**UMass SDP19 CDR – Evaluation Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Members:</th>
<th>Evaluators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Presentation (20%)

- **gpa range: 2.0 - 4.0**
  - **(4.0)** An overview of the project is succinct and demonstrates knowledge and comfort with all subsystems, including how they fit together and communicate with each other. An outline of the upcoming demonstration is brief but complete (i.e., what is working and what is not). Deliverables for the Final Project Review (FPR) are clear and reasonable. These deliverables include everything that is needed for a finished, functioning system that meets all its specs.
  - **(3.5)** Presentation is lacking in only one area: Overview, Outline of Demonstration, or Goals for FPR.
  - **(3.0)** Presentation is lacking in two areas, or one area is missing from the presentation.
  - **(2.5)** Presentation is lacking in all three areas, or lacking in one area with another area missing.
  - **(2.0)** Two areas are missing.

### Prototype Demonstration (20%)

- **gpa range: 2.0 - 4.0**
  - **(4.0)** A professional demonstration of a functioning prototype. Audience is not confused and understands how the whole system works. Each team member displays an understanding of how his/her subsystem fits into the integrated system.
  - **(3.5)** The knowledge is still communicated, but would clearly have benefited from more practice and preparation. The audience is confused once or twice, but these are clarified later.
  - **(3.0)** The audience is confused at one or two points as to what is going on with the demonstration. Attempts to clarify are not successful.
  - **(2.5)** The audience is confused more than twice during and after the demonstration.
  - **(2.0)** The demonstration is not well organized or presented.

### Demonstration of Deliverables (50%)

- **gpa range: 0.0 - 4.0**
  - **Name: ________________________ (4.0 - 0.0)**
  - **Name: ________________________ (4.0 - 0.0)**
  - **Name: ________________________ (4.0 - 0.0)**
  - **Name: ________________________ (4.0 - 0.0)**
  - **(4.0)** All deliverables demonstrated.
  - **(3.0)** Most deliverables demonstrated, but given past progress, about one week of work remains.
  - **(2.0)** About half the work to meet deliverables has been performed, and given past progress, two weeks of work remain.
  - **(1.0)** Less than half of the progress to meet deliverables has been achieved.
  - **(0.0)** Little progress towards meeting deliverables has been achieved.

### Team Responsibilities and Schedule (10%)

- **gpa range: 2.0 - 4.0**
  - **(4.0)** The group clearly defined the responsibilities of each team member and the planned schedule of activities for each team member.
  - **(3.5)** A pattern of clear descriptions was established, but a few tasks were not clearly defined in terms of ownership or timeline.
  - **(3.0)** The pattern was mixed between clear descriptions and either omissions or poorly defined roles and deadlines.
  - **(2.5)** Only a few events had clearly defined owners and deadlines.
  - **(2.0)** The responsibilities and schedules for achieving the goals were not clearly defined.
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