**Release 1 Feedback**

Disclaimer: this document does not constitute a points-based rubric.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Group: 7**

**Archived Project Implemented:** Prison Break (Spring 2019)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**The group is adequately prepared for the demonstration (all equipment and presentation aspects are dealt with): Almost**

**The group is cohesive, and effort is evenly distributed across members: Y**

**The coding release delivers the basic functionalities outlined in the archived project report and first scenario: Y**

**The coding release constitutes a significant product beyond what any individual member could produce: Almost**

**The coding release is demonstrated in a clear, step-by-step manner: Y**

The application structure looks good, and the workflow looks clear. But a couple of implementations mentioned in the scenario were missing. I would suggest to keep the 2nd release more realistic and implementable.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Grade:** 84