

Client Meeting 2 Rubric (Ver. 2026-08-14)

Project Name:

Reviewer:

Date:

Criteria	<i>Exceeds Expectations</i> 93-100 (A), 90-92 (A-)	<i>Matches Expectations</i> 87-89 (B+), 83-86 (B), 80-82 (B-)	<i>Fair</i> 77-79 (C+), 73-76 (C), 70-72 (C-)	<i>Needs Improvement</i> 67-69 (D+), 65-66 (D)	<i>Unacceptable</i> Below 65 (F)	Raw Numeric Score	Wgt.	Score
Project Overview - Background & Project Statement - Long Term & Short Term Objectives	The background information and project statement is clear. Long term and short term objectives are specific and aligned with the project.	The background information and project statement is mostly clear. Long term and short term objectives are appropriate.	Provides a basic project background and statement. Objectives are generally appropriate, but some are unclear.	Provides limited background or an unclear project statement. Objectives are incomplete, or only partially related to the project.	Background and project statement are missing or unclear. Objectives are absent, unrealistic, or unrelated to the project.		0.10	
Engineering Definition - Needs & requirements - Use Cases - User Stories	Identifies all key stakeholder needs and uses appropriate tools to develop the engineering definition. All needs and requirements have measurable metrics; use cases and user stories include acceptance criteria.	Identifies all key stakeholder needs and uses appropriate tools to develop the engineering definition. Most needs and requirements have measurable metrics; use cases and user stories are clear.	Identifies most key stakeholder needs and uses appropriate tools to develop the engineering definition. Most needs and requirements have measurable metrics; use cases and user stories are generally clear.	Identifies some key stakeholder needs and uses appropriate tools to develop engineering definition. Needs and requirements lack measurable metrics; use cases or user stories are unclear.	Fails to identify key stakeholder needs or use appropriate engineering definition tools. Requirements lack measurable metrics; use cases or user stories are missing.		0.20	
System Architecture - System components - Interface / Interaction	Overall system architecture is clear, shows all major components, interfaces, and system interactions with appropriate functional and technical detail.	Overall system architecture is mostly clear, showing all major components, interfaces, and system interactions.	Overall system architecture shows most of the major components and interfaces, but the interactions are not clear or incomplete.	Overall system architecture shows some of the major components, but the interfaces and interactions are incomplete or missing.	Overall system architecture is missing or unclear.		0.20	
Concepts - Multiple Concepts - Selection Criteria	The concept space appears to include all reasonable options for all system functions. Multiple concepts are presented for all system functions. Selection criteria are well-defined; scores are clearly explained.	The concept space appears to include good breadth for all system functions. Multiple concepts are presented for most of the system functions. The selection process seems appropriate for the project.	The concept space appears reasonable but not comprehensive. Multiple concepts are presented for some system functions. Some selection criteria are poorly defined (they do not match the specifications).	Concept space appears to be limited. Multiple concepts are presented for a few system functions. The selection process was conveyed, but it has some flaws.	Concept space appears to be inadequate. Multiple concepts are not presented. The selection process seems insufficient.		0.20	
Project Progress - Technical development - Evidence (Calculations, analysis, prototypes, UI storyboards, sketches, code, testing, or demonstrations)	Demonstrates substantial technical advancement beyond concepts, supported by appropriate evidence and discussion of technical challenges.	Demonstrates meaningful technical advancement beyond concepts, supported by appropriate evidence.	Demonstrates some technical advancement with limited evidence.	Demonstrates limited technical advancement with insufficient supporting evidence.	Demonstrates no meaningful technical advancement or supporting evidence beyond concept generation.		0.15	
Communication - Organization & Clarity - Visual Communication - Team Delivery & Professionalism - Response to Questions	Presentation is very clear, concise, and logically organized. Uses effective visuals, all team members communicate confidently, and questions are answered thoroughly.	Presentation is mostly clear, concise, and logically organized. Uses effective visuals, most team members communicate confidently, and questions are answered appropriately.	Presentation is generally clear, but organization, visuals, delivery, or responses to questions lack consistency.	Presentation is difficult to follow, uses limited visuals, and responses or delivery lack clarity and confidence.	Presentation is unclear, poorly organized, lacks appropriate visuals, and questions are not adequately addressed.		0.15	
						Total	1.00	

Comments (Optional)