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| Project: | 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)*** | ***Raw Numerical Score*** | ***Weight*** | ***WeightedClick Ctrl-A and F9*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Background:-** Sponsor & Customers- Problem & Motivation- Project History as needed | The background information is very clear. | The background information is mostly clear. | The background information is somewhat clear. | The background information is hardly clear. | The background information is unclear. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.60 |
| **Long Term Objectives:**- Project outcomes- Expected benefits | Long term outcomes and expected benefits are very clear and reflect the customer’s needs. | Long term outcomes and expected benefits are mostly clear and reflect the customer’s needs. | Long term outcomes and expected benefits are somewhat clear and reflect the customer’s needs. | Long term outcomes and expected benefits are hardly clear. | Long term outcomes and expected benefits are unclear. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.60 |
| **Semester Objectives:**- S.M.A.R.T.- In scope- Out of scope | All of the semester objectives are realistic, very clear, and consistent with the long term objectives. | Most of the semester objectives are realistic, clear, and consistent with the long term objectives.  | Some of the semester objectives are realistic, clear, and consistent with the long term objectives. | Few of the semester objectives are realistic and consistent with the long term objectives. | The semester objectives are unrealistic and/or unclear. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| **Engineering Tools and Method:**- Assumptions & Strategy- Resource needs | The technical approach is very clear and realistic. | The technical approach is clear and realistic.  | The technical approach is somewhat clear. | The technical approach is vague. | The technical approach is unclear. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| **Initial Deliverables and Dates:**- Deliverables, not tasks- Dates | Deliverables are presented. It is easy to correlate them with the semester objectives. All dates reflect a good first approximation to the project schedule.  | Many deliverables and few tasks are presented. It is generally easy to correlate them with the semester objectives. Most of the dates reflect a good first approximation to the project schedule.  | Some deliverables and some tasks are presented. It is somewhat difficult to correlate them with semester objectives. Some dates reflect a good first approximation to the project schedule. | Few deliverables and many tasks are presented. It is generally difficult to correlate them with the semester objectives.Few dates reflect a good first approximation to the project schedule. | Tasks, not deliverables, are presented. It is very difficult to correlate them with the semester objectives. Dates do not reflect a good first approximation to the project schedule. | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| **Documentation:**- Consistent, logical flow and organization - Professional (grammar, no typos, third-person used) references and citations - Appropriate use of tables and figures, including labeling, citing in the text.- Facts and evidence provided to support conclusions | The report is consistently clear and concise, using a technical writing style with little or no spelling / grammatical errors. Formatted well 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 a technical writing style with few spelling / grammatical 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 technical 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 properly 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 writing style was informal / casual. No diagrams or illustrations were included or were improperly used. References were not used or were incomplete or missing. | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **Overall** | 1.00 | 1.20 |