**Project Name: Reviewer: Date:**

| **Criteria** | ***Exceeds Expectations4.0 (A), 3.67 (A-)*** | ***Matches Expectations3.33(B+), 3.0 (B), 2.67 (B-)*** | ***Fair2.33(C+), 3.0 (C), 1.67 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvements1.33(D+), 1.00 (D)*** | ***Unacceptable0.0 (F)*** | ***Num.******Score*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Technical Background (Ch. 4)**· Relevant to the project· Analyses and implication· Usefulness· Engineering Standards | Information is very relevant tothe assigned topic.Implications for projectdecisions are very clear andcritical for moving forwardwith the project. | Information is mostly relevantto the assigned topic.Implications for projectdecisions are mostly clear anduseful in the project. | Information is usually relevantto the assigned topic.Implications for projectdecisions are somewhat clearand somewhat useful in theproject. | Information is insufficientand/or hardly relevant to theassigned topic. Implicationsfor project decisions aresomewhat unclear. | Information is irrelevant tothe assigned topic. |  |
| **Customer Needs and****Engineering Design****Requirements (Ch. 5)**· Constraints and Engineering Specifications | All relevant requirements andconstraints are identified,prioritized, and translated intoclear and measurable engineeringspecifications. | Most critical requirementsand constraints are identified.Some non-criticalrequirements missed. Many ofthe requirements aretranslated into measurableengineering specifications. | Many of the key requirementsand constraints are identifiedand translated intomeasurable engineeringspecifications. | 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 andSelection· Multiple concepts/solutions | Concept space includes allreasonable options for allfunctions. Selection criteriaare well defined, and scoresare clearly explained. | Concept space includes goodbreath for all functions.Selectin process areappropriate for the givenproject.  | Concept space includesreasonable but notcomprehensive. A selection process exists, but someselection criteria are poorlydefined (may not match withthe specifications).  | Some requirements andconstraints are identified andtranslated into measurableengineering specifications | Customer needs are nottranslated into clearrequirements. Most of therequirements are nottranslated into measurableengineering specifications. |  |
| **System Evaluation Plan****(Appendix B)**· SMART = Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, & Timely | The test plan iscomprehensive and includeswell-defined details. | The test plan iscomprehensive. Some detailsare unclear or incomplete. | The test plan is reasonable butnot comprehensive. | The test plan appears islimited. | No meaningful test plan ispresented. |  |
| **Writing**· Consistent and logical flowand organization· Professional (grammar, notypos, proper citations, third-person used)· Tables/figures properlylabeled and cited/described intext· Appropriate use ofreferences and citations· Appropriate use ofdiagrams, figures, sketches, andmodels· Appropriate use of facts and supporting evidence | The report is consistently clearand concise, using a technicalwriting style and with little orno spelling/grammar errors.Well formatted and alwaysflows smoothly, in a logicalmanner. Numerousdiagrams/figuresappropriately used toillustrate the text. In-linecitations with properreferences are alwaysincluded. | The report is usually clear andconcise, generally using atechnical writing style withfew spelling/grammar errors.Information usually flowedsmoothly and in a logicalmanner. Manydiagrams/figures areincluded to clarify the text.References are often usedand properly cited. | The report is generally clearand concise with a fewspelling / grammatical errors.The technical writing style wasnot consistently followed.Information generally flowedsmoothly and in a logicalmanner, but some parts arechallenging to follow. Somediagrams are used toaccompany the text. Someerrors in referencing/citingare made. | The report is unclear andoverly wordy or missingimportant detail. It was not ina technical style (e.g., “diary-style”).The information didnot flow smoothly, and alogical structure was not oftenused. Few diagrams areincluded and are notadequately related to the text.Few or incomplete referencesare used, and citations aremissing or incomplete. | The report contained fewdetails and was unclear.Information was notorganized. The writing stylewas informal/casual. Nodiagrams or illustrations areincluded or are improperlyused. References are notused or are incomplete ormissing. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Overall (Ave.) |  |