Item #	Game	Corp	Humanitarian	Entrepreneurial	Research	Cybersecurity
1	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	1	2	2	2	2	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	2	1
9	2	2	2	2	3	2
10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
11	1	1	1	1	N/A	N/A
12	1	1	1	1	N/A	N/A
13	1	1	1	1	N/A	N/A
14A	2	0.5	0.5	0.5	N/A	N/A
14B	N/A	0.5	0.5	0.5	N/A	N/A
15	N/A	1	1	1	N/A	N/A
16	1	1	1	1	N/A	N/A
17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2
18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3
19	1	1	1	1	N/A	1
20	1	1	1	1	2	2
21	3	3	3	3	3	3
22	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
23	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	230	230	230	230	230	230

Independent Judge
Faculty Adviser
Either or in most cases

Description
Was the presentation organized effectively and was content complete?
Did the visual aids enhance the presentation?
Did the presenters speak in a clear and concise manner?
Did the team answer questions fully and effectively?
Did the team use the presentation time effectively?
Was the team ethusiastic and engaging?
Did the group convey the problem statement clearly?
Did the team use appropriate tools, best practices, and methods to manage the project process?
Was the project technically challenging?
Does the research advance knowledge in the relevant field?
Was the architecture clearly presented and appropriate for the application?
Were alternative designs considered?
Was an appropriate testing strategy used?
Did the application have a stylish look and-feel?
Did the team provide appropriate mechanisms to visualize and examine system data to support development and testing?
Did the team incorporate security throughout the project's development and deployment, or did they explain why security
Did the team research alternate products / solutions?
Did the team convey how general users can use the project results or use any tools developed?
Did the team use appropriate tools and methods to solve the problem being addressed by the project?
Was the documentation appropriate?
Did the team function well as a team and/or work well with the thesis advisor(s)?
Did the application function properly or did the research produce useful results?
Was the literature review appropriate?
Does the game appear fun and / or engaging to play?

Item #	Question
1	Was the presentation organized effectively and was content complete?
2	Did the visual aids enhance the presentation?
3	Did the presenters speak in a clear and concise manner?
4	Did the team answer questions fully and effectively?
5	Did the team use the presentation time effectively?
6	Was the team ethusiastic and engaging?
7	Did the group convey the problem statement clearly?
8	Did the team use appropriate tools, best practices, and methods to manage the project process?
9	Was the project technologically challenging?
10	Does the research advance knowledge in the relevant field?
11	Was the architecture clearly presented and appropriate for the application?
12	Were alternative designs considered?
13	Was an appropriate testing strategy used?
14A	Did the application have a stylish look and-feel?
14B	Did the team provide appropriate mechanisms to visualize and examine system data to support development and testing?
15	Did the team incorporate security throughout the project's development and deployment?
16	Did the team research alternate products / solutions?

17	Did the team convey how general users can use the project results or use any tools developed?
18	Did the team use appropriate tools and methods to solve the problem being addressed by the project?
19	Was the documenation appropriate?
20	Did the team function well as a team?
21	Did the application function properly or did the research produce useful results?
22	Was the literature review appropriate?
23	Does the game appear to be fun to play?

Unacceptable (0)	Acceptable(5)
The presentation addressed few of the appropriate content areas. The presentation's flow was chaotic.	The presentation addressed many of the appropriate content areas. The presentation flowed smoothly from one section to another in many cases.
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.
Students were largely incoherent, difficult to hear, and hard to understand.	Students were rarely incoherent, difficult to hear or hard to understand.
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.
Presentation wasn't distributed in proportion with each topics significance.	Presentation was somewhat distributed in proportion with each topics significance.
The team wasn't engaging, ie. read in a monotone manner.	The team was somewhat engaging.
The presentation barely defined what problem the group was trying to solve. The scope and nature of the problem are hard to discern.	The presentation somewhat defined what problem the group was trying to solve. The scope and nature of the problem are unclearin some aspects.
There was no evidence of appropriate tools, best practices, and methods to manage the project.	There was some evidence of appropriate tools, best practices, and methods to manage the project.
The project was very simple technologically.	The project had a few minor technological challenges.
The research does not advance knowledge in the relevant field.	The research somewhat advances knowledge in the relevant field.
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.
Alternative designs were not disscussed.	Alternative designs were explained in some detail with the pros and cons of the design somewhat explained.
The application was not tested.	A reasonable amount of tests were documented and systematically performed.
The look of the application is unintuitive and generally unattractive.	The application looked ok and was reasonably intuitive.
The data / algorithms was/were not presented in a visual format.	Some of the data/algorithms generated were visualized meaningful.
The project did not consider security as part of its development or deployment and did not address why they didn't.	Some care was taken to address some issues of security throughout the lifecycle of the product development and deployment.
The team did not research alternative products.	The team researched some alternative products, listed them, and did not explain their pros and cons.

The team did not convey how general users can use the results or tools	The team discussed in general how users (with limited technical knowledge) could use results; but the team did not show howgeneral users could interact with the results or tools
The team used mainly manual methods and manual data entry to solve the problem	The team used various tools and methods to solve the problem
The documentation was significantly incomplete	There was a reasonable amount of documentation, but some areas could have been more complete.
The team did not manage the activities of their work effectively, or did not communicate their weekly progress clearly, or did not submit some of their deliverables on time.	The team managed most, but not all, activities of their work effectively using appropriate tools and processes, communicated their weekly progress clearly, and submitted quality deliverables on time.
The final application did not function well or the research did not produce useful results	The final application was demonstrated with a reasonable amount of its functionality as dictated by the requirements document or the research demonstrated resasoble findings.
Little or no literature review was performed.	A reasonable literature review was performed and documented.
The game does not appear to be fun and/or engaging to play.	The game appears somewhat fun and/or engaging to play.

Superior(10)
The presentation addressed all the appopriate content areas. The presentation flowed smoothly from one section to another.
Text is easily readable. Graphics used consistently support the topic. Slide composition has a professional look that enhances the presentation.
Students consistently spoke clearly and at an appropriate volume, and were well understood.
The team demonstrated full knowledge of the material. They explained and elaborated on all questions.
Total presentation time and time allocation by topic creates an effective presentation
All team members were engaging and exhibited enthusiasm.
The presentation clearly defined what problem the group was trying to solve.   The scope and nature of the problem are clear.
There was clear evidence of substantial appropriate tools, best practices, and methods to manage the project.
The project was technologically challenging.
The research significantly advances knowledge in the relevant field.
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 appropriate for the application.
Alternative designs were explained in significant detail with the pros and cons of the design completely explained.
A significant amount of tests were documented and systematically performed and achieved the desired level of code coverage.
The look of the application is intuitive and very attractive.
All the important data / algorithms were visualized meaningfully.
Extensive care was given to address security concerns throughout the lifecycle of the product development and deployment.
The team researched many alternative products, listed them, and explained their pros and cons.

The team discussed the significance of results and provided ways for general users to interact with the results or tools
There was clear evidence of substantial appropriate tools and methods used to solve the project problem
The documentation was complete, covering all necessary areas.
The team managed all activities of their work very effectively using appropriate tools and processes, communicated their weekly progress very clearly, and submitted high quality deliverables on time.
The final application was demonstrated with complete functionality as dictated by the requirements document or the research demonstrated signifcantly useful results.
A complete literature review was performed and documented.
The game appears extremely fun and/or engaging to play.