**Project Name: Reviewer: Date:**

| **Criteria** | ***Exceeds Expectations 4.0 (A), 3.67 (A-)*** | ***Matches Expectations 3.33(B+), 3.0 (B), 2.67 (B-)*** | ***Fair 2.33(C+), 3.0 (C), 1.67 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvements 1.33(D+), 1.00 (D)*** | ***Unacceptable 0.0 (F)*** | ***Num.***  ***Score*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical Background (Ch. 4)**  · 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. |  |
| **Customer Needs and**  **Engineering Design**  **Requirements (Ch. 5)**  · Constraints and Engineering Specifications | All relevant requirements and  constraints are identified,  prioritized, and translated into  clear and 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 of the key requirements  and constraints are identified  and translated into  measurable engineering  specifications. | Customer needs are mostly incomplete, unclear, or not linked to engineering requirements. Few engineering requirements. Feedback from the PDR is not addressed. Very little engineering work has been done and presented. | Customer needs and engineering requirements are skeletal. Feedback from the PDR is not acknowledged. No engineering work is evidenced. |  |
| **System Concept**  **Development (Ch. 6)**  · Concepts Generation and  Selection  · Multiple concepts/solutions | Concept space includes all  reasonable options for all  functions. Selection criteria  are well defined, and scores  are clearly explained. | Concept space includes good  breath for all functions.  Selectin process are  appropriate for the given  project. | Concept space includes  reasonable but not  comprehensive. A selection process exists, but some  selection criteria are poorly  defined (may not match with  the 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. |  |
| **System Evaluation Plan**  **(Appendix B)**  · SMART = Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, & Timely | The test plan is  comprehensive and includes  well-defined details. | The test plan is  comprehensive. Some details  are unclear or incomplete. | The test plan is reasonable but  not comprehensive. | The test plan appears is  limited. | No meaningful test plan is  presented. |  |
| **Writing**  · Consistent and logical flow  and organization  · Professional (grammar, no  typos, proper citations, third-person used)  · Tables/figures properly  labeled and cited/described in  text  · Appropriate use of  references and citations  · Appropriate use of  diagrams, figures, sketches, and  models  · Appropriate use of facts and supporting evidence | The report is consistently clear  and concise, using a technical  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 are always  included. | The report is usually clear and  concise, generally using a  technical writing style with  few spelling/grammar errors.  Information usually flowed  smoothly and in a logical  manner. Many  diagrams/figures are  included to clarify the text.  References are often used  and properly cited. | The report is generally clear  and concise with a few  spelling / grammatical errors.  The technical writing style was  not consistently followed.  Information generally flowed  smoothly and in a logical  manner, but some parts are  challenging to follow. Some  diagrams are used to  accompany the text. Some  errors in referencing/citing  are made. | The report is unclear and  overly wordy or missing  important 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 are  included and are not  adequately related to the text.  Few or incomplete references  are used, and citations are  missing or incomplete. | The report contained few  details and was unclear.  Information was not  organized. The writing style  was informal/casual. No  diagrams or illustrations are  included or are improperly  used. References are not  used or are incomplete or  missing. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overall (Ave.) |  |