Mid Term Design Review Feedback Form (Rev. 22)

Location:	Project Name:						
Criteria Exceeded Expectations A/A. It was very clear whithis project is important for the stakeholders. Somosor's motivation Customer needs Customer needs Very clear what the team plan to do and why. Forget History to be solved Requirements Functional - Performance, Size, and Usability - Preformance, Size, and Usability - Preformance, Size, and Usability - Prefirminary Results - Preliminary Results - Preliminary Results - Next steps - Preliminary Results - Next steps - Proseter - Visual presentation Expected (Fair) Expected (Fair) Expected (Fair) Expected (Fair) C+C/C- It was usually clear why this project is important for the stakeholders. It was somewhat unclear what the team plan to do and why. It was somewhat unclear what the team plan to do and why. Requirements and justification were very clear. - Performance, Size, and Usability - Progress and Plan - Choice of Core - Ereabilitity - Progress and Plan - Non-Function al Samade. Next - Steps were - Preliminary Results - Next steps - Preliminary Results - Next steps - Contents - Contents - Contents - Contents - Size cand spapes and Plan - Visual presentation - Non-Function was complete, clear, and wery easy to follow. There were minimal errors. It was mostly clear and appears to be sound. It was mostly clear and appears to be sound. It was somewhat unclear whithis project is important for the stakeholders. It was somewhat unclear what the team plan to do and why. It was somewhat unclear what the team plan to do and why. It was somewhat unclear what the team plan to do and why. It was usually clear what the team plan to do and why. It was usually clear what the team plan to do and why. Requirements and justification were usually clear. Requirements and appears to be sound. Technical approach is somewhat unclear in rot the team plan to do and why. It was somewhat unclear in rot the tea							
Exceeded Expectations A/A.	ate:				Location		
Expectations A/A	I. Team F	resentation					
It was very clear why this project is important for the stakeholders. It was usually clear why this project is important for the stakeholders. It was very clear what the team plan to do and why.	Criteria	Expectations	Expectation	Expected (Fair)	Improvements		Score
 Project History Semester goals Technical problems to be solved Requirements Functional Non-Functional Non-Functional Justification were very clear. Prechnical Approach Choice of Core technology Fresibility Progress and Plan Progress and Plan Nemeness of open Issues Next steps Contents Structure / Reading Visual presentation Grammatical and spelling errors. Visual presentation Grammatical and spelling errors. 	StakeholdersSponsor's motivationCustomer needs	It was very clear why this project is important for the	It was mostly clear why this project is important for the	It was usually clear why this project is important for the	unclear why this project is important for the	not introduced) why this project is important for the	
• Functional • Non-Functional • Performance, Size, and Usability • Usustification • Choice of Core technology • System Architecture • Feasibility • Progress and Plan • Preliminary Results • Awareness of open Issues • Next steps • Contents • Contents • Contents • Contents • Contents • Grammatical and spelling errors. • Functional • Am justification were work clear and justification were workly clear were usually clear. Technical approach is reproach is approach is somewhat unclear. Technical approach is somewhat unclear approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Technical approach is somewhat unclear. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Technical approach is somewhat unclear. Somewhat clear and appears to be sound. Technical approach is somewhat unclear. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Technical approach is somewhat unclear. Technical approa	Project HistorySemester goalsTechnical problems	what the team plan to do and	clear what the team plan to do	clear what the team plan to do	unclear what the team plan to do and	not introduced) what the team plan	
Technical Approach Choice of Core technology System Architecture Feasibility Progress and Plan Preliminary Results Awareness of open Issues Next steps Next steps Somethat Clearly defined. Clearly defined. Structure / Reading System Architecture Footnotes Structure / Reading System Architecture Feasibility Technical approach is approach is somewhat clear and appears to be sound. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Somewhat clear and appears to be sound. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Somewhat clear and appears to be sound. Slight progress was made. Some of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined. Clearly defined. Information was complete, clear, and very easy to follow. There was pelling errors. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Slight progress was made. Some of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined. Information was complete, usually clear and appears to be sound. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Slight progress was made. Some of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined. Information was complete, usually clear, and mostly easy to follow. There were minimal errors. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Slight progress was made. Some of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined. Information was complete, usually clear, and mostly easy to follow. There were minimal errors. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Slight progress was made. Next steps were realistic and clearly defined. Information was complete, usually clear, and mostly easy to follow. There were minimal errors. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Technical approach is somewhat unclear and/or questionable. Information was complete usually clear, and flowed well. There were were noticeable writing errors.	 Functional Non-Functional Performance, Size, and Usability 	and justification	and justification	and justification were usually	justification were	justification were unclear (or not	
 Preliminary Results Awareness of open Issues Next steps Contents Contents Visual presentation Grammatical and spelling errors. Was made. Next steps was made. Most of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined. Made. Some of the next steps were realistic and clearly defined. Information was complete, clear, and mostly easy to follow. There was spelling errors. Preliminary Results Was made. Next steps Were realistic and clearly defined. Information was complete, usually clear, and mostly easy to follow. There were minimal errors. There were minimal errors. 	Technical Approach Choice of Core technology System Architecture	approach is very clear and appears	approach is mostly clear and appears to be	approach is somewhat clear and appears to be	is somewhat unclear and/or	was unclear or inappropriate (or	
 Contents Structure / Reading Visual presentation Grammatical and spelling errors. complete, clear, and mostly clear, and mostly easy to follow. There were minimal errors. complete, usually clear, somewhat clear, and flowed well. There were minimal errors. There were minimal errors. 	Preliminary ResultsAwareness of open Issues	was made. Next steps were realistic and	was made. Most of the next steps were realistic and	made. Many of the next steps were realistic and	made. Some of the next steps were realistic and clearly	made. Next steps were unrealistic, unclear, or not	
What aspects of the project were impressive?	ContentsStructure / ReadingVisual presentationGrammatical and	complete, clear, and very easy to follow. There was	complete, usually clear, and mostly easy to follow. There were	complete, somewhat clear, and flowed well. There were	complete but rarely clear. (OR incomplete. There were noticeable	incomplete and/or	
	What aspects of th	e project were i	mpressive?	L		1	
What were possible opportunities for improvement?	What were possibl	e opportunities	for improveme	nt?			
	If you need more space	e, please use the ba	ack of this paper.				

Mid Term Design Review Feedback Form (Rev. 22) Project Name: Reviewer: II. Individual Presentation

Criteria	Exceeded Expectations A/A-	Match Expectation B+/B/B-	Less Than Expected (Fair) C+/C/C-	Need Improvements D+/D	Failure F
Contents • Information - Accuracy - Completeness	Always accurate, complete, and clear.	Mostly accurate, complete, and clear.	Usually accurate, complete, and clear.	Frequently unclear, inaccurate, and/or incomplete.	Mostly unclear, inaccurate, and/or incomplete.
Presentation Verbal (volume, tone, pace, fillers, etc.) Non-Verbal (gestures, posture, eye contact, etc.) Openness Defensiveness Argumentativeness	It was very easy to understand without distracting mannerisms.	It was mostly to understand without distracting mannerisms.	It was usually easy to understand with few distracting mannerisms.	It was frequently difficult to understand with some distracting mannerisms.	It was very difficult to understand with noticeable distracting mannerisms.

Students

First Name & Last Name	Contents Points	Presentation Points	Comments

Any additional comme	nts about the r	project?	