

## CI 493 Final Project Presentation and Demo Evaluation Form

Evaluators may score each value from 0 to 10 by increments of 1. Guidelines are specified by 5 point increments, but you can specify 1,2,3,...

**Evaluator:**

**Team:**

		<b>Unacceptable (0)</b>	<b>Acceptable (5)</b>	<b>Superior (10)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>1</b>	Was the presentation organized effectively and was content complete?	The presentation addressed few of the specified content areas.  The presentation's flow was chaotic.	The presentation addressed many of the specified content areas.  The presentation flowed smoothly from one section to another in many cases.	The presentation addressed all the specified content areas.  The presentation flowed smoothly from one section to another.	
<b>2</b>	Did the visual aids enhance the presentation?	Text is not readable, or no slides or visual aids.  Graphics used are mostly off topic.  Slide composition does not have a professional look and the look mostly distracts from the presentation.	Text is mostly readable.  Graphics used somewhat support the topic.  Slide composition has an acceptable look; does not distract from the presentation.	Text is easily readable.  Graphics used consistently support the topic.  Slide composition has a professional look that enhances the presentation.	
<b>3</b>	Did the presenters speak in a clear and concise manner?	Students read from cards with little to no interaction with the audience.  Students were largely incoherent, difficult to hear, and hard to understand.	Students looked down at the cards often, but attempted to interact with the audience.  Students were rarely incoherent, difficult to hear or hard to understand.	Students presented the material clearly without the need to refer to notes at all.  Students consistently spoke clearly and at an appropriate volume, and were well understood.	
<b>4</b>	Did the team answer questions fully and effectively?	The team demonstrated little knowledge of the material.  They were not able to explain coherently or elaborate on any of the questions.	The team demonstrated reasonable knowledge of the material.  They explained and elaborated on many of the questions.	The team demonstrated full knowledge of the material.  They explained and elaborated on all questions.	
<b>5</b>	Did the team use the presentation time effectively?	Presentation was significantly over or under allotted time.	Presentation was somewhat long or short	Presentation comfortably filled the available time.	
<b>6</b>	Was the team enthusiastic and engaging?	Team did not seem interested in being there.	Team was somewhat engaging and enthusiastic.	All team members engaged the audience and exhibited appropriate enthusiasm	

		<b>Unacceptable (0)</b>	<b>Acceptable (5)</b>	<b>Superior (10)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>7</b>	Did the team dress and behave in a professional manner?	Team did not look or behave professionally	Team was somewhat professional in behavior and dress	All team members wore business casual or better; demeanor was consistently professional	
<b>8</b>	Did the team research alternate products?	The team did not research alternate products.	The team researched some alternate products, listed them, and did not explain their pros and cons.	The team researched many alternative products, listed them, and explained their pros and cons.	
<b>9</b>	Can the product have significant impact?	A successful implementation of this project will have no positive impact for its target users.	A successful implementation of this project will have a positive impact on some of its target users.	A successful implementation of this project will have a major positive impact for its target users.	
<b>10</b>	Did the group convey requirements for the product?	The presentation barely details the user's expectation of the product.  The scope and nature of the project are hard to discern.	The presentation reasonably details the user's expectation of the product.  The scope and nature of the project are reasonably laid out.	The presentation completely details the user's expectation of the product.  The scope and nature of the project are completely laid out.	
<b>11</b>	Was an appropriate architecture selected?	The architecture was poorly conveyed barely illustrating the key design decisions.  No UML or other supporting diagrams used to illustrate the application's architecture were included.  The design choice is inappropriate for the application.	The architecture was reasonably conveyed adequately illustrating the key design decisions.  UML/other supporting diagrams used to illustrate the application's architecture were reasonably organized and clear.  The design choice was adequate for the application.	The architecture conveyed the key design decisions extremely well illustrating the key design decisions extremely clearly and concisely.  UML/other supporting diagrams used to illustrate the application's architecture were very well organized and extremely clear.  The design choice was very appropriate for the application.	
<b>12</b>	Were alternative designs considered?	Alternative designs were not discussed.	Alternative designs were explained in some detail with the pros and cons of the design somewhat explained.	Alternative designs were explained in significant detail with the pros and cons of the design completely explained.	

		<b>Unacceptable (0)</b>	<b>Acceptable (5)</b>	<b>Superior (10)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>13</b>	Did the team use appropriate tools to manage the development process?	No tools were used to manage the software development process.	A few tools were used to manage some aspects of the software development process.	Appropriate tools were used together at every level of the software development process.	
<b>14</b>	Was an appropriate testing strategy used?	The application was not tested.	A reasonable amount of tests were documented and systematically performed.	A significant amount of tests were documented and systematically performed and shown to be complete.	
<b>15</b>	Did the application function properly?  <b>This score carries triple weight.</b>	The final application did not function well.	The final application was demonstrated with a reasonable amount of its functionality as dictated by the requirements document.  The application performed smoothly, with a reasonably aesthetically pleasing interface.	The final application was demonstrated with complete functionality as dictated by the requirements document.  The application performed smoothly, with an aesthetically pleasing interface.	X 3=
<b>16</b>	Was the solution creative?	The solution was not particularly creative	The solution showed some creative aspects.	The solution was very creative.	
<b>17</b>	Did the application have a stylish look and-feel?	The application looked poor and was unintuitive.	The application looked ok and was reasonably intuitive.	The application looked excellent and was very intuitive to use.	
<b>18</b>	How original is the project's idea?	The project's idea was not original and has been solved many times.	The project had some original aspects to it, although most of the project has been solved many times.	The project's idea was groundbreaking.	
<b>19</b>	Was the project technically challenging?  <b>This score carries double weight.</b>	The project was very simple technologically.	The project had a few minor technological challenges.	The project was extremely technologically challenging.	X 2 =
<b>20</b>	Did the team consider relevant standards and best practices?	There was no evidence of consideration of standards and best practices within the project.	Some consideration of standards and best practices was evident in the project.	Full consideration of relevant standards and best practice was used within the project.	

Documentation Grade provided by CCI faculty: \_\_\_\_\_ (0 – 30)