**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+), 2.0 (C), 1.67 (C-)*** | ***Needs Improvements1.33(D+), 1.00 (D)*** | ***Unacceptable0.0 (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 project scope.Implications for projectdecisions are very clear andcritical for moving forwardwith the project. | Information is mostly relevant to project. Implications for project decisions are mostly clear and useful in the project. | Information is usually relevant to the project. Implications for project decisions are somewhat clear and somewhat useful in theproject. | Information is insufficientand/or hardly relevant to the project scope. Implications for project decisions are somewhat unclear. | Information is irrelevant tothe project scope. | 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 engineeringspecifications. | Most critical requirementsand constraints are identified. Some non-criticalrequirements missed. Many of the requirements aretranslated into measurableengineering specifications. | Some of the key requirements and constraints are identifiedand translated intomeasurable engineeringspecifications. | 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 evidence of engineering work is shown. | 0.0 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| **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 good breath for all functions. Selectin processes are appropriate for the given project.  | Concept space includesreasonable number of alternatives. A selection process exists, but someselection criteria are poorlydefined (may not match with the specifications).  | A few concepts offered to address some functions. Selection process mismatched with engineering specifications. | Single concept for some functions. Selection process and/and scoring missing from document. | 0.0 | 0.20 | 0.00 |
| **Project Plan (Appendix B)**· Gantt Charts· Project breakdown· Project details | The project plan iscomplete and includeswell-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. Work division is unclear or uneven for some team members. | The project plan is limited. Work division is unclear or uneven. | No meaningful project plan is presented. | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 |
| **System Evaluation Plan****(Appendix C)**· Test cases and details | The test plan iscomprehensive and includeswell-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 ispresented. | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.00 |
| **Writing**· Consistent and logical flowand organization· Professional (grammar, notypos, proper citations, third-person used)· Tables/figures properlylabeled and cited in the text· Appropriate use ofreferences and citations· Appropriate use ofdiagrams, 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 alwaysflows smoothly, in a logicalmanner. Numerousdiagrams/figuresappropriately used toillustrate the text. In-linecitations with properreferences are alwaysincluded. | The report is usually clear and concise, generally using a technical writing style withfew spelling/grammar errors. Information usually flowed smoothly and in a logical manner. Many diagrams/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 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 andoverly wordy or missingimportant detail. It was not in a technical style (e.g., “diary-style”). The information did not flow smoothly, and a logical structure was not oftenused. Few diagrams areincluded and are notadequately related to the text. Few or incomplete references are used, and citations are missing 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. | 0.0 | 0.25 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 1.00 | 0.00 |