**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*** | ***Weight*** | ***Weighted 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. | 0.0 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| **Customer Needs and**  **Engineering Design**  **Requirements (Ch. 5)**  · Engineering Specifications  · Constraints | 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. Very little engineering work has been done & presented. | Customer needs and engineering requirements are skeletal. No engineering work is evidenced. | 0.0 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| **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. Work is divided evenly among team members. | Concept space includes good breath for all functions. Selectin processes 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. | 0.0 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| **Project Plan (Appendix B)**  · Gantt Charts  · Project breakdown  · Project details | The project plan is  complete and includes  well-defined details about the breakdown of tasks. Work is divided evenly among team members. | The project plan is complete. Some details about the breakdown of tasks are unclear. Work is divided evenly among team members. | The project plan is reasonable but not complete. | The project plan is limited. | No meaningful project plan is presented. | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 |
| **System Evaluation Plan**  **(Appendix C)**  · Test cases and details | 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 is limited. | No meaningful test plan is  presented. | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 |
| **Writing**  · Consistent and logical flow  and organization  · Professional (grammar, no  typos, proper citations, third-person used)  · Tables/figures properly  labeled and cited in the 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. | 0.0 | 0.25 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 1.00 | 0.00 |