | Great job! Much improvement from the meeting last week.  Definition & Motivation: Pretty good, but it could have been better to be more clear in the definition. How exactly would the system help with question forming?  Why it’s important: There was perhaps too much focus about Computational thinking, so it was not as convincing that your solution would be a good approach. I think you could have shortened it a bit and just said “we limit our scope to the second part”  Presentation: slides are good; speaking could have been improved  Passion: Show more passion when talking. Otherwise pretty good.  Teamwork: Great! Divided up the questions to answer. |
| 진형욱 |
| 한동훈 |
| 2  Brogrammers | Bolat Ashim | 8.5/10 | Problem definition: Great! A smart surface with touch interaction costs a lot, and it would be great to lower the cost.  **Why it’s important:** Not sure… what would you do with smart (touchable) mirrors?  **Presentation**: The cost is a problem, but it seems adding a microphone is not going to be enough (as the first question said, showing the display, running software to do localization, etc.)  Passion: Seems fine.  Teamwork: Fine. All three answered questions well. |
| Azamat Smagulov |
| Adi Yerembessov |
| 3  CreamBears | 강현우 | 7.5/10 | **Problem definition:** Okay, but I would have liked to see some background on information retrieval and how this user-centered approach differs. It seems like a very different perspective. I suggest you narrow down the scope of the problem, as other questioners mentioned, you don’t want to be designing a new search (or ranking) algorithm. It’s a very difficult (and long-researched) problem. For evaluation, there are traditional IR (information retrieval) metrics of relevance and recency.  Why it’s important: Great. The portal search seems really bad!  Presentation: Good  Passion: Good  Teamwork: Good |
| 김지석 |
| 홍재민 |
| 4  CS4CS | 권태형 | 7.5/10 | **Problem definition:** The two problems are good (speed of action and coverage of potential victims). But it seems every situation would be different. How do you define appropriate time to respond? Think, for instance, fire vs. (less harmful) chemical leak. Also, who are the potential victims? How do you define them? How do you predict and differentiate situations that have been contained (e.g., to a single office or lab space) from a floor-wide or building-wide risk? This problem seems very difficult, and lots of research is needed.  **Why it’s important:** Yes, it is an important to send speedy alerts in potentially dangerous situations. But it seems any solution could cause much more risky situations.  Presentation: Pretty good  Passion: Great!  Teamwork: Good |
| 신은혁 |
| 조인영 |
| 5  GoatskiN | 김경원 | 8.5/10 | **Problem definition**: Knowing very little about the topic, it was not easy to understand the problem from this presentation.  **Why it’s important:** I was not convinced whether collecting private information itself presents much risk. Isn’t it how the information is used by whoever gets access to it?  Presentation: Again, the definition and motivation were not clearly delivered. Perhaps there was too much focus on the idea, rather than the motivation/background of the problem.  Passion: Good  Teamwork: Hard to tell |
| 박지희 |
| 최민엽 |
| 6  Hurricane | 김현수 | 8/10 | Gather online as if offline with P4T  **Problem definition:** The problem of team projects (hard to find time to meet, meeting too much trouble) is indeed something we can all relate to, and it is a pervasive problem. However, the problem has many aspects to it. It seems the “definition” narrowed it down to finding time to meet without too much burden, but the more detailed problem definition and potential solution do not seem to exactly match that problem. If finding time to meet all together is a problem, wouldn’t it be better to explore more asynchronous solutions, rather than voice chat which seems to need synchronization of time? If temporal synchrony is less of a problem but spatial synchrony is (e.g., meeting online is okay), then perhaps you should have stated that as your problem more explicitly.  **Why it’s important:** The motivation for voice chat was not clear. The chat function in Google slides not explored. How is this better than voice chat?  Presentation: Very good  Passion: Good  Teamwork: Good |
| 설윤아 |
| 함형록 |
| 7  Reflection | 김현수 | 7.5/10 | Problem definition: The problem definition is that people should know their emotion and Express their emotion. I relate to the need to express emotions, but why do you think “knowing your emotions” is hard? What is some evidence that shows that people don’t know their emotions? Also, as far as I know, there are existing mobile counseling services that allow anonymous counseling sessions. How would this service differ? (e.g., cost?)  Why it’s important: It’s certainly important to express your feelings, but why could they not express their feelings to family and friends?  Most importantly, the proposed solution of building a chatbot is a very difficult problem. I suggest you stay away from building a chatbot. Perhaps you can limit it to a set of pre-defined sentences that both the counselor and the user can say. |
| 이건 |
| 이녕우 |
| 8  Team Herald | 김태수 | 8.5/10 | Preventing bike accidents is a very important and timely problem on our campus.  Problem definition: However, I’m not sure about the detailed definition of the problem. The presented scenario was really good, and I thought that the detailed problem definition (or part of it) would involve bicycle riders who are using earphones (not paying attention to the surroundings) and potential collision detection, but the proposed solutions (of looking at sensor data on the phone) do not seem to tackle the problem presented in the scenario. How would you detect lack of attention and/or alert riders that potential collision could occur? This would involve some processing of the surrounding environment, rather than focusing on the individual bike rider.  Why it’s important: Safe biking is certainly important. If there were specific numbers of accidents, etc, it would have been better.  Presentation: Great presentation  Passion: Good  Teamwork: Great |
| 정찬주 |
| 허세준 |