**Senior Design Architecture Design Review**  
**& Final Exam**  
**REVIEWER EVALUATION**

Date: **December 10, 2014**  
Team: ______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERVIEW:</strong> Is the <strong>meta-architecture</strong> clearly described with critical <strong>guiding principles for the design</strong> delineated. Is the top-level design structure simply, logically and clearly defined (<strong>rationale</strong>, structural location of critical functions, <strong>external data input and output</strong>)? Fully and clearly defined (20 - 18 points)? Concepts are presented, but not thoroughly described (17 - 15 points)? Many questions remain (14 - 10 points)? Layers are confusing, unrelated to each other, poorly described, etc. (10 - 0 points)?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAYERS:</strong> Are the architectural layers well defined (purpose, function, dependencies, services provided to/expected from other layers, calculations/processing that is required, data input and output and data flows)? Is there a clear relationship between the layers? Is layer independence and interaction defined? Is inter-layer coupling minimized? Fully and clearly defined (20 - 18 points)? Subsystems and components are presented, but not thoroughly described (17 - 15 points)? Many questions remain, especially about relationships and interdependencies (14 - 10 points)? Grouping of subsystems and components is confusing and/or poorly defined (10 - 0 points)?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBSYSTEMS:</strong> Are subsystems and key components well defined (purpose, function, dependencies, services provided to/expected from other subsystems, calculations/processing that is required, data input and output and data flows between subsystems)? Is there a clear relationship to the layers in which they appear? Do concise user stories validate the completeness of design? Fully and clearly defined (20 - 18 points)? Subsystems and components are presented, but not thoroughly described (17 - 15 points)? Many questions remain, especially about relationships and interdependencies (14 - 10 points)? Grouping of subsystems and components is confusing and/or poorly defined (10 - 0 points)?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA FLOWS:</strong> Is the <strong>flow of data through the system</strong> clearly and completely defined and understood? Are all <strong>data elements</strong> described? Are any request/response flows properly identified? Fully and clearly defined (20 - 18 points)? Concepts are presented, but not thoroughly described (17 - 15 points)? Many questions remain (14 - 10 points)? Layers are confusing, unrelated to each other, poorly described, etc. (10 - 0 points)?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL,</strong> based on this review and a review of the draft ADS, the team’s Q &amp; A, and your subjective opinion of what you heard and saw today, how would you <strong>rate this architecture design</strong>? Superior/Outstanding (20 points)? Excellent (19 - 18 points)? Good (17 - 16 points)? Fair (15 - 12 points)? Weak (11 - 8 points)? Poor (7 – 0 points)?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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