## Peer Evaluation Form – CSE 473 Project (Spring 2010).

Project team members (last name first):

Project Title: Category of project (circle one): (1) Thoughtful reconstruction of a classical AI program, (2) PROLOG implementation of a probabilistic model, (3) Bayes Net event analysis in Python, (4) Case-Based Reasoning, (5) AI in Image Understanding, (6) Serious Games. Main technique being demonstrated: \_\_\_\_\_ and application problem being addressed: \_\_\_\_\_ For the following, either rate the quality of the item from 0 to 5 (0 means not implemented or "not at all" and 5 means excellent or "very much") or simply check off the item, meaning "satisfactorily done." Presentation: () The project was presented. ( ) Main technique was explained briefly. ( ) It is clear where the AI is. (Where? \_\_\_\_\_) () It is not clear where the AI is. () A simple example was presented and explained clearly. Demo: () A complex example was presented, and the program worked OK on it. () All team members participated in the demo. () Technique was illustrated using graphics. Transparency: () Comments were printed out as the program ran. () Interactive controls permitted setting parameters and/or inspecting data structures.. () A demo was run using a prepared file. Teaching/Learning: () I was already familiar with the main technique being presented. () This demo taught me about the technique. Strengths (name at least one) : Weaknesses (name at least one): \_\_\_\_\_ In what way(s) does or could the program foster a real collaboration between person and computer in problem solving or learning and teaching? Other comments: Evaluated by (please print:) (signed:) Acknowledgement by project team: I/we have read the above evaluation and I/we agree/disagree (circle one) Project member 1 signature: Project member 2 signature: CSE 473 – Univ. of Wash. S. Tanimoto