**Project Name: Reviewer: Date:**

| **Criteria** | **Exceeded Expectations** | **Match Expectations** | **Less Than Expected (Fair)** | **Need Improvements** | **Failure** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Background and Customer Needs Analysis**  | All users and stakeholders are identified along with critical analysis of potential issues. Issues are prioritized based upon the level of impact and probability. | Most users and stakeholders are identified along with critical analysis of potential issues. | Many users and stakeholders are identified, along with an analysis of potential issues. | Some users and stakeholders are identified, but little or no analysis of potential issues. | No users and stakeholders are identified, and little or no analysis of potential issues. |
| **Technology Assessment*** Relevant to the project
* Analyses and implication
* Usefulness
* Engineering Standards
 | Information is very relevant to the assigned topic. Implications for project decisions are very clear and critical for moving forward with the project.  | Information is mostly relevant to the assigned topic. Implications for project decisions are mostly clear and useful in the project.  | Information is usually relevant to the assigned topic. Implications for project decisions are somewhat clear and somewhat useful in the project.  | Information is insufficient and/or hardly relevant to the assigned topic. Implications for project decisions are somewhat unclear.  | Information is irrelevant to the assigned topic.  |
| **Requirements/ metrics**  | All relevant requirements and constraints are identified, prioritized, and translated into clear measurable engineering specifications. | Most critical requirements and constraints are identified. Some non-critical requirements missed. Many of the requirements are translated into measurable engineering specifications. | Many key requirements and constraints are identified and translated into measurable engineering specifications. | Some requirements and constraints are identified and translated into measurable engineering specifications. | Customer needs are not translated into clear requirements. Most of the requirements are not translated into measurable engineering specifications. |
| **Concept Generation*** Selection
* Multiple concepts/solutions
 | Concept space appears to include all reasonable options for all functions. Selection criteria are well defined, and scores are clearly explained.  | Concept space appears to include good breadth for all functions. Selection process appears to appropriate for the given project. | Concept space appears to be reasonable but not comprehensive. Selection process exists, but some selection criteria are poorly defined (may not match with the specifications). | Concept space appears to be limited. Selection process exists but has some flaws. | Concept space appears to be inadequate. Selection process appears inadequate. |
| **Communication (PPT)*** Consistent and logical flow and organization
* Professional (conforms to PPT standard format, readable, not too many words, fully annotated figures)
* Tables/figures properly labeled and cited/described in text
* Appropriate use of references and citations
* Appropriate use of diagrams, figures, sketches, models
* Facts and evidence provided to support conclusions
 | The report is consistently clear and concise, using an abbreviated PPT appropriate writing style and with little or no spelling/grammar errors. Well formatted and always flows smoothly, in a logical manner. Numerous diagrams/figures appropriately used to illustrate the text. In-line citations with proper references were always included. | The report is usually clear and concise, generally uses abbreviated PPT appropriate writing style with few spelling or grammar errors. Information usually flowed smoothly and in a logical manner. Many diagrams/figures were included to clarify the text. References were often used and properly cited. | The report is generally clear and concise with a few spelling / grammatical errors. The abbreviated PPT appropriate writing style was not consistently followed. Information generally flowed smoothly and in a logical manner, but some parts were difficult to follow. Some diagrams were used to accompany the text. Some errors in referencing/citing were made. | The report is unclear and overly wordy or missing significant detail. It was not in a technical style (e.g. “diary-style”). The information did not flow smoothly and a logical structure was not often used. Few diagrams were included and were not related to the text. Few or incomplete references were used, and citations were missing or incomplete. | The report contained few details and was unclear. Information was not organized. The PPT appropriate writing style not concise, not readable, not organized. Familiar and casual terms used. No diagrams or illustrations were included or were improperly used. References were not used or were incomplete or missing. |