

Review of Project: «Codename1»

Completeness scale: 5 answer is complete 4 3 answer is somewhat incomplete 2 1 answer is incomplete or missing many key aspects	Accuracy scale: 5 answer is accurate, shows excellent insight into the issues 4 3 answer lacks insight, although it is mostly accurate 2 1 answer somewhat inaccurate and shows little if any insight
* = aspect is outstanding in both areas, receives extra credit	

I. «S1».1 “About this Project” section	<i>Completeness:</i>		5	4	3	2	1
(addresses summary + rec. environment + team recommendations)	<i>Accuracy:</i>	*	5	4	3	2	1
II. «S1».2 “Approach for this investigation” section	<i>Completeness:</i>		5	4	3	2	1
(addresses steps (not results) + investigative environment)	<i>Accuracy:</i>	*	5	4	3	2	1
III. «S1».3 “Findings” section	<i>Completeness:</i>		5	4	3	2	1
(documentation + dir. structure + quality op/code + legal + testing)	<i>Accuracy:</i>	*	5	4	3	2	1
IV. «S1».4 “Recommendations” section	<i>Completeness:</i>		5	4	3	2	1
(fixes + enhancements + strategy for continued work)	<i>Accuracy:</i>	*	5	4	3	2	1
V. «S1».5 “Summary of faults and problems” section	<i>Completeness:</i>		5	4	3	2	1
(usable and useful presentation of problems encountered)	<i>Accuracy:</i>	*	5	4	3	2	1
VI. Section «S1» Overall Quality – effectiveness in conveying a full and informative review (5 = very effective; 1 = information is very inadequate)		*	5	4	3	2	1

Grading continued on back of page