CS 443/576, Spring 2014 Project 2 — Iterative design Grading Criteria & Scores

Name: Evan and Josh

EVALUATION Criteria		Max score	Your score
 INDIVIDUAL deliverables List of individual feedback from project 1, categorized and labeled. Peer-review form. 		10	10
TEAM deliverables			
 Functional requirements Were functional reqs combined and prioritized correctly? Sorted, labeled? Was the correct format used for listing the functional reqs? Were functional reqs complete and specific? Was enough functionality included in the High priority requirements for a project of this scope? These are mostly fine, but there are still a few listed that define How to accomplish a function; Again, you want to focus on just the What, not the How. Most of your high and medium reqs focus only on flying the spacecraft. What other things will your system allow them to do? (see end comment) One of Evan's feedback comments from project 1 says, "Provide a goal other than simply flying around in space." I agree with this comment and think you'll need to do something additional in order to entice people to really use your simulator. On Josh's feedback (from project 1), someone mentioned the idea of using rings to help steer ship into orbit. Josh responds by saying that he will "definitely try to put it in the game", but it ends up as a low-priority req. There is a bit of a disconnect here. The way you formatted this part of your report is great. Very each to read each comment and see how you decided to deal with it. 	Y Y Y ?	10	8
 User questionnaires Were questionnaires well thought out? Did they have important questions on them that were applicable to the system being designed? Were enough users sampled by these questionnaires? Was IRB compliance followed? Were results summarized and used in the next iteration of design? 	Y Y Y Y	15	14

	A sentence or two about how you conducted your surveys would be helpful. For example, who did you distribute these to? How did you select your participants? Did you give them a written questionnaire to fill out, or ask then the questions verbally? Etc.	n	40	
5.	Design iteration 2.		40	37
	 Were all High priority features and some Medium priority ones included in the new design? 	Y		
	 Were aspects of individual designs combined to form a cohesive, whole new design? 	?		
	 Was there appropriate representation in the design from individual designs (project 1)? 	Y		
	 Did the team clearly indicate which functional requirements were included in the design and which weren't? 	e N		
	 For those reqs (and feedback) not implemented, was there a discussion as to why? 	Y		
	 Was the scope of the functionality designed sufficient? 	?		
	 Did the team relay the design appropriately using a combination of sketches, annotations, descriptions, and narratives? 	Y		
	 Could the reader easily follow the functions designed from start to finish? 	?		
	 Did the team illustrate that they understood and could correctly apply principles of good design as discussed in class? 	Y		
6.	 Miscellaneous. Did the team follow the instructions given? Was the report the result of a collaborative effort, or did it appear to come from individual members only? Was the report neat, well labeled and easy to follow? Did the team appear to put in sufficient time and effort for this project? 	Y Y Y	10	10
DE	SIGN crits			
Dic	the team:			
	 Appear prepared for the crit? 	Y		
	 Present materials that were neat, easy to see, and easy to read? 	Y		
	Manage their time well and use all of their allotted time?	Y		
	 Present their design in a logical, easy to follow fashion? 	Y Y		
	Take charge of facilitating the discussion afterwards? Have particular questions or problems to ask the class for feedback about?	?	15	14
	Have particular questions or problems to ask the class for feedback about? Appear appar to design suggestions and not defensive?	Y		
	 Appear open to design suggestions and not defensive? Adequately explain how they arrived at their design and what factors influenced their decisions? 	Y		
	 Adequately explain how they arrived at their design and what factors 	Y N Y		

100

Team,

I enjoyed looking at your latest designs for Space Simulator. Each of the individual components look like they will be interesting and educational for users. Your graphics are appealing and do a good job of communicating what you have in mind for the three main sections shown. However, you need to find a way to tie these elements together to form an overarching story or motivation for users. For example, what is their goal in using the simulator? To explore? To learn? To get somewhere without running out of fuel? To learn how to manipulate the spacecraft? Etc. As I described during the crit session, you have the individual components there, but now need to bring them together under a consistent and enticing interface/umbrella. Here are a few additional comments:

- 10 people surveyed: OK, but bare minimum. It would also have been nice to include a slide in your presentation showing a summary of these results.
- I saw Josh taking notes on feedback during crit session good.
- Overall scope seems right for project, especially once it's all tied together.

Also attached to this project feedback are some notes that Evin Ozer took during the design crits. Please read through them carefully as he has some very useful suggestions and comments.